16.

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FIRST SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT

---

5 EDWARD VII., 1905

VOL. LXX

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

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

ERRATA

VOL. II.

Col. 2063, 3rd line from top insert ' Mr. Bennett.'

Col. 2384, 30 lines from bottom ' Who recalled that Henley,' should read : ' Who recalled that at Henley, Scholes the famous oarsman,' &c.

Col. 3286, the first financial statement : ' Amount to be paid annually to each province . . . . . an annual payment of $2,207,875 each, should be transposed to Col. 3287 and read after the fifth line from the top.

Col. 3744, heading of ' Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Ry. Co. . . . Motion agreed to,' should be deleted.

House of Commons Debates

FIRST SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 3, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 89) respecting the Monterey Electric and Gas Company, and to change its name to the Monterey Railway, Light and Power Company.—Mr. Macdonell—by Mr. Ingram.

Bill (No. 90) respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—Mr. R. Smith—by Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 91) respecting the Temagami Railway Company.—Mr. McCool.

Bill (No. 92) respecting the Ottawa and New York Railway Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 93) respecting the Grand Council of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association of Canada.—Mr. J. J. Hughes—by Mr. McIsaac.

Bill (No. 94) respecting the Brockville, Westport, and Northwestern Railway Company.—Mr. Derbyshire—by Mr. M. S. Schell.

Bill (No. 95) respecting Gillies Bros., Limited.—Mr. A. A. Wright.

Bill (No. 96) respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 97) respecting the Kingston and Dominion Central Railway, and to change its name to the Montreal, Ottawa, Kingston and Georgian Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Harty.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would point out to the Minister of Railways that in compliance with the order of the House yesterday in reference to the hay matter, he brought down a supplementary return, but the main return which was ordered five days before, he has not brought down, and of course the codicil is of no use without the will. I wish to have the return as soon as possible.

THE BUDGET.

Mr. FOSTER. I may be a little premature, but I would like to know if the Minister of Finance can tell us, about what time he proposes to bring down the financial statement.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I am not prepared to state at present but I will do so on an early day.

Mr. FOSTER. It will not be I suppose for a day or two ?

Mr. FIELDING. Not for a few days to come, but an answer will be given in due time so that my hon. friend will have ample notice.

DOMINION LANDS—INQUIRY.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to ask the Minister of the Interior, or the minister who is acting for him, when I may expect the return ordered early in the session as to the lands that had been sold in the Northwest during the past year.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I brought down a report about lands a few days ago.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not what I referred to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will have the matter attended to.

SEPARATE SCHOOLS—INQUIRY RE PUBLICATION.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the First Minister had time yet during these busy hours, to inquire as to an official statement or semi-official statement that was distributed recently in reference to separate schools in the different provinces ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand it was distributed by the Secretary of State, and I am further told that the document contains no comment but is composed simply of extracts from the former debates of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. My criticism was that though there is no argument in so many words, yet the whole is arranged in the form of a sustained argument and the clauses

which bear particularly upon the maintenance and establishment of separate schools are italicised all the way through. That would not appear in an official statement, or ought not to. Evidently there is a tendency in it to make an argument as well as to present official information.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not prepared at this moment to dispute what my hon. friend says ; I simply tell him that it was done by the Secretary of State.

REPORT FROM RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. H. LENNOX. On the 22nd of February last there was a discussion in reference to obtaining a report from the Board of Railway Commissioners on their work during the last financial year. Probably sufficient time has not elapsed for the preparation of that report, but I would ask the Minister of Railways if he can inform the House when we may expect it ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). I had a conference with the chairman of the Railway Commission, and he stated that the secretary of the commission was now preparing such a report. As soon as it is placed in my hands I will lay it on the table of the House.

Mr. LENNOX. Can the hon. minister state any definite time when it will be ready ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not ask the exact date. Only to day the chairman assured me that it was being prepared, but I did not ask whether it would be ready in a day or two. I assumed it would be ready in the near future.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—SURVEYS.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another question I would like to ask the Minister of Railways. We have on several occasions pressed for some information with reference to surveys made upon the route of the Grand Trunk Pacific. It is a question in which parliament is of course very deeply interested inasmuch as parliament furnishes the guarantees for all, or very nearly, all the road and the money for a large part of it. The House has had no information at all up to the present time and the Minister of Railways has fallen back upon the non possimus argument ; he has stated that he has no control over the commission. There ought to be some medium of communication between the commission and this House, and I imagine that it ought to be through the Minister of Railways. The representatives of the people ought to have access to the earliest information, especially when they are in session. Information has leaked out or has been given out by members of the commission as to what has been found. It is said that grades and facilities in the way of running a line have been discovered that were not dreamed of before. If this can be fairly well established it should be made known, but I find that the other day Mr. Hays, in making an address before a club in Toronto, gave absolutely definite information as to grades and curves. We have been in session now for two months, we, the representatives of the people who are responsible for the cash and the credit. Surely if there is such information we ought to have it, and it does look derogatory to the privileges of parliament and to the good business conduct of public affairs that a private club in Toronto or anywhere else should have definite and specific information with reference to this subject that has been withheld from the House. I simply call the attention of the First Minister and the Minister of Railways to this in order that it may be remedied. That information must be there or Mr. Hays could not have used it. If it is available I think it should be furnished to us as the House has asked for it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The request of my hon. friend is not at all unreasonable, but I must tell him that the government has no information whatever up to the present time upon this subject. We have heard hearsay, as my hon. friend has, from different quarters that grades have been found which are very satisfactory and that the character of the land has been found to be far better than was expected. The Grand Trunk Pacific have had engineers surveying this country for the past two years and more and they may have information which the government has not, but which perhaps the commission may have at this time.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the point.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The commission has not made a report. The question has come up as to whether the commission should be asked to make a report. As to that I have not come to any conclusion ; it is a question that deserves fair consideration before an answer is given one way or another. The government, however, have no information. It may be advisable to ask the commission for information. It is a matter for consideration which may well be looked into.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me that after we had pressed for the information before, some one should have taken the trouble to have asked the commission if they have information. Surely the government must have some means of getting that information. I must say to my hon. friend that the commission require money to carry on their work and I am sure that this House will not consent to give the money to carry it on unless we have the information. That

is a basic principle, we cannot give money for expenditures unless we have the information.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Unless they have the information they cannot give it.

Mr. FOSTER. That is it exactly.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No one can object to that.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. I understood from the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) that the location of part of the Grand Trunk Pacific line had been deposited in his department. The terminals of the different routes have been deposited in his department for a long time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. HAGGART. And his reason for not bringing down the information to the House was that it required the approval of the government before expropriation work could be done on that particular part.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. HAGGART. Surely we are entitled to that information. The minister's answer to the House was that he was not going to open it up for speculators from one end of the country to the other in order that they might purchase land at probable locations of the Grand Trunk Pacific. The answer to this was that the information has been furnished to individuals in his own department already. If that is so, why has the House not been placed in possession of the information?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). And why does the general public not have a show too?

Mr. EMMERSON. I stated to the House, and now I repeat, that plans had been deposited as respects the proposed terminals at Fort William and Port Arthur and also on the Pacific coast. That information is in the department. If my instructions were carried out, and I think they were, it is information that is under seal. I can say to my hon. friend that I even have not seen those plans and that they are under seal until the matter can be taken up. The reason given, I think, is a very good one that the information should not go out until the matter has been decided, until it has come under the consideration of the Minister of Railways and his colleagues. Until then it cannot be furnished and I think that on the ground of public policy and public interest it would not be wise to have the information given.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (Algoma). I am somewhat astonished in view of what I know to be the facts——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend is to make a speech on the subject, I would say to him that we will move the House into supply shortly and he will then have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. BOYCE. I am prepared to move the adjournment of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It would be preferable for the hon. gentleman to make any remarks he wishes to make when the House is moved into supply.

Mr. BOYCE. My remarks are entirely along the lines of those of the gentlemen who have preceded me, and I would rather give them now. I will not take long.

Mr. SPEAKER. The more usual course is to wait until the House is moved into supply.

Mr. BOYCE. I was surprised to hear the Minister of Railways in view of what he has placed on record and of the historical facts in connection with these plans. I had the honour of moving before the House for a return of these plans early in February. The motion duly came on and the Minister of Railways informed me that it was impossible, having regard to the provisions of the Act, I think section 122 of the Railway Act, as revised in 1903, to place them upon the table of the House, because although he admitted that such plans had been deposited in the department and therefore he knew that plans with reference to Port Arthur, Fort William and the Pacific termini had been deposited in the department they had not, in accordance with that section of the Act which differs from the section of the Act as consolidated in 1888, been approved of by the department. The answer the hon. gentleman gave to the House was that he was not going to make these plans public to this House, because it would encourage speculation. I had been informed before making that motion, and I have verified my information since, that at that time copies of those plans showing the intentions of the Grand Trunk Pacific with regard to Port Arthur and Fort William had been issued from the Department of Railways, were being handed about and were being used by speculators. I thought, therefore, that it was an extraordinary matter that the Minister of Railways should come down to the House in reply to a motion for return and say forsooth, that it would encourage speculators if these plans which were deposited but not approved of were laid on the table of parliament, but they could be handed out by the back door to speculators in that part of the country and elsewhere. I think the situation calls for an explanation at the hands of the hon. gentleman and I trust that he will explain as fully as the circumstances require.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am certainly surprised at the remarks of the hon. gentleman.

I have said that I personally have not seen the plans of these terminals. The very first moment that I learned of these plans being deposited was when I was informed of the fact by my deputy minister, who asked me if any one would be allowed to see them. I said no, certainly not, that on the contrary they should be placed under seal, and that no one should be allowed access to them either in the department or out of it. My hon. friend says that copies of these plans have gone out from the department. I wish to characterize that statement as absolutely unfounded in fact. If there are such plans in circulation, they do not come from the Department of Railways and Canals. I have too much confidence in the deputy minister and the officers of that department to believe for a moment that my instructions were not very closely observed, and I am satisfied that no one has been permitted to see these plans. I know personally that one day when I was in the department a prominent representative of a railway corporation in this Dominion came to me and asked to see these plans, and he will bear testimony to the fact that I said it was impossible for any one to see them and that he could not see them. No doubt my hon. friend made the statement he did in good faith. Possibly it may be true that there are some plans in circulation. If there are, they may have come from the corporation that prepared them, but certainly that any such came from the Department of Railways and Canals, I absolutely deny, and I base my denial on my confidence in my deputy minister and officials. I am confident that they would not permit anything of the kind, and I am satisfied that these plans are still under seal in accord with my instructions.

Mr. HAGGART. The extraordinary part of this matter is that these plans should be kept secret. Under the old Act of parliament the depositing of the plans was simply a mechanical act, the same as filing them in the registry office or filing the plans of a railway for the purpose of incorporation. These plans were afterwards filed in the different counties through which the railway was to run. Why the plans in question should be kept under seal is most astonishing. Why are they not open to the public? Why it should not be made public that this road would pass through a particular town or portion of the country, is something I do not understand. The last amendment to the Act of Parliament was simply to make the department or the government responsible for the character of the road which was obtaining government assistance, so that the government might see that the gradients and curvatures and everything else were up to the requirements of the contract. But when a railway company deposits its plans in the department, I cannot possibly understand why the public should not have access to them. As to the fact of these plans having been made public, I was informed by the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Boyce) that to his knowledge—and of course I am not holding the minister at all responsible but accept his statement as made in perfect good faith—parties have had access to the plans in the department and know exactly where these roads are to be located.

Mr. EMMERSON. They know more than I do.

Mr. HAGGART. I am not accusing the hon. minister. I believe that he spoke exactly what he considered to be the fact, but I believe that the facts, from the information given by my hon. friend, are different from what the hon. minister believes them to be. If that be so, the parties who disregarded the minister's instructions should be dismissed.

Mr. EMMERSON. You can rest assured of that.

Mr. HAGGART. But what I arose particularly to protest against is that when plans or other documents giving the location, character, gradients and all the other principal requisites of a railway are filed in the department, they should be looked upon as secret papers and kept from the public until the minister has given them his approval.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The question before the House is this: The plans have been filed for approval of a station ground at Fort William. The minister thought proper, rightly or wrongly, to have these plans kept secret until such time as the location is approved of. Some time ago my hon. friend from Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Boyce) asked to have these papers communicated to the House and his request was refused. That refusal was in accord with the decision of the Minister of Railways and Canals that until the plans were approved it was advisable in the public interest that they should not be made public. Whether that decision was right or wrong is a question open for discussion. But the charge is made these instructions of the minister were disobeyed and that these plans have gone out by the back door to some interested parties. This is a very serious charge.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend has information on which to base a charge of that kind, it is his duty to give it to the House so that it may be investigated. If his statement be true, it is in the interest of the government and the country that those who are the culprits should be known and punished, for it would be intolerable that such dereliction of duty should be allowed to go unchecked.

Mr. BOYCE. I may say in reply to the right hon. gentleman that so far as the information given me is concerned, I do not

doubt it for an instant. It came to me in the first instance indirectly and before I made the motion to have these plans laid upon the table. The answer I then received from the hon. Minister of Railways, and which will be found on page 917 of Hansard, was somewhat startling.

There are no plans deposited and approved in the Department of Railways and Canals. Therefore this motion could not very well pass.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) did not say 'approved.'

Mr. EMMERSON. They cannot be dealt with unless they are approved. It would be proper to bring them before the public; that might very well serve the interests of those who wished to indulge in speculation, but I do not think it would serve the public interest.

Mr. BOYCE. Have any plans whatever been deposited, whether approved or not?

Mr. EMMERSON. They have not been approved.

Mr. BOYCE. I asked if any have been deposited?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Now, the request for the return of these plans was justified by the language of the hon. gentleman himself. Though the reason given for withholding these plans was that, while plans are in transition in the Department of Railways, under, as the minister is pleased to say, the seal of secrecy, they cannot be made public to this House, yet others, if my information be correct—and I make the statement upon the best of information, and believe it——

Mr. EMMERSON. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) give me the source of that information?

Mr. BOYCE. I state to the Minister of Railways here that I have such information. And I have investigated that information as well as time and circumstances permit——

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend will pardon me: I would be glad if he would give me the source of his information. Because, as he himself must recognize, it is a very serious charge that he is making against the officials of the department. And it is due to himself, it is due to these officials, it is due to the House, if not to me, that the source of that information should be given to me either on the floor of this House or privately, to enable me to make a proper inquiry. If my hon. friend is not prepared to do that, I am sure he would feel that, in justice to himself he should withdraw the very serious charge made against the officials of the department.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. BOYCE. The Minister of Railways evidently is taking advantage of the fact that I am a very new member.

Mr. EMMERSON. Not overly modest.

Mr. BOYCE. Perhaps I can learn somewhat in the way of modesty from the Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson). I had no desire to make a charge against the Department of Railways which would at all reflect upon the hon. gentleman who presides over that department. But the fact that the circumstance I refer to has been brought to my notice is beyond peradventure. I make the statement, as I made it before, that the information was given to me, that I investigated that information to a certain extent, sufficiently to satisfy me that it was not false, that it was genuine information; and I bring it to the attention of hon. members in order that the contrast between the reply of the Minister of Railways in refusing my return with the facts as they exist, and as I am informed they do exist, may be made apparent to the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is hardly sufficient, my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) will permit me to say. He stated a moment ago that he knew that this information had been passed out of the back doors of the Department of Railways.

Mr. BOYCE. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will pardon me. 'Hansard' will show exactly what I did say. My reference to the back door of the department was somewhat of an allegorical one. I did not for an instant suggest that as a physical fact that the plans, or copies of the plans, had been handed out by the back door of the department, because I did not know the channel by which they were taken out. I merely meant to convey the fact—and so stated—that information had reached me which I believed to be reliable that copies of the plans so deposited had been furnished.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Then, the hon. gentleman meant to convey the information to the House that the plans had been improperly conveyed by somebody from the Department of Railways, and that the hon. gentleman himself had investigated the information, and was satisfied that it was correct. The impression is conveyed to the House, the statement is made to the House, that somebody in the Department of Railways has improperly, and in violation of his duty, given copies of these plans. Under such circumstances, I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me that it is not sufficient for him to say that he is satisfied that his information is correct. Somebody in the Department of Railways—if the hon. gentleman's information is correct—has committed a breach of his duty. We ought to know who it is, for such a person ought not to be retained in the service. It is the duty of the hon. gentleman to submit the information and make his charge, if he has charges to make.

Mr. HAGGART. This is a most extraordinary statement for the Prime Minister

to make, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) had improperly received information.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not say that.

Mr. HAGGART. Then, I misunderstood the right hon gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and I beg his pardon. In any case he said that this information had been improperly given by some one in the department.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, if the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Boyce's) information is correct.

Mr. HAGGART. We on this side for the first time have received the information from the Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) that these plans are private and not open to the public. That is an extraordinary position to take. Who can be more interested in the location of the road or in its passage through any part of the country than the public themselves ? Is it to bring influence to bear upon the department or the government in reference to a more proper location of the road ? But, if the plans are concealed from the public, only those who have charge of the plans know of the matter. The object of plans being filed either with the government or in the registry offices in the different parts of the country is to give notice to the public where the road is to be located.

Mr. EMMERSON. But it may not be located there.

Mr. HAGGART. Where it is proposed to be located. These are located plans of the different terminals filed in the office of the department ; and the sole object in filing them is to give notice to every one interested where that road is to be built.

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) will pardon me ; I will ask him if these proposed plans are not the subject matter of a decision of the government as to whether they will be accepted or not——

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. You may not approve of them at all.

Mr. EMMERSON. Precisely, there is the answer.

Mr. HAGGART. The Act of parliament was amended last year for the purpose of getting the approval of the Minister of Railways in reference to the matter. The hon. gentleman says that these plans are not filed for the purpose of having the approval or otherwise of the government. Why does he seal them up ? Why does he tell my hon. friend that there are no plans filed or approved of ? Why does he give that answer to the House ? What a peculiar position he takes. First of all, he denies there was a plan filed at all ; then he gets out of it by saying that there are no plans filed or, and approved of.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, I said filed and approved of.

Mr. HAGGART. The very words I used.

Mr. EMMERSON. You used the word 'or.'

Mr. HAGGART. I corrected it and said 'and.' He said there were no plans filed and approved of. What inference would the House draw from that ? That there had been no plans whatever in the department. It was only by slow means that the hon. gentleman dragged the information out of the head of the department that the plans had been there for a number of weeks for his approval, but they had not been approved of. There is the position. But it is a new departure that these plans have to be sealed and secret. In old times any one could go to the department, the plans were open, and any one could get a copy if he liked. Perhaps the official who gave copies of the plans looked at the Act of parliament and knew for what object they were filed, and thought that it was within his duty—until he got different instructions—to give them to any one that applied for them.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I have been reading over the law on the subject in the Railway Act and it provides that once these plans are filed, they are open for inspection, and if any one has an objection to make he can urge it on the minister, and then the minister may order a change in the plans—it is all in that direction. I say we have a right to the plans ; and on the other ground, that this parliament is paying for this expensive commission. This parliament represents the country, this commission is dealing with an important interest, and all their plans ought to be subject to parliament.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If I may be permitted to trespass again on the attention of the House—this question of whether the plans are to be given to the House or not, will come up on Monday when the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) has a motion for the production of these papers. The question may be properly brought up then whether we should give them to the public or not. But the charge he made was that these plans had been improperly communicated to some one, that is the point under discussion.

Mr. FOSTER. With that statement of the Prime Minister, we might let the discussion drop at present and take it up again.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Is it fair to the officers of the Railway Department to allow a charge of that nature to be made and stand as it does now ? I think the hon. gentleman who has made it—made it in good faith—must feel that he ought to furnish the minister, if

not publicly then privately, with such information as would enable him to investigate. It is not fair to the officials of a great public department that a charge should be made on the floor of the House that some of them did a very wrong thing, and then let the matter stand in that way by saying : I believe it, I made the statement in good faith, but I decline to go any further. I think he will see on reflection that he ought to go further, and assist the minister in making an investigation.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not agree with the Minister of Finance.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If the rooters desire to fulfil their proper function let them all root together. The First Minister has behind him a number of gentlemen who have no other function than to root ; but the great drawback is that they do not root together, and there should be some person to give the signal so that these rooters may all come in together. The Finance Minister suggests that when a charge is made against the officer of the Railway Department, the man making the charge should help clear it up. There is the responsible head of the Railway Department, and he is the gentleman who is covered by the charge. My hon. friend here assumes responsibility for his words, and cannot be bluffed down. That little bluff game of getting up and calling, 'Name, name,' is played out in the House. This gentleman has had the hardihood and the manhood to stand on his dignity, though he is a new member of this House, and to assume the responsibility of his statement. The government has its usual recourse if it wants to get at the facts. Let them appoint a Royal Commission with a gentleman of the calibre of Judge Britton at the head of it, and perhaps we will get some information on the subject.

Mr. FIELDING. It sometimes happens that my hon. friend is mistaken. He has not stated the case accurately. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Boyce) stated that he did not make any charge against the hon. the Minister of Railways. He did not make the charge against anybody in particular, he made it against the department.

Mr. COCHRANE. He merely stated the fact.

Mr. FIELDING. That is not enough. If I make a statement that an hon. member has stolen somebody's purse and say I believe it, that is not enough ; I must give some evidence. If the statement were made as affecting the Minister of Railways, my hon. friend from Algoma would be obliged to withdraw it, because the statement could not be sustained once the denial is made. But there is no responsibility involved in an hon. member simply saying : I am informed and believe that some official of the department has done something very wrong.

Mr. COCHRANE. He did not say the department at all.

Mr. FIELDING. Oh, well, now that is another thing. My hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) says he did not say the department at all. If the hon. member for Algoma says he made no statement about these plans——

Mr. COCHRANE. But he did not refer to the officials in the department at all, and the Finance Minister is drawing a red herring across the track.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. member for Algoma distinctly stated that these plans had been given out of the Railway Department ; my hon. friend will not deny that.

Mr. BOYCE. I think the Minister of Finance has made a little mistake himself, he has misconstrued my words. The whole matter arose out of the question which I addressed in the early part of my remarks to the Minister of Railways asking him how it was that the plans of this proposed route were withheld from this House when, as the information which I had given to me, and which I believed to be reliable information, was that they were handed out to others.

Mr. FIELDING. The Minister of Railways stated that these plans could not have been given out because to his knowledge they were placed under seal and remained under seal. Thereupon the member for Algoma said that he had information that that could not be the case, because he was aware that these plans had been given out to friends in order to be made the basis of speculation.

Mr. BOYCE. The Finance Minister will remember that the Minister of Railways then stated that the plans might have been derived from some other sources.

Mr. FIELDING. But that is not the statement of the hon. member for Algoma. He did not say they were derived from some other source, he said they had been given out of the Railway Department. Therefore my hon. friend's observations, standing as they do now, leave a cloud on the reputation of Mr. Collingwood Schreiber and all the officers of the Railway Department. I do not think that is a fair position in which we ought to leave the officials of our public service.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought I could see a light twinkling in the eye of my hon. friend when he was putting this forth with such an assumption of seriousness. He is too old a parliamentarian and has been too long in this House not to know that it is the privilege of any member to get up in his place and make a statement, from in-

formation that has come to him, that he believes such and such a thing is true. It is entirely within his own judgment as to whether he will go further, and as to how he will go. Now there is no use attempting to bluff down a new member, and I am glad to know that my hon. friend here has not been bluffed down by the Minister of Railways or by the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Railways intimated that my hon. friend here lacked in modesty. Well, that is one thing that the Minister of Railways does not lack in. He certainly did not lack in that admirable quality last year when certain very important legislation was going through intimately connected with his department and when all the King's horses and all the King's men could not draw a word, on account of his excessive modesty, from my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is my natural reserve.

Mr. FOSTER. If I heard rightly, what my hon. friend from Algoma said was this —the essence of it is certainly known to all members of the House. The words that a man uses sometimes, when he is making a statement, are not just exactly what he would have liked them to have been. There was a notable instance of that in the case of an hon. gentleman who sits a little behind my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals the other day. That often happens in this House, but what my hon. friend said was that, according to the best information he had, private parties had in their possession plans of these terminals, and were using them for their own purposes.

Mr. FIELDING. And that they received them from the Railway Department.

Mr. FOSTER. No; he did not say that they received them from the Railway Department. I do not think that will be shown by 'Hansard.' But see the statement made by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. It was that these things came to him under seal, and that they were kept under seal.

Mr. EMMERSON. No; I did not say that.

Mr. FOSTER. It was that they did not come to him under seal, but that he immediately put them under seal.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is it.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well; they did not need at all to have had the seal broken and to have been distributed by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, or by his deputy, to be seen by other servants in his employ. Evidently the men who prepared the plans did not think they were of such a nature that they had to be transmitted under seal to the minister. They were in the course of transmission to the department, and no one knows how long they lay there until they were taken by the hon. minister and put under seal. The hon. minister has not been over spry—on account of his modesty, I suppose—in overtaking the details of his department, and these same plans having been lying in his department since July or August, I think he said, anyway for a good long while, and the hon. minister has done nothing at all in regard to them yet. How long did they lie there before the hon. minister got hold of them and put them under seal? During the time of the transmission to the hon. minister they were not under seal, and they were evidently not looked upon as information that should necessarily be under seal, and it was possible for this information to have gone out. After the plans came there, and before they were put under seal, it was possible for this information to have been obtained. My hon. friend will agree with me in that, and that is all my hon. friend from Algoma said—that in some way or other these plans got into the hands of private parties. Then the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals said: Oh, they are secret; they are not to be seen, and I have put them under seal. And then the statement was made that it must have been through the back door of the department that they came. But, as to the matter itself, we will take that up when we come to discuss the whole subject. It does seem to me that there will be a good ground, not a party ground at all, for inquiring into this matter, because we want to know what is the best thing to do.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am waiting to take the matter up again. After hearing the pretty little romance from the hon. member for North Toronto, I wish to say that in August, or last autumn, when the first plans were submitted to the department, they were shown on a certain day; and on the next morning, the very first morning thereafter, I was made acquainted with the fact by the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals. Accompanying that information was the request to know whether parties could see these plans, and whether the public, or anybody who called, would be permitted to see them. I stated no, most certainly not; that they could not be considered as public property until they had been considered by the government, and that it would be wrong to have that information go out from the department. I asked him to place the seal of secrecy upon the plans, and not permit anybody to see them. I did not see them myself. Now, since then, and within a few months or a few weeks, other plans came in, and I have the right to assume that the same policy was pursued in respect to these. That is the case in a nutshell. I personally have not seen them. I did not ask to do so; I was not in a position to do so; I have not done so,

and I think I am right in the position which I have taken. It is a question as to whether or not I was right in the judgment which I exercised in the matter, but the charge which is made is a different thing, and it is a more serious matter. If there has been any official in the department who has given out that information, and it is known, either by the back or the front door, and if my hon. friend from Algoma has any information in respect to any official doing that in violation of his instructions, I think it is due to me, due to the department, due to all concerned and due to the public, who have confidence in the officials of the Department of Railways and Canals, that he should give me, either publicly in this House or privately, the information as to who the man is or who the men are.

Mr. HAGGART. Just one word.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me ? I think the discussion has been running out of order. Several hon. gentlemen have spoken twice on each side, and those who have spoken before will not have an opportunity again unless with the permission of the House. The motion is that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. OSLER. Mr. Speaker, just one word. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) states that these plans were at least one day deposited in the ordinary manner and treated as ordinary plans. He says that he thinks it was the morning following that on which they were deposited that he gave instructions to have them sealed up. It is six months nearly since they were deposited, and the hon. minister's memory may be quite astray within a day or two, and it is quite possible the plans were kept in the department in the ordinary way for two or three days before his instructions were given.

Mr. EMMERSON. Will my hon. friend pardon me for just a moment ? I have the right to assume that when Mr. Schreiber asked me that question he had not previously to that moment shown any one these plans ; else, why would he come and ask me ?

Mr. FOSTER. Nobody suggests that he did.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes ; that is the suggestion which has been made.

Mr. OSLER. I assume that they were deposited in the office in the ordinary manner, and it is exceedingly likely that all sorts of people would want to see these plans. I fancy it is a common occurrence that people want to see plans the moment they are filed in the department, and if they were deposited in the ordinary way in the minister's office for three or four days, or it might be longer, it is more than likely that these plans were seen.

Motion (Mr. Boyce) to adjourn, negatived.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he can give any information to the House as to the probable date at which the second reading of the Autonomy Bill will be taken up ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not this day, but I think I can inform the House early next week.

SUPPLY—MUNICIPAL TAXATION, C. P. R. LINES.

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

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). I wish to direct the attention of the House to a very important judgment delivered recently by the Supreme Court of Canada. The court pronounced on the contention of the western municipalities that the lands of the Canadian Pacific Railway were subject to municipal taxation, and the holding was absolutely against the municipalities in that respect. I would suggest to the Prime Minister that when he is preparing any more measures dealing with territorial autonomy he should have this judgment before him, because there are laid down in it certain very important interpretations of the constitution. It is well also that the general public should become acquainted with those interpretations in view of other questions which will be discussed in this House, and I therefore ask the Prime Minister to have the judgment of the Supreme Court printed. From the copy of the decision I have been able to get, I read these extracts from words of the chief justice speaking the unanimous opinion of the court.

I am unable for myself to reach the conclusion that the principles with regard to legislation generally and specially with regard to India laid down in the Burah case have or can have any application to the special tentative and uncertain powers of legislation which were vested in the Lieutenant Governor in Council or by and with the advice of the assembly for the Northwest Territories in 1881.

Further he says :

Reliance was placed in the judgment below and in the argument before us upon the education clauses of the Territories Act of 1880, section 10, as the section was originally enacted in 1875 and re-enacted in the Consolidating Act of 1880, its operation was expressly made contingent upon a system of taxation having been first adopted in the district. That limitation upon the operation of the section was, it is true, abolished in 1885 by parliament (48-49 Vic., cap. 51), but when the latter statute was passed the Northwest Territories Council had already in 1883 and 1884 passed ordinances introducing systems of taxation for municipalities and school districts throughout the territories, and the words of limitation were no longer neces-

sary. This statute of 1885 enacted that the amendment removing the limitation from section 10 of the Act of 1880 should take effect from the date of the passing of the latter Act presumably in order to remove any doubt as to the validity of any school taxation which might have been imposed in the meantime.

In conclusion the judgment says :—

I am of the opinion that the powers of legislation of the Northwest Territories Council were delegated powers from the Dominion and that the exemption from Dominion taxation in the 16th clause of the contract embraced and included taxation by the Territorial Council or by any municipal district as well as by any school district afterwards established therein.

I cannot dispute the law laid down, but I point out that in this decision the Supreme Court of Canada has declared that all the legislation of the Legislative Council of the Northwest Territories was tentative or temporary and can be repealed at any moment. This is important in view of some other great questions that will arise in this parliament. I would like to have had present to-day the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) and the member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway). The Prime Minister expressed the view the other day that this exemption of the Canadian Pacific Railway from taxation was most burdensome and most unjust to the people of the west, and he deplored it and he stated that it was the law of the country and it could not be remedied. The Prime Minister knew of no remedy by which the shackles which have been put upon the people of the west could be removed. I have raised this question in the House before ; I hope to bring it up again this session and I trust that I shall have greater assistance from the member for Brandon than I have had in the past. The people of the Northwest are suffering from two grievances in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. It has been held that the Canadian Pacific Railway lands are not subject to municipal taxation, and it has also been held that the railway rates on the Canadian Pacific Railway are not subject to revision until a certain dividend is paid on the capital invested in the construction of the road. I do not agree with the Prime Minister that there is no cure for these evils. For every legal wrong there is a legal remedy.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is the remedy ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. There is the remedy already adopted by the Prime Minister in other legislation, that when you are negotiating with the Canadian Pacific Railway for franchises and other privileges they seek, you can at the same time negotiate with them for a removal of existing abuses. This session the Canadian Pacific Railway is asking franchises to cover the whole country ; they are constantly coming here for legislation of every kind. They may be here in a very short time for a grant of land or a bonus for some of their undertakings, and then is the time to negotiate with them for reforms, just as the Prime Minister did in connection with the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. Large sums of money were granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway to aid in the construction of that road and certain concessions were made by them in return. Sir John Macdonald in his time took a similar course. The Canadian Pacific Railway had a monoply in regard to lines going south and that monoply was abolished by negotiation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. By payment.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Even so, and fortunately the money value of the relinquishment of this privilege which the people of the Northwest complain of can be very easily ascertained. I believe that if the Prime Minister makes an effort he will find a remedy for these grievances. The other day the right hon. gentleman grieved about this imposition placed upon the people of the west, and I would remind him that when he is framing other legislation he ought to be careful that he does not forge further shackles to manacle the people of that country. The member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) has just come into the House and I appeal to him to assist me and to assist the Prime Minister in finding some remedy for the evils which exist in this connection. As I have said, the Prime Minister grieved for the people of the Northwest the other day, and he declared that in all his reading of legislation he never saw anything quite so bad as this legislation which was enacted by a former government.

Now I say it is possible through negotiation to remove that restraining law whatever it may be, and I trust that now that the hon. member for Brandon (Hon. Mr. Sifton) is not in the ministry he will take the matter up and assist the people of the west in having this obnoxious law removed. Again I ask the Prime Minister for the benefit of the House to try and have this judgment of the Supreme Court distributed to the members before he proceeds with his Autonomy Bill, because it is a very illuminative document. It shows that any powers exercised by the Northwest legislature or the Territorial legislature are delegated ; that all their legislation has been temporary and tentative and that all the legislation of this Dominion as regard these Territories has been temporary and tentative, and, therefore, revocable at will. If that is the case we ought to be in a position to have this document before us for use in the coming discussion in connection with the Autonomy Bill.

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

Prince Edward Island Railway—chargeable to capital—to increase accommodation at Charlottetown, $108,000.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). This is a revote; the matter was fully discussed last year.

Mr. A. MARTIN. During this session I asked for some correspondence about the location of this road. I think the minister will find it in the 'Hansard' of Ferbuary 3. I asked for a return of the correspondence in connection with the location of this station and it would be of some service to us in the discussion.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend will have an opportunity of discussing this in connection with the supplementary estimates. The return has not yet come from Moncton. We had to send to Moncton for copies and they have not been returned, otherwise I would have had it laid on the table before this. The whole subject was very fully discussed last session.

Mr. A. MARTIN. There has been a very great deal of delay in the location of this station. The matter has come up frequently and several delegations have come to see the minister about it.

Mr. EMMERSON. A delegation came to see me about it at Moncton before I came here in the early part of January or the end of December.

Mr. A. MARTIN. It is very important that this station should be built without any more delay. We have found in Prince Edward Island that delegations come here with some object in view, one time about a railway station and----

Mr. EMMERSON. The trouble is you do not agree.

Mr. A. MARTIN. The people of the province are put to the expense of these delegations and I think it would be better if the minister went down. We have heard that the minister was going down to settle about this, and I would like to know if he is going down.

Mr. EMMERSON. I did promise this delegation from the Board of Trade that I would go over, that was on the eve of the session and I had hoped that I might be able to steal away for a few days, but the weather conditions which have prevailed since and my duties in parliament made it impossible for me to leave, and I do not now anticipate that I shall be in a position to go until the close of the session, at which time I purpose determining the question of site. It is one with reference to which there is a great difference of opinion among people without regard to any political phase of it, and I have very great difficulty in determining the location. I have to bear in mind the interests of the railway, the question of expenditure, and I would like, as far as possible, to consult the convenience of the people. I find it quite impossible to do that without having some personal knowledge, because after all I have to bear the responsibility to this House and be able to answer any objections.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Has the hon. minister any option on any particular land in Charlottetown ? I notice on page W—43 of the Auditor General's Report that there is a charge of $1,500 for land taken for increased accommodation at Charlottetown and option $14. Will the hon. minister explain that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That was $1,500 paid for land we purchased from the province of Prince Edward Island. It is near the end of the Hillsboro bridge.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I do not think there is any government land there.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is land covered with water, I believe, required for the use of the railway, and was purchased from the province.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I should think that would be the property of the government of Canada.

Mr. EMMERSON. We would hardly purchase from the government of the province land which belonged to ourselves. The railway track is between the water and this land, and this land belongs to the province. The titles were searched and deeds passed in connection with them.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I find a vote in 1904-5 for $115,000 and in 1905-6 of $108,000. That would indicate there was an expenditure of $7,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is a misprint. The $115,000 should be $110,000. We estimate that $2,000 will be spent before the 1st of July and we ask for a revote of $108,000.

To dredge and blast rock at deep water terminus at Halifax, $18,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. Last year we asked $30,000 and the estimated expenditure during this year is $12,000. The object of this dredging and blasting is to give 30 feet of water at low tide. We are asking for a revote of $18,000. This work cannot be carried on expeditiously. They do not seem able to make as much progress as we hoped for. Therefore only $12,000 are likely to be expended out of the $30,000 during this fiscal year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What depth of water have you at present ?

Mr. EMMERSON. About 28 feet.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose there is 30 feet of water along a portion of the dock?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This is to extend that area ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it expected that the thirty feet will accomplish that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, the whole of it would cost about $70,000. We would require at least $30,000 more after the year 1905-6 if the necessity for it should arise. A certain number of berths will be provided by this expenditure ; and if the traffic increases as we hope it may, there will be at least $30,000 more required to complete the whole work.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How many berths will the present vote provide for ?

Mr. EMMERSON. When this is completed we will have five berths.

Double tracking parts of line, Intercolonial Railway, $100,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I should like to have a statement of what work is done, how long it has taken, when it is anticipated the double track between Halifax and Windsor Junction will be completed, and whether or not the hon. gentleman contemplates double tracking the line from Halifax to Truro ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Last year we had a vote of $150,000 for double-tracking parts of the line. We anticipate that the expenditure during the present fiscal year will be $100,000, so we shall require a revote of $50,000 for the year 1905-6. The proposal for double tracking under this vote includes these portions :—From Richmond to Rockingham, about 2½ miles, estimated cost $47,768 ; from Bedford Bridge to Windsor Junction, about 5 miles, $112,200 ; from Rockingham to Bedford Bridge, about 4½ miles. $112,000; widening of Bedford Bridge, which will cost about $45,000 ; making a total for that section of about $317,000.

We have had in contemplation the double tracking of the line between New Glasgow and Stellarton, and also between Pointe Lévis and Chaudière Curve. That has not been undertaken as yet. We have also in contemplation the double tracking between Moncton and Painsec Junction. No vote has been asked for these. We hope ultimately to extend the double tracking from Windsor Junction to Truro. No steps have been taken as yet to ask parliament for that vote, because these works cost a good deal and we do not wish to ask for excessively large votes. We prefer to await the gradual increase of the business. I believe, in view of the growth of the traffic, that it will be absolutely necessary to double track from Halifax to Truro—indeed right on to Moncton.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Some portion of this work has been completed ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, between Richmond and Rockingham has been double-tracked and is in use. Between Rockingham and Bedford Bridge is under contract. and it is expected that the work will be completed early this spring. A further contract has been let between Windsor Junction and Bedford Bridge.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who are the contractors ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Reid McManus had the contract between Bedford Bridge and Rockingham, and also has the one between Windsor Junction and Bedford Bridge. That contract was let in January.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. These were let after public advertisement, I suppose?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know whether the minister can give us information as to the possibility of avoiding some serious delays that have taken place. I am not speaking by way of criticism. After a delay of sixty-four hours at Oxford Junction on my way to Halifax recently, I was inclined to be critical I must confess ; but when I had an interview with the divisional superintendent and had examined the snow banks they had to contend with—mountains one might say—and understood the very compact nature of them, I was rather inclined to wonder that the men got the train through as quickly as they did. But I may say, to give hon. members an idea—I suppose the minister has an idea already—of what the men have to contend with, I was told by the divisional superintendent that when two engines with an ordinary snow-plough, which, it is well known, will stand a very great strain, charged one of the snow-banks at fifty miles an hour, the snow-plough crumpled as if it were so much paper. In some cases there had to be a cutting through banks not less than forty feet high. Loaded teams came along while the train ahead of us was stalled for four days, and succeeded in getting across by driving over the top of the snow-plough. It occurred to me and others in the train, that, possibly delays might be prevented to some extent in the future by building snow-sheds or snow-fences. I talked that over a little with one of the officers of the road, and he told me there were snow-fences already at some of the exposed points. But it seemed evident that, if we are to have winters in the future of anything like the severity of that through which we are passing, a great saving of money could be effected to the department and the country by making provision to prevent to some extent, at least, the immense drifts that have piled up over the railway during this winter. Of course, the minister will realize that, not only has there been very great inconvenience and loss of time, sometimes under very distressing circumstances, but

there has been actual suffering. A gentleman who keeps a country store in the vicinity of Westchester told me that there was suffering in his vicinity through lack of supplies. He himself had been obliged to take flour out of his own House, that is from his domestic supply, to satisfy his customers. Freight had not been through there for a very long time. People are destroying their cattle and horses in many parts of the country because they have not food for them. And, generally, great loss is entailed by the conditions. Now, while we may not be inclined to criticise the efforts of the department during the present winter under the conditions which have prevailed, we are, I think, justly entitled to consider whether or not some remedy may be found for this in the future. I would like to ask the minister whether that is in contemplation ; and, at the same time, I would like to know whether the minister has any reports from his officers which indicate that the freight, which necessarily has been at a standstill, as I understand, for three or four weeks on some portions of the road, is likely to be moved in the near furture, so that better conditions may speedily prevail.

Mr. EMMERSON. I may say to my hon. friend that I have private accounts, and from the officials of the Intercolonial, statements which are certainly not exaggerated of the conditions prevailing on that road. This winter for severity has been phenomenal in the province of Nova Scotia. I have been for a good many years familiar with the weather conditions in that section of the country and certainly in my lifetime there has been nothing like it, particularly in the province of Nova Scotia. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition knows the conditions on the Intercolonial well. They were bad indeed, but were not nearly so bad as they were down in the Annapolis valley. According to the information which I have had from time to time, the people there were actually in want. I know that the schools in that locality, Acadia College and affiliated institutions were on the point of being closed. They had no coal, they had no fuel, and they really had very little supplies. There was actual want in all sections for sixteen days. They did not have a train at all. The Intercolonial went to the assistance of the Dominion Atlantic and finally they were successful in making an opening into the Annapolis valley. I understand that they had a prospect of getting to Yarmouth last night. We have information to-day from officials who are on the spot that freight is being moved all over the line. The weather is fine all over, and at all points freight is being moved, except on the short line division between Oxford Junction and Pictou. But every effort is being put forth to have that line opened up.

I want here to pay a compliment to the men of the Intercolonial for the splendid manner in which they have given themselves to the work of removing the snow blockade. I think from what I have heard from private sources and from what I have seen in the newspapers, that it is impossible to speak too highly of them, of the personal sacrifices that they made, and the risks and exposures to which they were subjected in endeavouring to relieve the situation. The men have worked faithfully, not only in the interests of the railway, but in the interests of the travelling public, and have done all that is possible to secure their comfort, and to make conditions as easy as possible for those who were in that unfortunate position. We could not have expected such a winter, there never has been one like it in the history of the Intercolonial. In fact it is seldom during the winter season that we have any snow to speak of between Amherst and Halifax. But this winter, on the Intercolonial and others railways, has certainly been exceptional. I have not had any special report. We hope that we will not have a repetition of the occurrences of this winter. We need more motive power on the Intercolonial ; that has had something to do with the difficulty. It is through no fault of the management if we have not sufficient locomotives. We have a limited number of ploughs. We were asked by all the railways to loan them ploughs and engines on those branch lines that were closed. They find themselves blocked in without coal, they cannot move their engines, they are without water, without snow ploughs, and it is impossible for them to get out. I am told that in the county of Queen's, New Brunswick, there is actual suffering and want. A telegram came to me last night from Chipman that simply told a tale that was heart rending. We are endeavouring on the Intercolonial, although it has put us to a great deal of inconvenience, to relieve somewhat the suffering of the people.

Now as to the future, I am sure that every precaution will be taken at points where the greatest drifts are to be found. When you see a snowdrift forty feet high, and contemplate that a team of horses can travel over it, across the channel cut out for the railway track and across the top of a snow plough, you can realize what a quantity of snow must have fallen and the force of the wind that drifted it. Snow fences can be of no avail under such circumstances. Why, snow fences get covered up, and after that they are of no possible value. It would only become a question of whether you should have a tier of snow fences one on top of the other as the drift got higher, raising your fence as the drift increased. But, the wind has been so fierce there would be difficulty in doing that ; they are blown down.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That very thing was tried in the west where they have built fences with brush.

Mr. EMMERSON. The snow is packed in so hard there would be more difficulty in getting that brush out again than there would be in going to the woods and bringing in a supply of brush. They say these drifts are very hard. The leader of the opposition can probably testify on that point. The wind was so strong and it packed the snow so hard that people could drive teams of horses over the drifts without their sinking in. That is my information.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know that you can expect freedom from conditions of this kind in the future. We know that there is a great deal of precipitation of moisture in the maritime provinces, both in winter and summer. During the past six or seven years, or up to three years ago, a great deal of that came in the winter time in the form of rain, or of snow followed by rain. But conditions were not such during the past winter. If you have a winter of unusual severity when the precipitation comes almost altogether in the form of snow, and sometimes in the form of rather moist snow which packs very hard, and may be followed by severely cold weather. You must expect occasionally to have conditions such as have prevailed during the present winter, although perhaps not to so great an extent. So far as regards the snow fences, I did not gather from those with whom I conversed that they were of no use; on the contrary I was told they were of considerable use, but that the snow fall was so enormous this winter that they did not suffice to prevent a blockade.

Mr. EMMERSON. They are good up to a certain point.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The benefit is greater if you have two or three fences on the exposed side. But I understood that at one time there were snow sheds there, I do not know whether they were regarded as useful now. On the line below the city of Quebec, I know there are snow sheds, I do not know whether they have been found useful. I suppose this matter is in the hands of the officers of the department, who are making a study of it. What I desire to suggest is that I think some provision should be made to guard against the recurrence of this difficulty in the future. Even if it should occur only at considerable intervals, nevertheless, it would be wise to take what is a reasonable precaution, because the enormous cost the country has been put to during the past winter would serve to erect snow fences and wind breaks along the road to a very considerable extent between Halifax and Amherst.

To increase accommodation at Halifax, $200,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like the hon. minister to explain this item.

Mr. EMMERSON. We are only asking during this year for $200,000. My hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) smiles over that modest request, but when he has heard of all the requirements of the situation I am afraid that he will not be in the mood for smiling. The situation at Halifax is such that we will necessarily, before the terminals there are put in such a condition that they will meet what we hope to be the requirements of the country, require a very large expenditure of money. The improvements contemplated cannot all be carried out in one year. The expenditure will have to be extended over a number of years. This year we have very modestly, I think, asked for $200,000. We had in 1904-5 an appropriation of $385,000. We anticipate that the expenditure during this current year will be $185,000 and we are asking for the balance of $200,000 as a revote on the assumption that we can only spend $200,000, or not more than that on the ordinary construction works, provided the same progress is made during 1905-6 as is being made during the current fiscal year. There are several things to be done at Halifax. We require land for the engine house and that is a very difficult proposition. The physical conditions near Richmond where this engine house requires to be, make it almost impossible that we can secure land without very great expense; indeed, we cannot secure it without blasting or without constructing land somewhat encroaching upon the water, and in order to do that we have to do a lot of blasting so as to get the rock removed. We require an engine house which will be circular in form. The diameter will be about 350 feet. To get a piece of land there for that purpose, or to construct land, would require in the vicinity of $35,000. Then, we want some land on Cornwallis street for the purposes of the railway. We want an electric plant. That is under construction.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. For what purpose—for lighting?

Mr. EMMERSON. For lighting the shops, station and everything of that kind. We require and we have been making improvements to the station. These improvements will cost about $6,000. We want new tracks at the elevator. We anticipate that they will cost $4,000. That work is now being done.

Mr. TAYLOR. And no grain going to the elevator.

Mr. EMMERSON. Not this year but we are hopeful. We do not anticipate that it will be a case of hope deferred. Then, we require the new wharf and freight shed which are under construction. They will cost about $125,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Where is the new freight shed to be constructed?

Mr. EMMERSON. Right on the wharf. It is under contract now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is a freight shed in existence.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is just near Richmond at what is called the deepwater terminus.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the hon. minister be good enough to explain what will be the use of that as compared with the freight shed which extends to the foot of Cornwallis street ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The use of that is in connection with export shipments brought down on the cars to the steamers. The cars go right out on the wharf and the merchandise is to be put into this warehouse on the wharf. This is where these 30 foot berths are, and it is part and parcel of this deepwater wharf. It is practically a warehouse on the wharf. Then, there is crib work with tracks on it which will be used largely in connection with the shipment of lumber brought from the interior. That work will gradually be carried on. Something is being done already in connection with it. We also want in addition to the land for the engine house a 30 stall engine house which, complete, would cost at least $162,000. Nothing is being done in that regard just now. The old one is being utilized as far as possible. Then, we want a water supply from the city supply extended to the site of the engine house which will cost $7,500. With the shops and engine house, &c., we will require to do some grading at Richmond, because, as my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) knows, there is a very narrow strip at Richmond. There are high banks right in the rear and it is necessary to do a large amount of grading. This will involve a large expenditure. Then, there is that other question of the land on Water street. I may say that since the matter was up at the last session when it was referred to by my hon. friend, I did, recently in December, when I was in Halifax at the time of the arrival of His Excellency, go over the ground again.

I recognize, as I think every one must, that to perfect the terminal at Halifax, having regard to the future, if not to the immediate present, it would be necessary to purchase this land. Of course, when landowners know this, their idea as to the value of land increases abnormally, and the department that undertakes to expropriate never gets off very cheaply. I have had several conferences with the Halifax Board of Trade, and they say that it is absolutely necessary, in the commercial interests of the city and the province, to have a flour shed on the wharf. The people of the outports who deal with Halifax, and the people interested in the flour trade of the western provinces, coincide in this view, and insist that this should be done. This will cost $100,000. It has been suggested that we might take the marine wharf now occupied by the Department of Marine and Fisheries and that they could transfer to Dartmouth. This proposal, although at first condemned by the city council of Halifax, is, I understand, now favoured by them. We are preparing accommodation for immigrants arriving at Halifax, which will cost $40,000; and there is to be a covered way from the steamers to the immigrant shed, which will cost $4,000. It is in the interest of this terminal that we should have a car shop, and it is believed that the work could be advantageously done there if facilities were furnished. The excavation of the land between the railway property and the Campbell road would cost $50,000. In addition to this, it is absolutely necessary that there shall be a double-track from Richmond down to the terminals. The leader of the opposition is familiar with the locality, and he knows that at Richmond a great number of tracks converge into one track running down to North street and beyond that to the dockyard. The passenger and freight business has to be shunted over this long single track at considerable expense, at great loss of time and at great inconvenience to the business people of Halifax and the people of the west who are interested in the export and import trade of that port. The Messrs. Allan have been to see me on more than one occasion to complain of the delay caused in transferring passengers, mails and freight, because of the single track. We will require a large sum of money, due to the physical conditions, to enable us to secure at least a double line of railway. All this will involve an expenditure of not less than $1,000,000. Of course, that would not be much to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I am sure my hon. friend the director of that railway will not complain.

Mr. OSLER. The Canadian Pacific Railway would make it pay before they would do it; that would be the difference.

Mr. EMMERSON. The Canadian Pacific Railway could not make it pay until they increased the facilities, and we do not expect to make it pay until we incur the expenditure and do the work. If we had proper facilities last autumn and winter, we could have had a very large amount of traffic at Halifax in connection with the Grand Trunk Railway and the Allan Steamship Line, but we were unable to take advantage of this because of the existing conditions. Of course, we cannot hope to do much trade in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. This is an outline of all that is mapped out for the future of Halifax. I am not asking for the total sum now; I am only asking for a sum of $200,000—that is trifling in comparison with the larger amount that will eventually be required to complete the terminal at Halifax. After all, I do not think this committee should be startled about this.

Mr. COCHRANE. We are not startled at anything from the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am glad of that, for I would not wish to affect the nerves of my hon. friend. The other day my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) was anxious that large sums of money should be handed over to the imperial government for the benefit of imperial interests.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. When was that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In connection with the defences of Halifax.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If the minister will be good enough to read 'Hansard,' he will not find anything there to support his statement.

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, I am only referring to my hon. friend in a very mild manner, and venturing the statement that he very worthily proposed that Canada should spend a large sum of money in connection with imperial defence.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. You do not put it the right way.

Mr. EMMERSON. It does not relate very much to the present discussion, but, at all events, I think he advocated the expenditure of a large sum of money for imperial interests, and I am just reminding him that if we are ever to build up a national trade in connection with our national ports, we must afford equal facilities at Halifax and St. John to those that are to be found in Portland and Boston. It is no use for us beginning to launch out on imperial ideas until we are content to improve the national interests of Canada, and I conceive one of the most important national interests of Canada is the advancement of its export and import trade via Canadian seaports at all seasons of the year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As far as concerns one matter which the minister has mentioned, namely the acquisition of the land south of the station and along the western side of Water street, I advocated the acquisition of that land three or four years ago and on more than one occasion since. I still think it is desirable to acquire it, and while I fully realize that men who have property which is likely to be taken by the government are apt sometimes to put a very high figure upon it, nevertheless the government can always acquire property at a fair valuation by means of expropriation. There is something to be said on behalf of these men on Water street so far as the price of their property is concerned, because, as I pointed out to the committee some two or three years ago, that property has been very seriously depreciated by reason of the fact that the Intercolonial Railway tracks run along the east side of Water street; the width of the street has been seriously diminished and business formerly done on that street has been transferred to other parts of the city.

With regard to the general proposition of the minister, I sincerely hope that his expectations in regard to traffic may be realized. I gather that these expectations are very largely basis on the hope of traffic to be gained by means of some arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway, but in view of the proceedings which are now in progress for alleged violation of an arrangement made some six or seven years ago and in view of what I understand to be the pronounced attitude of officials of that road as to their duty in connection with those agreements, it does not seem to me that the expectations of the department or of the country should be placed too high. The policy of the Grand Trunk Railway, as very frankly announced in those very arbitration proceedings, was to send their traffic to Portland where it pays them best to carry it. I do not know whether the minister's expectation is based on any definite agreement with the Grand Trunk which we have not seen or heard of, or whether it is based on something else, but certainly if it it based on anything else than an absolute and distinct agreement we cannot expect very much from it so far as Halifax is concerned. If it is based on as distinct an agreement as that to which I have referred, we may still in the future be confronted by the necessity of seeking the same remedy by arbitration or otherwise as we are now seeking.

Mr. WM. ROCHE. I desire to say a word in connection with this subject. For a number of years people owning property along the line in Halifax connecting the present passenger station with the deep water station have understood that the government intended to take over the properties; the properties have been allowed to dilapidate and to decrease in value in consequence of repairs not being made upon them. This would be a favourable juncture for buying these properties. If the railway does not take them over now the people who own them will begin to repair and consequently the value will be much enhanced. So far as I have heard from several proprietors along the line they are disposed to take moderate prices, and I would strongly support the intention of the government to purchase the property now and not to wait until it would be enhanced in value when it would be absolutely imperative to take more property.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose this work is done partly by the department directly and partly by contract.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is being done almost entirely by contract.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are there contracts now outstanding?

Mr. EMMERSON. The contracts are outstanding; the crib work, the wharf and the shed on the wharf, in fact, almost all the work is being done by contract that can possibly be done.

Rolling stock, $698,500.

Mr. OSLER. The minister promised certain returns of figures before the item was taken up.

Mr. EMMERSON. I was asked by my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Osler) to give the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway in connection with rolling stock on capital account since 1896. The figures are as follows:

1896-7	$ 14,996 04
1897-8	54,565 97
1898-9	619,999 26
1899-1900	533,223 40
1900-01	1,563,705 77
1901-2	2,066,879 38
1902-3	254,694 38
1903-4	643,020 83
Total	5,751,085 03

There are two heavy locomotives purchased before 1897-8 on which there was paid in that year a small balance of $389.60. This purchase had been made some few years before the balance was outstanding.

In 1897-8 two dining cars were purchased at a cost of $10,944.95. In 1899-1900 refrigerator cars were purchased to the extent of $30,016.69, making a total of $5,792,441.27. In answer to the inquiry of my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker), I may read to him the following statement of rolling stock on hand:—

	30th June, 1896.	30th June, 1904.
Locomotives	204	302
Passenger cars	276	367
Freight cars	6,667	10,107
Snow ploughs, &c.	77	86
To be rebuilt—		
Locomotives	None.	3
Passenger cars	None.	3
Freight cars	198	265
Snow ploughs	None.	1

Mr. OSLER. What is the rule when a car or engine is absolutely destroyed and has to be replaced ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The cost of rebuilding or replacing is charged to revenue.

Mr. BARKER. The return just read carries out what I said last night, namely, that the hon. gentleman is getting back, as regards the condition of rolling stock, to the good times left by my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart). In 1896 the freight cars out of work were 198. We got continuously worse every year until this year, 1904, when we have got back to some extent to the condition under the late government, the hon. gentleman has brought the number down to 265. He knows that every year from 1896 the number of freight cars and others out of service and absolutely off the list increased until a year ago there were 555 out of service. That is what I have been complaining of all the time, and I gave the hon. gentleman credit yesterday of trying to get back to the good days of the Conservative government.

Steel rails and fastenings, $380,000.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. minister promised us an explanation of this.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have been unable to get the exact data of the amount charged to maintenance on the one hand and to capital on the other, if any were charged to capital, but I am having a statement prepared of all that was purchased and shall bring it down before the supplementaries are submitted. We shall unquestionably require a further vote in regard to steel rails ; and if I should consider that our policy should be on the line indicated by my hon. friend, I shall certainly follow his advice.

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. minister want us to pass this item ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. And if in the meantime, before the supplementaries come down, he should find that, according to the proper method of keeping accounts, this should be charged to revenue, will he revise his method ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It will be too late to revise it as regards this item but my hon. friend will get the benefit of it.

Mr. BARKER. Could we not revise the item when going into supplementary estimates ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The item could not very well be revised on acount of its being in the main estimates then, but as regards any future vote, I shall be governed by what I consider to be right in the matter.

Mr. BLAIN. How does the quality of steel rails made in Canada compare with those imported ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am informed by my officer, that, so far as their experience has gone, our Canadian steel rails are certainly equal to any imported.

Murray harbour branch and Hillsborough bridge, $357,400.

Mr. EMMERSON. Last year we asked $650,000. We are asking now $357,400. The estimated cost of the bridge was $1,494,097.15.

Mr. A. MARTIN. In 1898, if my memory serves me well, the cost of the bridge was $750,000. I think that 'Hansard' will bear me out in that.

Mr. EMMERSON. The matter has been repeatedly referred to. And I know that, last session when we asked for this vote, the matter was again gone into. I am not familiar with what was done in the past. I am only speaking of the figures giving the total cost of the bridge and the esti-

mated cost of the branch to Murray river, which was $926,460.70. And the estimated cost of the line to Murray harbour is $104,-600.32. The whole estimated cost, including the cost of rolling-stock and crib work in Murray harbour is $2,795,113.17.

Mr. A. MARTIN. How much is it for the bridge and railway separately.

Mr. EMMERSON. For the bridge $1,494,-097.15, and for the railways—that is, the branch to Murray river and the extension to Murray harbour—$1,031,061.02.

Mr. A. MARTIN. That is very singular to me, because, on the 23rd of January, the minister gave us this information :—

Total expenditure in connection with Murray harbour branch railway to January 1, 1905, is $1,018,711.93.

And a little later on I asked what the cost would be of completing the road, and he told us that the estimated cost of completing this work was $561,253.93. I asked him further if there were not some wooden bridges which required to be replaced and he told me that there were three of them at least which would cost $8,000. In the face of the figures the minister cites, I am astonished.

Mr. EMMERSON. That includes the bridge.

Mr. A. MARTIN. No, if the minister will turn to 'Hansard' of January 23rd, page 106 of the revised edition——

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not see wherein the figures given on that day in any way differ from these. I am giving the estimated cost of the works. On the 23rd of January, I was asked what was the total expenditure in connection with the Murray harbour branch of the Prince Edward Island up to 1st of January, 1905. And I answered that that expenditure was $1,018,-711.93. And the estimated cost of the bridge is $1,494,097.15.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I want to get the cost of the road and of the bridge separately.

Mr. EMMERSON. The total estimated cost of the road was $1,031,061, and I have said that the total expenditure was $1,018,-711.93.

Mr. A. MARTIN. But the hon. minister forgets, that a little later on I asked him this other question.

Mr. EMMERSON. I was asked the total expenditure on Hillsborough bridge to January 1, 1905, and I stated that it was $1,-220,968.32. The estimated cost of the bridge was $1,494,097. Both expenditures were within the estimate.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I asked this question :—

Mr. EMMERSON.

1. Has the Murray Harbour branch line of railway in Prince Edward Island been completed ? If so, when ?

2. If not, what remains to be done, and what is the estimated cost of same, including rolling stock ?

3. How many of the bridges are wooden or partly wooden structures ? Are they to be replaced by stone or steel ? If so, when, and what is the estimated cost ?

To these questions the minister gave me this answer :

Mr. EMMERSON. Will my hon. friend give me the date.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I have not got the date here, but I think it was about ten days after the first question was asked. The minister gave me these answers :

2. The work remaining to be done is as follows, viz.:

Hillsboro' Bridge.

Rip-rapping, completion of approaches, rip-rapping piers, erecting and placing in position five fixed spans and one swing span, building rest piers, tracklaying and flooring of whole structure.

On the line.

Three iron bridges to be erected to replace temporary wooden trestles, station and terminal facilities to be completed, water tanks to be erected, rolling stock to be provided.

The estimated cost to complete above mentioned works is $561,253.93.

3. There are three temporary wooden bridges which will be replaced by iron or steel, probably during the current year, and the estimated cost is about $8,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is all right, is it not ?

Mr. A. MARTIN. That would make a toal cost of $587,964.

Mr. EMMERSON. But you must remember there is to be an improvement. You add $270,000 on to that estimated cost of the railway, the estimated cost of rolling stock, $200,000, the estimated cost of crib-work at Murray Harbour, $69,955, all included in the cost of the railway. Now let me resume in a few words. The estimated cost of the Hillsboro' River bridge was $1,494,-097.15. We expended from the beginning to November 30, 1904, $1,217,744.98, showing a balance of $276,352.17 on the Hillsboro' River bridge, as between the estimated cost and the amount actually expended.

Mr. HAGGART. When was the estimate made for the bridge alone ?—because the estimate furnished to the House was one-half of that $750,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think my hon. friend is speaking of the substructure.

Mr. HAGGART. I am talking of the bridge.

Mr. EMMERSON. On July 5 last, the estimate, including the wharf, was $2,795,-

113.17. That is exactly the same as I have read out to this committee.

Mr. HAGGART. The estimate was made in 1898, what was it then ? The minister is talking of the last years' estimate.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is ancient history. I have now to resume. The branch to Murray Harbour was estimated to cost $1,031,061.02.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. When was that estimate made ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Is it not a fact that that road was estimated to cost $8,000 a mile, and now we find it has cost in the vicinity of $32,000 a mile? The House would like an explanation of the jump of $24,000 a mile in the cost of a railway in a level country without any grades. The Prince Edward Island Railway was built for $8,000 or $10,000 a mile, and we find this railway costing three times as much per mile as the railway built in 1871, though labour is cheaper, material is cheaper, and the mode of construction is cheaper. Besides that, I believe the rails were second-hand rails taken from the Intercolonial.

Mr. EMMERSON. They were just as good rails as are being put down on the Intercolonial to-day, except that they were a lighter rail. They were practically new rails. You do not require 80 pound rails on a narrow gauge railway ; but you have just as good rails on that railway as you have anywhere on the Intercolonial, except that they are lighter.

Mr. BARKER. May I ask if these rails that were quite good, were taken off the Intercolonial ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. Then you charge the Intercolonial capital account with the whole of the new rails ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I might explain here; the total expenditure on the branch and Murray Harbour was $870,121.91, leaving a balance or difference between the estimated cost and the amount expended, of $160,931.11. Then for rolling stock, the estimate was $200,000, and there was expended up to November 30 last, $145,992.35. That left a balance of $54,007.65. Then there was an estimate for rails at Murray Harbour in connection with the railway, of $69,955. No portion of that had been expended, and therefore there was to expend $69,955. Now in answering the question with respect to the balance to be paid on these works, I said there was still to pay and still unexpended, $561,253.93. That total is reached by adding to the $276,352.17, the balance on the Hillsboro' River Bridge, $160,939.11 the balance on the branch to Murray Harbour, $54,007.65, and the balance on the rolling stock, $69,955, for rails at Murray Harbour. Those several amounts make the total sum of $561,253.95, which is in accordance with the answer which I gave to the hon. gentleman on the floor of the House.

Mr. A. MARTIN. What would be the total for the road now ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The total for the road, including rolling stock and crib-work at Murray Harbour, would be $1,301,016.02, plus the balance that is to be paid, according to the statement which I read to my hon, friend a moment ago.

Mr. HAGGART. My statement is that the bridge was only to cost about $750,000, and the road about one-third of tae present estimate.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think the hon. gentleman has mixed up the superstructure and the substructure.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 43) respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.—Mr. Gervais.

Bill (No. 56) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Bole.

DEATH OF MR. E. F. CLARKE, M.P.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) Mr. Speaker, it becomes my very sad and painful duty to announce what is already known, I think, to a great many members of the House, the very sudden and lamented death of our friend Mr. E. F. Clarke, member for Centre Toronto. I understand that an opportunity will be given on Monday to make fitting reference to this very sad event. I rise at the present time to suggest that as a tribute of respect to the memory of the late Mr. Clarke, we should adjourn now and not proceed further with the business of the day. I am sure that all of us on both sides of the House will feel that we should pay this tribute to the memory of our late confrère.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). The House has heard with profound regret the sad information conveyed by the leader of the opposition, of the death of our late colleague, Mr. E. F. Clarke. I am sure that the Prime Minister will share with the leader of the opposition, as we all do, in the deepest sorrow at this unexpected visit of the angel of death. It is becoming that we should act on the suggestion of the leader of the opposition. I

have no doubt that the sad event will be appropriately referred to on Monday next, I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 8.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 6, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 98) to incorporate the Imperial Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Belcourt.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST — PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to inquire of the government whether or not there are to be any changes made in the Bills that have been introduced by the Prime Minister for the establishment of new provinces in the Northwest Territories ? I venture to mention this because I see in newspapers that are supposed to be in the confidence of the government, rumours—nay more than rumours, direct statements—that there are to be certain changes made in the provisions of these Bills. In connection with this matter, it seems to me that the practice followed by the Prime Minister with regard to these Bills, and also the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill of two years ago, is not a practice supported by any competent authority. I refer to the practice of introducing a Bill with which the House is not at all familiar, and proceeding to debate it in a manner which is usual only upon the second reading. I am aware, of course, that it is not only perfectly proper, but that it is usual to make a succinct statement explanatory of the provisions of a Bill upon its first reading, but I do not find any authority for proceeding to debate a Bill upon its first reading, before the measure is laid before the House in printed form and before the House has had an opportunity of becoming familiar with its provisions. I am well aware that it was the intention of the government to have favoured me personally with a copy of the Bill some little time in advance of its introduction ; but, unfortunately, for reasons which were no doubt beyond the control of the government, that intention was not carried out, and I received the Bill only about the time the Prime Minister rose to introduce it. But even if I had received the Bill say twenty-four hours in advance, as might perhaps have been very proper under the circumstances, that would not have afforded an opportunity to other members of the House who are equally interested with myself in discussing the measure, if it was to be discussed at that stage, to make themselves thoroughly acquainted with the scope and meaning of the provisions of the Bill before proceeding to discuss it. I mention this because it seems to me that if this practice is to be followed by the government in the future in regard to important measures of this kind, it would be well to have each Bill printed two or three days in advance of its introduction, so that, if there is to be a discussion on the first reading, the House can proceed intelligently with that discussion, and can have an opportunity beforehand of giving the Bill that consideration which, of course, is absolutely necessary to a measure of this kind.

Now, I have asked as to changes in the Bill. If they have not come to any conclusion with regard to changes in the Bill ; if they have not come to any conclusion up to the present time, I would very respectfully suggest to the Prime Minister that, if any changes of importance are to be made in the provisions of this Bill before the second reading is reached, it would be highly in the interest of the members who will have to discuss the measure, and indeed would be very much in the interest of the country as a whole, that the Prime Minister should acquaint the House with the nature of those changes a reasonable time before the second reading is brought on. I have no doubt that the right hon. gentleman will assent to this as a reasonable request, and that it will be complied with.

Let me add just one word of personal explanation with regard to myself. I do not usually trouble the House with very much personal explanation about statements with regard to myself in the public press ; but there have been a number of suggestions or statements made as to my recent absence from the House which I think must proceed upon an entire misunderstanding. I quote only one of these, which is not couched perhaps in a very offensive form, but which conveys a suggestion which is absolutely untrue :

> That the constant factors in our politics are not wholly unknown to some of our Conservative friends the tactful absence of Mr. Borden from Ottawa at this juncture abundantly illustrates.

And so on in other journals, some of the suggestions being couched in a somewhat more impertinent form than that which I have just read. I had no intention of absenting myself from the city of Ottawa up to four o'clock of the afternoon of last Wednesday week, when I received a telegram announcing the sudden death of a very near and dear relative under very distressing circumstances. On the following

morning I left for my home in Halifax for that reason and that reason alone, expecting to return to Ottawa by noon of the following Tuesday. As I have already mentioned in this House, I did not reach Halifax on Friday evening owing to the snow blockade, but I reached there on Monday evening, more than seventy-two hours late. I left Halifax on Wednesday morning and arrived at Ottawa on Thursday evening. I think it is due to myself to make this explanation, because I do not think that in my public life I have usually been found wanting in my attendance on parliament; nor do I think that anything has been displayed in my public career which would lead any journalist of even the most suspicious type to suppose that I would have gone to Halifax on this particular occasion if it had not been absolutely necessary, in my judgment, that I should do so. I apologize to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House for having been compelled in self defence to inflict this statement of private and personal affairs upon the House, and I know that under the circumstances the House will pardon me for doing so.

There is one other matter which I forgot to mention. On the introduction of this Bill I brought to the attention of the government the fact that a number of returns which had been moved for had not yet been brought down. I also pointed out that there was certain information which I thought would be necessary for the intelligent discussion of the questions that are to be considered in the House, and that it should be brought down in a shape to be readily available to every member of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I think I voice the feeling of the House when I say to my hon. friend that no apology was needed from him as to his absence from the House. Unfortunately, we are all victims of the press, and if we were to take very seriously everything that is said of us, our repose would be considerably affected. But I think we can make allowance for the newspaper men in their desire to give the latest news. Everybody knows the painful circumstances under which my hon. friend had to leave this House, and no one, I can assure him, speaking for this side, had any suspicion that his absence was due to any other cause than domestic affliction. With regard to the main question which my hon. friend has put to me, I do not agree with him as to the constitutional practice. I admit that in Canada the discussion generally takes place on the second reading of a Bill. This is so in England also; but my hon. friend is aware that in England every important measure, I do not say invariably, but as a rule, is explained by the minister in charge of the Bill upon its presentation for the first reading. Thereupon the matter is left for some time for the deliberation of the House and the country. This practice I have followed on this occasion, and I believe yet that it is the best method. The government have explained their policy, and have left it to the judgment of the House and the country. If the Bill were to be presented without any explanation, the country would be without the real reasons which prompted the government in introducing it. If the first reading were to be followed immediately by a discussion, I think the House, especially the opposition, would be taken at a disadvantage, and the government might be charged with sharp practice; but if the Bill is left for a reasonable time after being introduced, the opposition have an opportunity to prepare and explain their views upon it. I still think this is the best policy that can be followed.

My hon. friend has asked me if it was the intention of the government to introduce changes into this Bill. I have only to reply that it is open to the party who introduces a Bill to change it at all times. I have seen few Bills introduced into this House or any deliberative assembly which have gone through the third reading without being considerably amended, and the more important the Bill the more likely is it to be amended. Even Bills of a very minor importance are very often amended so as to be hardly recognizable when they leave the committee. Whether or not any changes shall be made will be known as the Bill goes through its various stages; and if any should be made, they shall be made in the ordinary course. With regard to the information asked for by my hon. friend, I shall endeavour to comply with his request.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me that in addition to the information already asked, it would be advisable that a definite summary be furnished of the different changes, dating from confederation, in the financial terms which have taken place to the benefit of the provinces. There has been legislation in various years, adding to the provincial subsidies. If a concise memo. could be made of all these changes with reference to each of the provinces, showing the additions that each one has received to its subsidy and matters of that kind, that would help us very much when we come to discuss the financial clauses of this measure.

Mr. FIELDING. I agree with my hon. friend that a memo. of that character would be useful, and shall endeavour to have it produced before the second reading of the Bill is proceeded with.

Hon. PETER WHITE. It would be desirable that in the case of a long speech such as that which was delivered by the right hon. the leader of the government when introducing this Bill, a copy of the Bill should be also at the time, before the House. It would be well hereafter that members of the

House, should be given the opportunity of becoming conversant with the contents of the measures introduced, when the speech explained that measure on its introduction is delivered. Let me quote from Sir John Bourinot :

It is usual on the introduction of a Bill—on the motion for leave—to explain clearly and succinctly its main provisions ; but it is not the practice to debate it at length at that stage, such discussion being more properly and conveniently deferred to the second reading when the Bill is printed and the House in a position to discuss its principle. Sometimes, however, a short discussion may arise on some features of the Bill on the motion for its introduction, as there is no rule to prevent a debate.

That is quite true, but, when on an important Bill, such as that creating new provinces in the Northwest Territories, the main speech of its introducer is made on the motion for leave to introduce, I think the Bill itself should then be in the hands of hon. members, so that they might be seized of its contents before it is introduced.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. So far as my information goes, and I think it is accurate, this is not the English practice.

Mr. WHITE. I do not know what the English practice is.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In this country we have been accustomed to explain Bills on their second reading, but in England all important measures are fully exposed and explained on their first reading by the minister in charge.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think there is much difference between the right hon. gentleman and myself regarding the practice, but the question is whether the practice is carried out, and the only difference between us is as to the practice which was pursued in this case.

PRIVATE BILLS.

NORTHWEST TELEPHONE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 28) to incorporate the Northwest Telephone Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Mr. BOLE. The point I desire to raise is whether it is advisable we should endorse the principle of incorporating more telephones. A Bill somewhat similar to this was introduced in the Manitoba Legislature a few weeks ago and was opposed by the council of the city of Winnipeg, which I have the honour to represent in this House. They opposed it chiefly on the ground that as the policy of taking over the business of telephone companies by the government was in the air, it would not be advisable to incorporate any more companies, and the Bill was sent back to the committee in order that they might carefully inquire into the whole question of having telephone business conducted by the government. When the Bill before us was introduced into this House, I regret very much that I was not present and therefore unable to put on record my objection ; and I deem it now my duty to reflect the opinion expressed by the city of Winnipeg, an opinion with which I am in full sympathy and accord. I have in my hands a resolution passed by the city council of Winnipeg on February 20, last, which is as follows :

That as this council have a reasonable hope that the telephone system may in the near future be under government control, they would look with disfavour on the granting of any new telephone charters as complicating the situation, and hereby instruct our solicitors to oppose any such legislation now contemplated at Ottawa.

With the spirit of that resolution I am fully in harmony. A telephone business, being essentially a monopoly and an important public utility, it is dangerous to have it in the hands of a private corporation. A great many cities throughout the United States, and I think in Canada also, have made thorough inquiries into this subject. The city of San Francisco had an application before it for a charter for a local exchange, but representations were made to the council that the telephone business was essentially a monopoly, and therefore no new telephone company should be chartered and the application was not granted. Instead, the city of San Francisco appointed a commission to inquire into the whole subject, and the commission reported. This is the last clause of its report, as published in the bulletin of the League of American Municipalities in November, 1904 :

Inasmuch as a telephone was essentially a monopoly, that it would simply increase the burden on the citizens when they increased the number of telephone companies. There is no other public utility with which we come in contact where there are so many objections to competition.

That is the mandate of a commission which has made extensive inquiries, which visited all the important cities on the Pacific coast and examined into the conditions.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the hon. gentleman tell us exactly what commission that was, I did not quite hear him.

Mr. BOLE. A commission was appointed by the city of San Francisco to inquire into the whole question of the telephone business. An application was made by certain promoters to the city of San Francisco for permission to construct and operate a rival telephone business in San Francisco. Representations were made to the city council that to multiply telephone lines would be a nuisance, and the city council therefore

appointed a commission to inquire into the whole question and they have reported as I stated that the rival telephone company is a nuisance and recommend that the request of the promoters should not be granted.

Now with respect to rates, it is very true that nearly all independent companies start out with low rates; that is the experience throughout Canada and the United States, but the same authority that I have just quoted states that the editor has made extensive inquiries into the whole subject, and I shall read his observation with respect to the question of rates. He said :—

During the past decade hundreds of independent telephone companies have been started in all parts of the country and although their rates are much lower than those charged by the Bell companies the competition does not usually result in any saving to the telephone users generally. The Bell companies have almost invariably refused to meet the cut rates of their new competitors for the very good reason, perhaps, that while they may temporarily suffer a falling off in patronage, they soon recover and finally increase the number of their subscribers in the face of the competition. In the various cities of all sizes and conditions, where we have investigated the subject of telephone competition, we find the Bell companies have been able to maintain their rates, and at the same time greatly increase the number of their subscribers. This fact must be taken as evidence that the Bell service is considered by telephone users to be worth the price asked for it. The fact is that in every city where there are two telephone companies in operation the business and professional men find it necessary to have the service of both companies, and where the Bell rates are not reduced by the competition these users have forced upon them an additional expense for telephone service.

It will be seen from this that while the rates are invariably lower when they start because of their short connections and because the new company is first connected with business houses, still it appears to be the result of the subsequent extension of their lines that the cost of operation is increased proportionately beyond their income. Nearly all companies, as nearly as I can learn have got into difficulties ; there are some companies that have succeeded in Canada and some in the United States, but I find that the almost invariable rule is that competing companies have failed and gone into insolvency. I might also quote another extract from the same authority. They say :

In practically every city where we have investigated the financial history and status of independent telephone companies, we find the receipts have been inadequate to cover the charges against the business, and this general condition may safely be attributed to the low rates at which the independent companies undertake to furnish service.

I am not here as the special advocate of the Bell Telephone Company. On the contrary I believe that the Bell Telephone Company have by nature a monopoly and I believe that a monopoly of an important public utility should not be in the hands of any private corporation, and I think therefore that we could very properly consider at this time the policy of having the telephone business conducted by the government. As time goes on these applications for telephone charters will increase in number and as they increase they will become a nuisance to telephone users. It is well known to every person who has lived in a city where there is a duplicate telephone service that business men are obliged to put in two sets, and the result is that while the introduction of a new company may reduce the rates, at the same time at the end of the year it is found that the citizens are paying more for telephone rates than before. I therefore feel it is my duty to move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. TURRIFF. I must ask you not to rise and report progress now. This Bill has been through the Railway Committee and has passed there with some stringent amendments. Every precaution has been taken to make the Bill a satisfactory one in every respect, and I do not see any reason why this House should throw the Bill out at this stage simply because the member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) asks to have it done. Under clause 19 of the present Bill the city of Winnipeg does not need to use this telephone company's service if they do not want to. Provision is made that the company cannot exercise rights in any municipality whatever without the consent of that municipality, except for the purpose of running one through line through the municipality. Because the city of Winnipeg may be acting in the interests of the Bell Telephone Company, and no one can object to their doing so, to my mind that is not a reason why all the other portions of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories and that portion of Ontario to the east of Winnipeg down to the great lakes, should be left without competition if they desire competition. The Bill has been carefully considered in committee, several amendments have been added and in fact everything has been done to make it as wide as possible ; there is nothing whatever in the way of monopoly. It was provided in the Bill that any other telephone company or any individual having a private system could connect wires with the wires of this company when established, so there is no reason whatever for throwing out the Bill at the request of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole).

Mr. D. ROSS. I would ask the hon. member for Winnipeg whether he can give the committee any information as to the time when the provincial government of Mani-

toba is going to adopt the policy of government ownership of telephone lines ?

Mr. BOLE. I did not state that the provincial government of Manitoba were going to adopt that policy. I think that the government which should adopt that policy is the Dominion government.

Mr. BLAIN. Might I ask the introducer of the Bill if the important changes that were made in the Railway Committee have been printed.

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes, and the printed Bill has been distributed ; you will probably find it tacked inside the original Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not seem to me that the member for Winnipeg has given sufficient reasons as to why the committee should rise and report progress. His object seems to be to have the government take hold of the matter and, as far at least as the trunk line service is concerned, perform that service. If his purpose in moving that the committee rise is to bring that about, it would seem that we ought to have some expression from the government as to whether they feel favourable to that ; otherwise we may, as the hon. gentleman who has last spoken (Mr. Turriff) has suggested, be depriving large portions of the country of the benefit of a competitive telephone system, and at the same time not be advancing the cause that the hon. gentleman has at heart. So far as my information goes, I should be disposed to question the reliability of the report made by a commission in San Francisco as interpreted by the hon. gentleman. It ought to be presumed that they would know what they are reporting about ; but so far as my information goes, it is not true that all or a majority of the independent telephone companies in the United States of America, have been financial failures. I think it is true that within the last eight or ten years independent telephone service in the United States of America, commencing at zero point, is at present in a greater condition of development and has more phones than the Bell Telephone system of the United States of America—at least if they have not more, they have about an equal number, and are operating them to-day in every part of the United States of America. One great difficulty that an independent telephone company has to meet in its inception is that it does not possess any trunk lines, and consequently long distance service is made very difficult, and that is an element which has to be taken into consideration. But this Bill, so far as it can do so, if I understand it, provides that a monopoly shall not be had in long distance work, that there shall be the same interchange of message service between the different lines as there is now for instance amongst railways, that running rights so to speak can be given under a reasonable toll whereby a new company can have services of the trunk line system by paying therefor according to reasonable rates. I do not like to admit the assumption that rivalry and competition tend to increase prices. It seems to me that rivalry and competition tend inevitably to reduce prices, and that therefore it is not more costly to the people who are users than if it were one monopoly. It seems to me there have not been very strong reasons given why we should defer the work of the committee on this Bill. Of course if the companies who are interested state that they would look with favour upon providing a general trunk system, or taking the whole question under government charge in this country, that would be a sufficient reason, and for my part I should be willing to vote with my hon. friend who made the motion ; otherwise I do not see that sufficient reasons have been given.

Motion negatived.

On section 1,—incorporation—corporate name.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This is amended by providing that the corporate name of the company shall be, 'The Northwest Telephone and Telegraph Company.' The corporate name now is, 'The Northwest Telephone Company.' That amendment was made by the committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The copy I have is marked, 'Reprinted as amended and reported by the Railway Committee,' and the name of the company as set out in the first clause is the Northwest Telephone Company.

Mr. HYMAN. I may explain that. The title of the Bill is an Act to incorporate the Northwest Telephone Company, and that will be changed before the third reading of the Bill. This is a necessary change to conform with that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why should that be changed ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is understood that it is to be changed. It refers to telegraphs as well as to telephones. There will be an amendment made to change it when the proper time comes on the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It gives the power of operating telegraphs as well as telephones ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

On section 10,—business of company.

Mr. FOSTER. Where does the provision for the assent of the municipality come in ?

Mr. TURRIFF. In clause 19.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is intended by the expression 'provincial and muni-

cipal franchises' ? It seems to be rather an unusual form of words.

Mr. TURRIFF. It is provided in the Bill that they cannot operate in any municipality without first acquiring the franchise from that municipality in order to do business, and it is provided by this section that they cannot acquire a municipal franchise and dispose of the franchise. They cannot sell that franchise.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The word 'franchise' is a very inappropriate word to express that which the hon. gentleman has just stated. The word has a certain signification in the law, and it will be so interpreted in this Bill, but the court interpreting the Bill would be forced to discard that interpretation and seek for something else. I hardly understand why the expression should be used, why it should have occurred to any one to use words of that character with an intention of that kind. 'Acquire and use provincial and municipal franchises' —what this expression means, as I understand the hon. gentleman, is to acquire permission from provinces or municipalities to construct and operate telephone lines within their boundaries. If that is what is intended, I would, in the first place, have thought that it was absolutely unnecessary to make a provision of that sort, but if it is desired to do so, it would be very much better to say so instead of using a form of words which has a very much wider signification.

Mr. HYMAN. What does the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) suggest ? It might be acceptable to the promoter of the Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have not thought very much about that. My mind has been more directed towards the criticism of the words which are there at the present time.

Mr. HYMAN. Cannot that franchise of which the hon. gentleman speaks be given to the company under this wording ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is not a franchise at all.

Mr. HYMAN. That very question that the hon. gentleman brings up was discussed very fully in the committee, and it was felt that these words practically meant that all rights given by a municipality to the company would be considered to be a franchise.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Any one who is familiar with the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada will remember that in a case decided six or seven years ago the late Chief Justice of the Supreme Court gave a very full definition of what the word 'franchise' means at common law. The meaning, as defined by him, at common law—and it cannot be the meaning given to it here to-day—is entirely inappropriate to the intention which has been suggested by the hon. gentleman who is moving this Bill, and I would suggest some form of expression like this—'acquire and use any privilege granted by any provincial or municipal authority.'

Mr. GALLIHER. From the municipality, the province or from individuals who might hold such privilege from them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am speaking without much consideration on the spur of the moment, but I would suggest 'acquire and use any privilege granted to the company by any provincial or municipal authority.'

Mr. GALLIHER. To this particular company ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, that is what I mean.

Mr. HYMAN. If my hon. friend takes exception to this wording, I would suggest that the rest of the Bill be gone over, that we then rise and that we take it up in committee again.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Certainly.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 10 stands.

On section 11,—amalgamation and pooling prohibited.

Mr. HYMAN. This is the same provision that was put in a Bill last year, except that this is made general. The Bill last year was confined to the Bell Telephone Company.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think this is all right.

Mr. HYMAN. It is simply to prevent amalgamation under another name.

On section 12,—sale to or acquisition of similar company prohibited.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would suggest that this section might be made a little more comprehensive. Will the hon. gentleman have any objection to inserting after the word 'its,' where it occurs the second time in the second line of this section, the further words 'rights, powers, privileges' ?

Mr. HYMAN. There is no objection to that.

Mr. GALLIHER. That would make it conform with the other sections.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN moved :

That the section be amended by inserting the words 'rights, powers, privileges' in the second line of section 12 after the word 'its.'

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 13,—agreements with other companies ; rates and charges ; Governor in Council may order inquiry by a judge.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Subsection 2 raises rather an interesting question, one to which I have not given very much consideration, but I would like to know whether it has been under the consideration of the government. That is : Whether or not it is desirable to retain under control of the Governor in Council the revision of telephone rates, or whether it would not be better to give that control to some independent body. We have the Railway Commission constituted at great cost to control rates on railways, and no reason occurs to me at present why the same body should not control telephone rates. Has this matter been considered by the government, and if so with what result?

Mr. HYMAN. The clause in this Bill is the usual clause. If hereafter it is the policy of the government to transfer to the Railway Commission the power to control these rates, of course this company would be brought under that provision of the General Act. This Bill ought to be considered apart altogether from any policy of the government in the matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When the Bill for the establishment of the Railway Commission was before the House, very cogent reasons were given by the then Minister of Railways why a commission composed of men specially qualified who would give their whole time to the matter, could deal more effectually and thoroughly with questions of this kind than could members of the administration. Parliament coincided with these reasons which are equally cogent in regard to telephone matters. This is a subject which ought to engage the immediate attention of the government.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Did we give the Railway Commission power over telegraph rates ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think the power was conferred on the Railway Commission, but I do not see any particular reason why it should not be. We all know that members of an administration have a great deal of their time occupied with their political duties, and they cannot be expected to so thoroughly deal with matters of this kind as would an independent tribunal. We know also that immediately upon the institution of the Railway Commission matters which would never have come before the railway committee of the Privy Council were brought to the attention of the Railway Commission and have been dealt with. It has been suggested by the member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) that a telephone in order to be effective must essentially be a monopoly. I am not saying whether the statement is correct or not, but assuming that it is correct, it necessarily follows that you must either have the telephone as a government institution, or you must have it as a monopoly in the hands of a private corporation or private corporations under the most effective control that can possibly be devised, so far as rates and operations are concerned. It is important that the government should take this into consideration at the earliest possible date.

Mr. HYMAN. I do not think there can be any two opinions on the main question which the hon. member has brought up. Of course that would have to be brought about by a general amendment to the Railway Act, and not in connection with this private Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not suggesting that we should make any change here, but I avail of this as a convenient time to press on the government the advisability, if not the absolute necessity, of having the control of these rates placed in the hands of an independent commission.

Mr. FOSTER. The intention of subsection 2 was that the municipalities should have the right to apply for a revision of rates, but I do not think that is quite clear by the language of the section. If it is not clear it should be made clear.

Mr. HYMAN. That was the intention of the clause—can you suggest a better wording?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would suggest that it should read :

'May from time to time apply for such revision and be heard upon the application therefor.'

Mr. HYMAN. Very well, we will make that amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. HAGGART. There is nothing in this Bill to empower the government to expropriate this property at any time. Of course the government could exercise the right of eminent domain, but notwithstanding that there is the same power in England they insert in these Acts a clause giving notice to the stockholders that the government may at some future time expropriate the property and fix the terms of expropriation. There should be some similar provision to these acts just as we have in the Grand Trunk Act.

On section 17,—borrowing powers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it usual to grant these powers in this absolutely unlimited form ?

Mr. HYMAN. If I am not mistaken, these are the exact words of an Act passed last session of exactly the same character.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman forgets that a Railway Act has been passed in the meantime, and that sections 192,

193 and 194 of that Act do not apply to this at all.

Mr. GALLIHER. In the Railway Committee I took occasion to object to this clause being allowed not only in this Bill, but in any Bill of this nature. While it was suggested there that the lenders of money would no doubt look after themselves with regard to the security—and I am perfectly satisfied to leave that matter to them—what I am concerned for, and what I think we ought all to be concerned for, is the interests of the minority shareholders. The unlimited borrowing powers given to companies often leave them free to borrow more than they require to carry on business on a sound commercial basis, and that has been the rock on which many companies have gone to pieces. I think the borrowing powers of companies of this kind should be limited. For instance, it is provided here that two-thirds in value of the subscribed stock, which may be held by one or two men, may pass a by-law enabling the company to borrow to any amount it sees fit. The holders of the other one-third of the subscribed stock may object, but they are powerless.

Mr. BELCOURT. This section, I understand, is in the exact words of the section in the General Companies' Act, of 1902. It may be desirable to limit the borrowing powers of a company of this kind, but I cannot see how it can be done.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In some of the English statutes the borrowing powers of the company are limited by the amount of the paid up capital. The difference between this company and the companies incorporated under the General Companies' Act is that this company is for the purpose of carrying on a public work, while the other companies are not invested with the same privileges, but are formed for ordinary commercial purposes, and parliament may not be specially concerned in regard to their borrowing powers. This company is in the same category as a railway company, and every argument which goes to restrict the borrowing powers of a railway company applies with equal force to this company. I think these borrowing powers should be limited, otherwise, you may have an enormous capitalization by means of bonds, and that may be given as a reason why the rates to be paid by the public should be kept up to an undue figure.

Mr. STOCKTON. Under the Joint Stock Companies' Act of the province of New Brunswick the power of borrowing is limited to 75 per cent of the stock actually paid up. That is the rule generally applied to incorporated companies, and there is no difficulty there. It does seem to me that an unlimited power to borrow is not a desirable power to give to a company of this class.

Mr. BELCOURT. Possibly we might limit the borrowing power to two-thirds of the assets of the company; but it is difficult to determine what are the assets of a company. I agree with the hon. leader of the opposition that in a case of this kind there ought to be a limit to the borrowing power, but I cannot think of any way in which it could be fixed. The suggestion of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Stockton) would hardly do in this instance, because the company might have, say $100,000 paid up capital and yet have assets of many millions. It might have very large assets outside of its paid up capital, and it would be an injustice to the company to limit it to only 75 per cent of its paid up capital. If you made it say two thirds of its assets, then it would be probably within the mark.

Mr. STOCKTON. How would you determine the assets?

Mr. BELCOURT. There is the difficulty, I quite agree.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think this should stand so that we may consider it a little.

Section 18 allowed to stand.

On section 19,—approval by municipality before exercise of right; exclusive long distance line; interpretation of long distance line and arbitration of disputes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it intended by the second section that the location of the line shall be subject to the approval of the municipal council or such officers as it may appoint? If so, this is pretty awkwardly expressed.

Mr. HYMAN. This whole section is one which appeared in several Bills last session and the session before. It was drawn up after consultation with the municipal bodies and they all agreed to it as it was worded. We have put it in exactly as it is worded in these other Bills.

Mr. HAGGART. Why not put it in as it was worded in the Railway Act? You have eliminated from your Bill clauses 192 and 193 of the Railway Act, thinking that they applied only to railway companies, but you have included clauses 194 and 195 of the same Act.

Mr. HYMAN. I did not look into this matter carefully but was satisfied that this would meet the views of the municipalities, as it was drafted after consultation with them and was approved by them. And as it is entirely in their protection and they were satisfied, I saw no objection to it.

Mr. BELCOURT. I wish to call attention to the words 'general by-laws and

regulations.' In some municipalities there are special by-laws, applicable to particular subjects, and this clause would prevent these special by-laws being applicable to these companies. I would suggest that the word 'general' should be struck out wherever it appears in this section.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. HAGGART. One of them provides a method of settling disputes by the Board of Commissioners. You make that clause applicable and at the same time you have a special clause providing arbitration for the purpose of settling these disputes. We should have it clearly distinguished what subjects the board has control of and what matters come under the arbitration clause.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The difficulty is that three different tribunals are provided for the decision of certain disputes in connection with this company. In the first place, so far as rates are concerned, the Governor in Council has power; under subsection 4, as concerns all matters in dispute relating to long distance lines they are to be determined by arbitration; then, under section 20 you make sections 194 and 195 of the Railway Act apply, and under that you have a third tribunal.

Mr. HYMAN. What do you suggest?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What I said a moment ago, that there should be a reference of all these matters to one tribunal, the Railway Commission. In that way you would avoid a great deal of confusion that must necessarily arise under this statute.

Mr. FOSTER. We have admitted the principle, of course, by section 194 and 195.

Mr. HYMAN. Of course this Bill was drawn up without the whole matter being in the hands of the commission, and therefore the committee I presume, had to make the best of it as the case stood. In the first place they endeavoured to meet the wishes of the municipal authorities; this is a special clause that they desired, and I do not know whether even if the matter was left under the control of the commissioners that the municipal authorities would be satisfied. This is a special provision made at their request and we are meeting their views.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you met their views?

Mr. HYMAN. We have, so far as section 19 is concerned. That is word for word and in exact accordance with the agreement. They appeared before the committee and made known their wishes in another case and we have met their views. They wished to have it in this way and the committee acceded to their request. We had considerable discussion with these gentlemen.

Mr. BELCOURT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman, with all deference to him, is confusing two things. We are not suggesting that any restriction placed by this Act upon the powers of the company shall be taken away; we are not suggesting that any power of location conferred upon a municipal council shall be taken away. We are pointing out that you have under this Bill three different tribunals which are to adjudicate upon any case where the municipal council itself is not the final judge to determine the matter. The municipal council is given the power to itself determine matters as to which it has a certain interest, but apart from that there are other matters as to which it has no such power. These fall under this statute within the purview of three different tribunals, the Governor in Council, the arbitration provided under subsection 4 of clause 19 and the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. HYMAN. There is no question about that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And, as the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has pointed out, not one of us would be able to say without a great deal of consideration at least—and courts might differ about it—whether subsection 4 or section 195 of the Railway Act should apply, and which should be the proper tribunal to go to first.

Mr. HYMAN. What is the matter?

Mr. FOSTER. Do you not think you might take this into consideration with the other two sections?

Mr. HYMAN. I have no objection to this clause standing, but I would again say that in dealing with this we were dealing without any reference to the Railway Commission and dealt with it in the light of the law as it stood. I presume when the broad question comes up that all these matters will be decided, and possibly that clause 19 will become part of the general law. But in the meantime it is not part of the general law, and this is special legislation to meet the wishes of the municipalities.

Mr. FOSTER. Get a hustle on your government and decide it.

Mr. HYMAN. We have plenty to do just now.

Mr. BELCOURT. The object the hon. gentleman has in view seems to me to be met by having half a dozen different jurisdictions; the company can surely not escape its duty with all these tribunals.

Mr. HAGGART. The question is whether you have given it distinctly to any tribunal.

Mr. BELCOURT. As far as section 20 is concerned, it does not seem doubtful to me. We have incorporated in the charter of this company sections 194 and 195 of the Railway Act. Section 194 gives jurisdiction to the Railway Commission to determine the manner in which the company will erect its system. Then we have incorporated the provision of the Telephone Company's Act which determines the manner in which the line shall be built, the height of poles, wiring and manner of stringing wires, &c.

Mr. HAGGART. Suppose there is a dispute as to which has jurisdiction.

Mr. BELCOURT. It seems to me that section 194 of the Railway Act would apply.

Mr. HYMAN. As against section 19.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would think there was a great deal of doubt about that with all deference to my hon. and learned friend (Mr. Belcourt).

Mr. BELCOURT. I am discussing section 19.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Section 19 deals especially with location and provides for a settlement by arbitration. The question dealt with by section 19 is to be determined under section 19 ; but under the provisions of section 20, another tribunal is created, and I would not like to say off-hand, nor would my hon. and learned friend, just what you can determine under section 19 and under section 20.

Mr. BELCOURT. I can quite see the difficulty; subsection 4 of section 19 creates an arbitration whereas section 20 brings it under the Railway Act.

Mr. HAGGART. That is the trouble.

Mr. BELCOURT. I see the conflict and think we should do away with one clause.

Mr. TURRIFF. When the Bill was before the committee sections 194 and 195 of the Railway Act were made applicable at the request of some one, I think, connected with the Railway Department who was in the committee.

Mr. HYMAN. That only refers to section 194.

Mr. TURRIFF. Well, it was covering the crossing by telephone lines over railway tracks.

Mr. HAGGART. But includes both 194 and 195.

Mr. TURRIFF. No objections to give it to either tribunal.

Mr. BELCOURT. Strike out subsection 4.

Mr. HYMAN. No, subsection 4 is part of the agreement with municipal authorities. It would break faith with them. I move that section 19 stand.

Motion agreed to.

On section 24,—subsection 5,

Mr. GALLIHER. I notice that penalties are imposed by virtue of this Act, how are we going to carry out the enforcement of these penalties ? There is nothing in this Act providing for it.

Mr. HAGGART. It is the moral influence they will exert.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In the provinces there is usually a general statute providing how penalties may be recovered in case no other provision is made. I am not aware that we have any such general statute for the Dominion but possibly there may be one; if not, the question which has been put to the government by my hon. friend (Mr. Galliher) is a very pertinent one.

Mr. HYMAN. I suggest that that matter be brought up again when the Minister of Justice is present, and we will further consider the Bill.

Mr. TURRIFF moved that the committee rise, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to and progress reported.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 86) respecting the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company, Limited.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 87) to incorporate the International Terminal and Bridge Company.—Mr. T. G. Johnston.

Bill (No. 88) to incorporate the Athabaska Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 89) respecting Monterey Electric and Gas Company, Limited, and to change its name to 'Monterey Railway, Light and power Company.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 91) respecting the Timagami Railway Company.—Mr. McCool.

Bill (No. 92) respecting the Ottawa and New York Railway Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 93) respecting the Grand Council of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association of Canada.—Mr. J. J. Hughes.

Bill (No. 94) respecting the Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Railway.—Mr. Derbyshire.

Bill (No. 95) respecting Gillies Brothers, Limited.—Mr. A. A. Wright.

Bill (No. 96) respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

QUESTIONS.

DREDGING AT PENETANGUISHENE.

1. Who is the owner or owners of the dredge which in the summer of 1904 performed dredging at Penetanguishene ?
2. If a company, what is the name of the company ?

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works). Bowman & Company.

ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR SUBSIDY.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. What amount has been paid to the claimants against the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company since July 1st, 1904, on account of subsidy voted in 1901 for a line of railway between Caplin and Paspebiac ?
2. Has the Department of Railways and Canals prepared a statement showing to whom, by whom, on what date, and on whose recommendation, each separate payment comprised in the total amount was made ?
3. Was any investigation by an official of the Department of Railways and Canals made regarding these claims prior to the 1st August, 1904 ? If so, by whom, and on what authority was the said investigation made ?
4. Was any further investigation held after August 1st, 1904 ? If so, by whom, and on what authority ?

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

1. $24,513.58.
2. No.
3. Yes, by Mr. G. A. Mothersill, a commissioner appointed under chapter 114 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.
4. Yes, by the Honourable Justice Langlier, a commissioner appointed under chapter 114, of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

WHARF AT GREECE'S POINT.

Mr. PERLEY asked :

1. What was the total cost of the public wharf at Greece's Point, on the Carillon canal ?
2. How many boats used this wharf, and what was the revenue received from it during the last year ?
3. Who is in charge of this wharf, and how much did he receive for his services during last year ?
4. Was he paid by fees or by salary ?

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works).

1. $5,452.19.
2. The Marine Department have no record of the exact number of boats which used that wharf. The gross revenue last year (1903-4) was $60.93.
3. Telesphore Ranger.
4. Fees, being a commission of 25 per cent of the amount collected.

Mr. TURRIFF.

WHARF AT HULL.

Mr. PERLEY asked :

1. What was the total cost of the public wharf at Hull ?
2. How many boats used this wharf, and what was the revenue received from it during last year ?
3. Who is in charge of this wharf, and how much did he receive for his services during last year ?
4. Was he paid by fees or by salary ?

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works).

1. $54,049.76.
2. Some ten boats periodically called at that wharf during the season of 1904. No wharfage charged.
3. J. P. Labelle ; paid at the rate of 50 cents per day.
4. By salary.

FISHWAY AT CARILLON CANAL.

Mr. PERLEY asked :

1. Is there a fishway or ladder provided at the government dam across the Ottawa river in connection with the Carillon canal ?
2. If not, why not ?

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

1. No.
2. Because the Department of Railways and Canals did not feel warranted in spending $10,000 in its construction which was its estimated cost.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked :

1. Has the Murray Harbour branch of the Prince Edward Island Railway been handed over to the government by the contractors ? If so, when ?
2. What amount, if any, is yet due to the contractors for work performed under their contracts ?

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

1. The Murray Harbour branch of the Prince Edward Island Railway from Southport to Murray river was handed over to the government by the contractor on November 5, 1904.
2. The final estimate on his contract has been paid to the contractor for the branch.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—CAPITAL ACCOUNT.

Mr. CHISHOLM—by Mr. W. Wright—asked :

1. What was the total amount expended on capital account in connection with the Inter-

colonial Railway and its equipment, down to and including the financial year ending 30th June, 1897 ?

2. Within the above dates, and for similar purposes, what sums were expended on capital account for branches, extensions, connections, and other subsidiary parts of the Intercolonial system ?

3. What sums have been expended on capital account for the Intercolonial Railway and the Intercolonial system, and its connections and branches, yearly, since 30th June, 1897 ?

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

1. $65,750,099.87.

2. $14,316,561.16. This amount is included in the answer to number one.

3. 1898, $252,756.80 ; 1899, $1,081,929.94 ; 1900, $3,255,348,29 ; 1901, $3,633,836.57 ; 1902, $4,622,841.05 ; 1903, $2,254,266.68 ; 1904, $1,880,856.60.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—FREE TRANSPORTATION OF COAL.

Mr. KEMP—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Was coal transported free over the Intercolonial Railway to points in Ontario in the year 1902-3 ?

2. If so, what quantity was transported free, and to what points in Ontario ?

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

1. Yes.

2. 495 tons. City of Ottawa.

PAYMENT OF HALIFAX FISHERY AWARD TO PROVINCES.

Mr. CARVELL asked :

1. Has a proposed case for reference to the Supreme Court of Canada, to determine the right of the provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island to be paid the amount of the Halifax fishery award, received by the Dominion, been submitted to the government on behalf of said provinces, or any, or which of them ?

2. If so, have the terms of such proposed reference been approved by the Minister of Justice ?

3. When is the case to be submitted to the Supreme Court for decision ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister).

1. Yes.

2. The terms of such proposed reference have not yet been approved by the Minister of Justice, but are still under consideration.

RAILWAY SURVEYS IN JOLIETTE.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Barker—moved for :

A return showing :—1. The names of the civil engineers and others, who were employed by the government, to make a survey for a line of railway in the county of Joliette in Quebec province, during the months of October and November, 1904.

2. The salary paid to each of said engineers and assistants for the work already performed in the said county of Joliette.

3. The number of days during which each of said engineers and assistants was employed.

4. A copy of instructions given to said engineers ; also a copy of report with plan or other detailed information which said engineers have made.

5. A statement showing the expenses (other than salary or salaries) entailed for the completion of said work and survey thus made in the said county of Joliette.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). There is no objection to the motion, but it will be necessary to amend it by striking out the words 'employed by the government' and substitute therefore 'employed by the commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway.'

Mr. BARKER. You might put it in the alternative.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have already stated that there was no survey by the government, but that there was a survey, as I understand it, by the Transcontinental Railway Commission.

Motion as amended, agreed to.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—LAYING OF RAILS.

Mr. FOSTER moved for :

A return showing for each of the fiscal years from 1st July, 1897, to 30th June, 1904 : (a) of the number of tons (2,240 lbs.) of old rails taken up from each of the government railways ; the location and number of track miles which had been therewith laid, and the tons to the mile.

(b) Of the number of tons (2,240 lbs.) of new rails and fastenings substituted in each instance ; the tons to the mile, and the cost.

(c) The gross quantity taken up in the above period, and the gross quantity substituted ; and the cost, if any, charged to capital, of taking up and substituting track ; and of carriage of rails and materials to and from the place of laying.

(d) The disposition made of the rails and fastenings so taken up. If re-used on the government railways, when, where, and to what extent ; at what price charged out on relaying, and to what account ?

(e) If not re-used, to what extent ; where, if any, they are stored ; and at what value they are carried, and in what account ; if credited to capital or to working account ; when, how and to what amount ?

(f) If sold, to what extent, for what price, when, and to whom ; and where delivered at the price ; and to what account the proceeds were credited ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In order to get the full information on this matter, I would suggest to my hon. friend that the date of the motion should be changed and that we should go further back.

Mr. FOSTER. Put it back as far as you like ; I did not want to overburden you.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not want to get back to the time of Noah, but suppose we make the date the first of July, 1879.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well.

Motion as amended, agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

A return showing in detail the various amounts expended since two years upon the wharf and abutments situated at Isle Bizard, in Jacques Cartier county, Quebec.—Mr. Monk—by Mr. Barker.

Copies of all correspondence, documents, papers, and reports, not already brought down, relating to the harbour of Port Colborne, the breakwater thereof, and elevators, or proposed elevators therein.—Mr. Barker.

Copies of all petitions, memorials, and resolutions from the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, the executive of that province, and any correspondence relative to the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba to the west or north.—Mr. W. S. McCarthy.

Return showing the number and location, cost and earnings, of the cold storage establishments called 'bait freezers,' of maritime Canada; together with the returns, duly certified, of all such institutions, since 1900; the names and the salaries of all superintendents, officials and keepers of same; and the amounts in pounds of the different kinds of fish therein stored; the amount of bait from them used by bona fide fishermen, and the names of the same; together with all such information as may permit of the thorough examination of the question of government assisted refrigerators.—Mr. A. Martin—by Mr. A. A. McLean.

Return showing the names of residents in the Northwest Territories not entitled to a second homestead, for whom the sanction of the department has been given, allowing them to purchase additional quarter sections, subject to ordinary cultivation conditions; the dates upon which such sanctions were given; the lands which have been purchased by such settlers in consequence of this authority, with the price agreed upon, and the sum paid down; also the form in which the authority to make the sale was made known to the local agents of Dominion lands.—Mr. Lake.

Return of the 'statement of the case' in the 'Canada-Cape Breton' accident, as served by Captain Reid, of Montreal, upon witnesses whose certificate or license was liable to be dealt with in connection with the investigation regarding said casualty.—Mr. Ames—by Mr. Perley.

RURAL MAIL DELIVERY.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe) moved for:

Copies of all reports, returns, estimates, correspondence, writings, records, documents, memoranda, or written or printed information of any kind in the possession or control of the Post Office Department, in reference to the question of establishing rural mail delivery in Canada, or the manner of establishing or conducting such service, and the probable cost; including any information in the possession of the department relative to the working of the United States system, or such a service or system elsewhere, and the annual expense and other particulars.

He said: As the subject of this motion has been engaging a good deal of attention from the people of the rural districts, Canada, I gave notice to the Postmaster General that I would discuss it to-day. We have had this matter referred to on several occasions, and some of us have been watching, as I believe the Postmaster General has been, the progress of this question in the United States. I do not know that the Postmaster General has given any very full statement in regard to it, except upon one occasion last year, although I may not be correct as to this. I am referring to a discussion which took place on the 28th of June last, when the matter was brought up by the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) who referred to the system as being wonderfully successful in the United States. The Postmaster General joined issue upon that statement. Whether or not it has been successful in the United States is important to consider in connection with the agitation now taking place in Canada. I am not, and probably no hon. member would be disposed, to commit himself to the proposition that the time has come when we should have rural mail delivery in Canada; but we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that there is considerable feeling throughout the country that this matter should at all events receive the earnest consideration of members of both sides of the House as one affecting a very large and important class of the people of Canada. I believe I shall have the sympathy of both sides of the House in saying that anything that we can do at a reasonable expense to bring more of the conveniences of city life within the reach of the people of the country ought to be cheerfully borne by the finances of the country in general; and in bringing this matter before the House, I do not wish to be understood as pursuing any line of attack on the Postmaster General, more than this, that I have formed the opinion, whether rightly or wrongly, that the hon. minister is under some misapprehension as to the true condition of this matter in the United States. I judge from the statement the hon. gentleman has made. Even if there is some ground for believing that the Postmaster General is justified in the gloomy view he takes of this matter as a result of looking at what has taken place in the United States, yet the request of perhaps a large section of the rural constituents of Canada should be taken into consideration, namely, that an experiment should be conducted in a small section, a township or a county, so that we

could by actual experience determine for ourselves whether or not the time has come when this system should be inaugurated. In answer to the hon. member for East Lambton, the hon. Postmaster General, last year, as I find in Hansard, on page 5750, said :

I do not know what my hon. friend means when he says that rural delivery in the United States has been successful. The United States people were rather dragooned into the establishment of rural mail delivery, and it has raised very serious problems in the United States. I venture to say that in the very near future there will be a feeling in the United States that they were rather rash in rushing into that system.

The hon. member for West Toronto, Mr. Osler, asked, 'how were the United States dragooned into this system?' The Postmaster General does not answer that, but he goes on to say :

It is only a few years since the United States started that system, and now the expenditure has risen to about $12,000,000 and is going in the near future to be many times that amount. For some time the officers throughout the country engaged in working the system represented it as a huge success, and succeeded in having those views certified to in the official reports of the Postmaster General of the United States. I think the more——

Let me pause here to say that although the Postmaster General seems to have thought that the Postmaster General of the United States was deceived as to what had actually taken place in that country, yet, perusing the reports of the Postmaster General for the United States of the last three or four years, including that for the financial year ending the 30th of June last, I find no indication whatever that the postal authorities there have been deceived or misled in any way in this matter ; but, on the contrary, I find that down to a date even later than the last report—because I have taken the trouble to get later information—the uniform declaration is that in the United States at all events the system has been a great success. The hon. gentleman says further :

I imagine the Post Office Department undertaking to serve the people of this young country, with an area equal to that of the United States, in the same way as is done in smaller countries, such as England and in Europe. Fancy the establishment of a rural delivery system within an area the size of all Europe. That is what is involved in proposing to adopt rural delivery in Canada, and the first step of the Postmaster General would be to ask the House to vote $5,000,000 or $10,000,000, perhaps not the first year, but in a very short time. The first year perhaps $1,000,000 or $2,000,000 would be sufficient, but it would go on so that in five years the Postmaster General would have to ask the House to give $10,000,000 or $15,000,000 to establish rural delivery. It might be that in a few years we would be called upon to vote an item of probably not less than $25,000,000.

I can hardly imagine that the Postmaster General was in earnest in saying that. Our total expenditure in connection with the Post Office Department, as was then pointed out, is less than $5.000,000, and the United States, instead of beginning at even the moderate sum of $1,000,000 or $2,000,000, began the system with the expenditure of $40,000. That was considered sufficient for the inauguration of the system in the first instance in 1897 ; the expenditure was $50,000 in 1898, $150,000 in 1899, $450,000 in 1900, $1,750,000 in 1901, $3,993,740 in 1902, $8,054,400 in 1903, and an estimate of $12,921,700 for 1904—at the time the financial year closed the whole of this has not been quite expended. Now, taking into consideration the relative density of population, and our numbers as compared with those of the United States, the system, if inaugurated in Canada would of course for a long time be on a very limited scale. As a matter of fact, the United States intend to extend the rural mail delivery system only to those parts of the country where 100 families can be served on a route of twenty-five or thirty miles. So if you apply it to Canada it would not for a long time be necessary to extend it to a very great number of sections of the country or to expend on it a very large sum of money.

There is another feature to which I wish to call attention in connection with what my hon. friend the Postmaster General has said. Rightly or wrongly—and I submit by the reports wrongly—he concluded that difficulties have been found to exist in connection with the working of the system in the United States which render it impracticable here. But these difficulties do not really exist. The hon. gentleman says they started on the basis of paying for a courier and equipment $500 a year. That may have been the case, but as far as I can find from investigation, it began at $600 a year. However, that is not of very much consequence. He pointed out that the companies engaged in express and passenger traffic objected to these couriers carrying express parcels and passengers, with the result that these men engaged in the mail service demanded an increase of salary, and the result of the pressure brought to bear by the express companies and the others engaged in the carrying trade was that the government had to increase the pay to $750 a year. That again is a misapprehension. I find that—not at the time the hon. gentleman spoke of, but later on—the government did increase the rate to $720 a year, but that was only for the longer distances, and the expense ranges from that rate down to $432 a year. The Postmaster General then went on to say that if we were to establish this

service, we would probably have to pay $1,000 a year ; and on an average that would represent about 15 cents a mile. But if we take into consideration the conditions existing in Canada and the rates we are paying for our mail carriage at present from place to place, we need not be very much afraid on that score, because the rates that are paid in Canada for such service will fall very far short of the fanciful rates which my hon. friend claims were demanded a year ago in the United States. If you take the rates of transportation in Canada, you will find that they will not exceed probably five cents a mile instead of fifteen. There is something interesting in the figures. You are well aware that this work is done by contract after calling for tenders, and you would suppose that the rates would be reasonably even all over the country. But let me begin by taking for illustration South Simcoe and North Simcoe, and I will take only the short distances of under a mile. In South Simcoe, giving the stations, distances, the total number of trips and amounts paid, we have the following results :

SOUTH SIMCOE--DISTANCES LESS THAN A MILE..

Name.	Distance.	Total Trips.	Amount Paid.	Rate Per Trip.
	Miles.		$ cts.	
Angus to Railway Station	1/8	1,248	48 00	
Colwell and Railway Station	3/8	624	62 80	
Utopia "	1/16	624	87 92	
Lefroy "	1/16	624	31 40	
Nantyr and Railway Catch Post	3/8	312	60 00	
Thornton and Railway Station	3/8	936	85 36	
Vine and Railway Catch Post	1/16	624	56 52	
Alliston and Railway Station	1/8	1,248	87 92	
Beeton "	3/4	1,248	169 66	
Cookstown "	1/4	1,248	150 72	
Tottenham "	1/4	1,248	49 00	
Everett "	1/16	936	*50 00	
Glencairn "	1/4	312	50 00	
Lisle "	1/8	312	25 00	
Tioga "	1/4	624	43 96	
Allandale "	1/8	1,872	100 00	
		14,040	1,158 26	
Average rate per trip				$8\frac{24}{100}$ cts.
Average yearly cost per transfer				$72·39

NORTH SIMCOE—LESS THAN A MILE.

Avening and Railway Station	3/4	624	120 00	
Batteau "	1/16	624	91 50	
Collingwood "	1/8	1,872	300 00	
Creemore "	1/4	1,248	94 20	
Duntroon "	1/2	1,248	314 00	
Nottawa "	3/4	624	114 00	
Smithdale "	1/4	312	25 12	
Stayner "	1/4	1,248	78 00	
Brentwood "	1/8	624	60 00	
New Lowell "	1/4	1,248	37 44	
Anten Mills "	1/2	312	29 00	
Saurin and Mail Changing Post	1/4	624	20 00	
Elmvale and Railway Station	1/2	936	100 00	
Phelpston "	1/16	312	42 38	
		11,856	1,425 64	
†Average rate per trip				$12\frac{102}{1,000}$ cts.
Average annual rate per station				$89·10

* Estimated. † Higher than South Simcoe by 45·87 per cent.

Mr. LENNOX.

Why is the difference ? In South Simcoe —a riding which is well represented, I think—we have an average of eight cents per trip ; whereas in North Simcoe, although tenders were called for, we have an average of twelve cents, or just 45·87 per cent higher for carrying these mails in North Simcoe than in South Simcoe. No doubt it is not too much in either case, but it suggests a peculiar inquiry ; and it seems, now turning to North York, that I am, in a sense, between the devil and the deep sea. I take the longer distances, and we have the following results :

SOUTH SIMCOE.

Name.	Distance.	Total Miles.	Amount Paid.	Rate per Mile.
	Miles.		$ cts.	cts.
Alliston and Rosemont	9	5,616	234 72	4·17
Alliston and Elmgrove	11½	7,176	152 00	2·14
Angus and Baxter	7½	2,340	88 00	3·33
Athlone and Tottenham	17½	10,920	219 48	2
Black Bank and Lisle Railway Station	8¾	5,460	202 00	3·70
Churchill and Railway Station	2½	3,120	219 00	7·04
Egbert and Mail Changing Post	3	1,872	90 00	4·87
Thornton and Ivy	4⅛	2,574	206 00	6·41
Bell Ewart and Lefroy Station	1	1,248	72 00	5·76
Stroud and Railway Station	1	1,248	120 00	9·61
Innisfil and Stroud	3	1,872	125 00	6·66
Killyleagh and Thornton	3	624	25 00	4
Earnscliffe and Rosemont	5½	3,432	200 00	5·82
Honeywood and Ry. Station	12	7,488	274 00	3·85
Kilgorie and Whitfield	4½	936	60 00	6·41
Perm and Everett	7½	4,680	*100 00	2·13
Rosemont and Shelburne	12	7,488	453 58	6·05
Rosemont and Sheldon	3⅜	2,340	100 00	4·27
Ruskview and Terra Nova	2¾	858	40 00	4·66
Penville and Tottenham	19½	12,168	270 29	2·22
Thompsonville and Railway Station	1¼	1,560	110 00	7·05
		85,020	3,355 47	
Average rate per mile				3·94 cts.

* Estimated.

NORTH SIMCOE.

Name.	Distance.	Total Miles.	Total Amount.	Rate per Mile.
	Miles.		$ cts.	cts.
Apto and Phelpston	6	3,744	164 23	4·38
Crossland and Phelpston	19	5,928	300 00	5·06
Elmvale and Gibson	9	2,808	128 00	4·55
Banda and Glencairn	2½	1,560	124 80	8
Cashtown and Creemore	2	1,248	100 00	8
Collingwood and Gibraltar	12½	3,900	235 00	6
Creemore and Lavender	13	8,112	345 00	4·25
Duntroon and Maxville	14	8,736	316 00	3·61
Glen Huron and Railway Station	1½	936	140 00	14·95
Nottawa and Rob Roy	10	3,120	143 00	4·58
Stayner and Sunnidale " Strongville	23¾	7,410	155 79	2·10
Barrie and Hillsdale	16	9,984	297 00	2·97
" Midhurst	5	3,120	180 00	5·76
Grenfel and Railway Station	2½	520	78 00	15
Minesing and Railway Station	2	1,248	72 27	5·79
" Russellton	6	1,872	100 00	5·34
Glen Huron and Railway Station	1½	936	140 00	14·95
		65,182	3,019 09	Av. $4\frac{33}{100}$ c.

NORTH YORK.

Name.	Distance.	Total Miles.	Amount Paid.	Rate per Mile.
	Miles.		$ cts.	cts.
Sutton West and Vachell	4	2,496	75 00	3·
Mount Albert and Sharon	7¼	4,524	177 50	3·92
Queensville and Ravenshoe	6	3,744	150 00	4·
Keswicke and Roche's Point	3	1,872	139 00	7·42
Aurora and Schomberg	15	4,200	162 25	3·86
" Vandorf	8¼	5,148	290 00	5·63
Glenville and Newmarket	3½	2,184	120 00	5·54
Kettleby and Railway Station	1½	3,744	229 20	6·12
King and Strange	4⅝	2,964	198 00	6·68
Linton and Kleinburg Railway Station	13¼	8,268	375 00	4·53
Lloydtown and Schomberg Railway Station " Tuam and Railway Station " and Railway Station " Tuam		3,957	267 84	6·76
Schomberg and Tuam	5	580	59 00	10·14
Temperanceville and Railway Station	6½	4,056	200 00	4·93
Georgina Island and Verginia	4	832	40 00	4·80
Newton Robinson and Bradford	9	5,616	365 00	6·49
Deerhurst and Gilford	4½	2,808	155 00	5·52
		56,693	3,002 79	Av. 5 3/100 cts.

Average 5·30 cents a mile.

Average in South Simcoe is 3·94 cents per mile. Difference is (in favour of North York) 34 per cent.

I find from the Postmaster General's Report that the total number of miles of mail route travelled in South Simcoe was 85,020 at a cost of $3,355.47 or an average of 3·94 cents per mile for the whole riding. In North York, on the other hand, the total number of miles travelled was 56,693 at a cost of $3,002.79 or an average of 5·30 cents per mile. It is a peculiar thing that in the centre, in South Simcoe, the cost is lower by 45 per cent than in North Simcoe on the other hand, and 34 per cent lower than in North York on the other hand, although they are all by tender.

The matter to which I particularly want to direct attention is that if we take the average mileage cost for carrying mails in Canada and apply our information upon that point to the mileage that would be required for the free delivery if it were established, there is no reason to believe that it will entail anything like the expense which the Postmaster General seems to anticipate or be a matter of serious difficulty so far as we would require for the present to extend the system. The Postmaster General suggested that the United States had arrived at a position when they had to reconsider the matter, when in fact it had given rise to litigation and difficulty, and that in all probability they would like to get out of it. I find no suggestion of that kind in any of the reports in connection with post office management in the United States. I have examined the congressional record right down to date; congress is sitting and these matters are coming up for discussion every day, yet there in no information that any difficulty of this kind has arisen. They have been extending the system from year to year. Beginning with forty-four trips they had at the end of the fiscal year 1904, established 24,556 trips, and by December 2, 1904, when the Postmaster General of the United States made his report, they had established 28,073 trips, and he estimated that by January 15, just past, they would have 30,073 trips in operation. As the Postmaster General of the United States and his assistants point out, there had not at any time therefore been such a demand for this service nor had the service ever been so successful as in the fiscal year ending the 30th June, last. The postal authorities of the United States also point out that they were serving at the end of last year 12,000,000 people, and counting on the same basis, they are now serving at a cost of $12,000,000 nearly 13,500,000 people in the rural municipalities of the United States.

The president of the United States in his message to the Senate dated 6th December last gave some interesting information upon this service. He said:—

In the Post Office Department the service has increased in efficiency and conditions as to revenue and expenditure continue satisfactory. Included in these expenditures was a total appropriation of $12,956,637.35 for the continuation and extension of the rural free delivery service, which was an increase of $4,902,237.35 over the amount expended for this purpose in the

preceding fiscal year. Large as this expenditure has been, the beneficent results attained in extending the free distribution of mails to the residents of rural districts have justified the wisdom of the outlay. Statistics brought down to the 1st of October, 1904, show that on that date there were 27,138 rural routes established, serving approximately 12,000,000 people in rural districts, remote from post offices, and that there were pending at that time 3,859 petitions for the establishment of new rural routes. Unquestionably some part of the general increase in receipts is due to the increased postal facilities which the rural service has afforded.

Lest the Postmaster General or any member of this House should be misled as to the deficits of the mail service in the United States, I point to the enormous figures I have just read, and the fact that for many years, going back ten or fifteen years, there has been a deficit every year.

I have no desire to rob the Postmaster General of any credit he is entitled to in Canada for a different condition of things prevailing here, as long as it does not result in robbing the people who do the work. But I have stated the fact that in the United States the deficits have not been occasioned by the adoption of rural delivery ; but that on the other hand the Postmaster General there points out that the increased receipts of the post office are to some extent due to the adoption of rural mail delivery ; and I also point out that they have been able to discontinue the expenditure on the Star service route, effecting a saving of $579,324; and of rural post offices, to the amount of $171,000, making a saving of $750,445.32, during the last year in consequence of the establishment of rural mail delivery, an important point in considering this question. I point out the fact that the Postmaster General's Report, and all these reports that I have taken occasion to peruse, contain many features well worthy of consideration in this country, a country where rural life contrasts unfavourably in respect of conveniences and advantages with town life and city life, and where all the people of the country should be willing at a reasonable expense to extend these advantages to every section of the country. We will have, if we establish it, as pointed out by the United States Postmaster General, a great general increase in conveniences. He says also it has resulted in increasing the value of the farms, it has resulted in improving the highways, it has increased the values of markets to the farmer, and enabled him to transact his business more satisfactorily by giving him direct access from time to time with the carrier, to transmit money and to carry on many business transactions. Moreover what is as important as anything, it will bring increased comforts to the home, and make contrast between city and rural life less marked than it is to-day. It will tend to encourage the farmers' sons to stay upon the farm, and thus add to the general prosperity of Canada, and by giving them facilities now denied. I propose to read an article from the 'Weekly Sun.' I have great respect for the opinion of the agricultural journals of this country in a matter of this kind, because they come in close touch with the farmers, and the farmers after all are the people who have to bear the chief burden, if this matter is carried out. The article is headed 'The Country Can Afford it.'

Just before parliament prorogued, Sir Wm. Mulock, in answer to Mr. Lennox, said a study of the question of rural mail delivery had convinced him of the impossibility and unwisdom of the inauguration of such a service for Canada, and that it would be many years before any government would recommend its adoption.

The expenditure necessary to extend the service to every farm house in the whole of the United States, including the most sparsely settled sections will not exceed one dollar per family, or less than half the value of the service to those enjoying it. A year or two ago the total expenditure on rural mail delivery in the United States was twelve million dollars.

A little above the mark there as to time as I have shown.

It would not cost anything like that sum to introduce such a service here, and even if it did, what then ? The Laurier government has increased the expenditure on the general services of the country by fourteen million dollars in eight years. The amount that is wasted on little public works——

This is a matter that should strike my hon. friend the Postmaster General, in connection with a discussion we had recently.

——in the form of docks, &c., for doubtful constituencies, and in bounties to iron manufacturers and subsidies to steamboat owners and railway promoters, would easily meet the cost of providing the farmers of Canada with this great boon.

I regret having trespassed upon the attention of the House at such length, but I think the importance of the subject justifies me in doing so. In moving the motion that I have placed on the Order Paper for a return of the papers and documents in connection with this matter, my object was to introduce a discussion upon this question, and at the same time to urge upon the Postmaster General to consider the propriety of testing this matter for ourselves. It is not necessary to make an extensive experiment. As I have said, the system was begun in the United States with a sum of $40,000. Let us appropriate $5,000 or $10,000 for an experiment in Canada, and if it is not found satisfactory, it will have served the purpose in the meantime, and will have satisfied the people that we are all united in a desire to promote the best interests of our farmers throughout the country.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). There is no objection to the order passing with this exception. My recollection is that there are in the department some reports of a confidential character dealing with some of the workings in the United States; those will have to be omitted. My hon. friend rested his argument largely upon the financial consequences involved in the establishment of this system. In doing so I think he directed his attention to the real difficulty in the way. Let me supplement his figures. He gave us the appropriations for the system in the United States down to and including the year 1904. He was correct so far as he went. The United States Congress appropriated in the session of 1903, for the service of the succeeding year, $12,921,700. My hon. friend's information doubtless came to a stop there, for he did not give us the figures of the estimate for the year 1905, nor for the year 1906. The appropriation for the year 1905 by Congress was $20,816,600. The Supply Bill that is now going through Congress contains an appropriation for 1906 of $25,828,300. The appropriation therefore for 1906 is about one hundred per cent greater than it was for 1904, the last figures the hon. gentleman furnished to the House. The system began in 1897 with $40,000. It is true there was a vote of $40,000 at that time, but no real, substantial progress was made until about 1901, when Congress appropriated $1,750,000. Now, beginning with $1,750,000 in 1901, the appropriations have reached $25,800,000 in a period of six years. That shows with what rapidity the expenditures have increased as the system extends. My hon. friend, I have no doubt, was perfectly right when he said that there was a greater demand in the United States last year for the extension of this system than ever before.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that increase of expenditure take place in applying the system generally, or in applying the system from one section to another, and so increasing the expenditure in that way?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not quite understand the hon. gentleman's question.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to know whether they have adopted the system generally in the United States, and this expenditure is growing because of its application to the general system, or whether they have adopted the plan, experimentally if you like, for one district and they are extending it to another district.

Mr. LENNOX. They have almost the whole territory covered now.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The system is being extended to a number of new points. They have not extended the system from the Atlantic to the Pacific and thus completed it, but, I dare say, from the influences that are brought to bear, they are making a beginning here and there and extending it to other points. Development is going on from ocean to ocean, and from north to south. Doubtless every Congressman who goes to Congress goes there pledged to get rural delivery for his constituents. I assume my hon. friend is quite right when he says that you cannot find in the 'Congressional Record' any protests from representatives in Congress against the extension of the system. They all come pledged to secure it. The scheme is started, and when it has a footing in some localities every other locality is demanding what it is contributing to furnish to other districts. But the conditions in Canada are very different. Since we are dealing with figures, let me call my hon. friend's attention to the question of deficits. In 1902, practically before the country had commenced to feel the consequences of rural delivery, the revenue of the United States Post Office Department was only $2,937,649 below the cost. There was a deficit of a shade under $3,000,000, but for the year 1905 they have a deficit of $14,000,000 and odd. I may say that for some years, speaking from memory, I can recall having read the figures of the United States Post Office Department showing that they had a deficit of $10,000,000 or $12,000,000 a year. It gradually fell, and it looked as if they were ultimately going to put their post office on a paying basis. I have not seen the annual statement showing their deficits, although the figures can be discovered by reference to their reports, but the Post Office Department of the United States gradually began to approach a paying basis, the deficit having fallen, in 1902, to $2,937,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the $24,000,000 odd voted this year for the purpose of covering the cost of rural delivery or for the purpose of meeting the deficit?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The $25,800,000 is the estimated expenditure of rural delivery in the United States for the year 1906.

Mr. LENNOX. And the establishment of new services.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. For existing services, and this $5,000,000 extra over the appropriation of this year is doubtless for the extension of the service. Doubtless they are extending it every day. The expenditure has grown in four years from $3,900,000 to some $25,000,000.

Mr. LENNOX. Is it not a fact that they have now got about six-sevenths of the total area covered that they expected to cover, so that they have almost reached their total expenditure?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Nobody can answer that question. I will give my hon.

friend one illustration, and he will see that they have only touched the fringe of the thing yet. They do not serve the cross-roads, and they do not go within a certain distance of houses. The courier will start from the post office where he gets his mail, he will go ten miles along the concession line, he will then cross over to another concession line and he will then return to the place of beginning, having probably travelled about twenty-five miles. The people on these cross-roads are not served. They will demand the service there. The $25,800,000 would be practically doubled—I will not say doubled—but would be enormously increased to serve the people living in between the concession lines. I believe this is one of the wildest schemes the United States ever embarked on. My hon. friend says there are no protests against it. There may not be any protests against this system any more than there are protests against the pension system, which is costing to-day $140,000,000, although it is forty years since the war was closed.

Mr. FOSTER. They are good long livers there.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. They are; but yet nobody in Congress would care to imperil his popularity with the Grand Army of the Republic by objecting to the increases of the classes to which pensions are payable. I would not take the expression of opinion in Congress as a safe guide for us in Canada in a matter of this kind. Moreover, if we were disposed to favour this institution, our conditions are vastly different. It is true that in some sections we have as close settlement as in some parts of the United States, but I do not think any government will be powerful enough to establish rural delivery in favoured sections and not be compelled to yield to all demands and establish it in other sections as well. We have a population of 6,000,000 of people. They have a population of twelve times that at least. Our population is very sparse in districts, but a large part of our country is occupied by that sparse population. My hon. friend seemed to think that the establishment of rural delivery in the United States has caused a great increase in the revenue of the post office. He gave the figure, I think, as being 6 per cent of an increase over last year.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes; they gave 6 per cent. I did not intend to advance that. It was not an argument of mine. I was reading it from the report. I did not state that that was from rural mail delivery, but I said that it applied to the whole postal service.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Quite so; but the hon. gentleman drew the inference that the establishment of a rural mail delivery had resulted in increasing the revenue.

Mr. LENNOX. That is what they say.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. And he mentioned that the revenue of the Post Office Department of the United States increased 6 per cent last year. The United States is largely a commercial country. I have never made a comparison between the population in cities and rural districts in the United States and in Canada, but a country whose population is largely commercial will use the post office to a greater extent than will a country whose population is largely rural. No matter what may be the cause of the increase, whether it be because the people in the United States are more numerous in cities than in rural districts as compared with the people in Canada, yet I think our revenue increases each year at a rate far in excess of 6 per cent. I have not here the figures, but I think I would be quite safe in saying that our revenue has increased quite ten per cent and we have no rural delivery, so that I think the hon. gentleman cannot get any comfort out of that argument.

Mr. FOSTER. There is one point on which I would like the Postmaster General to give us information. Can it be found out somewhat nearly what the cost of the rural delivery is, and what the income is that is derived from the areas which are covered by rural delivery; so that we can get at an idea of the relative income and outgo?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The minister stated that the deficit in 1904 was $14,000,000. Is that correct?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I gave the deficit for the year 1905. I think their financial year ends in March, but at all events the estimated deficit in the United States post office for the fiscal year 1905 is $14,340,938.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I received a letter from a congressman in Washington to-day and he distinctly states that the deficit in the rural mail delivery service has never exceeded $8,000,000.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not know that the United States government has ever balanced up the revenue and expenditure on rural mail delivery alone. The deficit in the Post Office Department before the rural mail delivery service was inaugurated amounted to about $3,000,000. In 1902 they commenced the expenditure on rural delivery, and while the deficit that year was only $2,900,000, it has grown in these past few years to be over $14,000,000, and the chief increased expenditure is for rural delivery.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). Mr. Speaker, the motion before the House

is in my opinion a most important one. Last year when I asked the hon. Postmaster General what he was doing in regard to rural free delivery, I was surprised to hear the answer he gave to the House, and I think that if he investigates the subject, he will admit that his remarks on that occasion were slightly exaggerated. He made the statement that the representatives of the United States had been dragooned into the present legislation. I do not believe the representatives of the United States are the class of people to be dragooned into any legislation that would be against the best interests of the people of that country. The hon. Postmaster General went so far as to say :—

> The unfortunate administration is evidently at its wit's end to know what to do with this monster that has been raised up, and has apparently no way of controlling the thing.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure and privilege to have visited a number of the districts where rural free delivery has been in operation for a number of years, and were a man to stand up in those districts and make such a statement as that, he would have a very cool reception; because I want to assure you that the people of the rural districts around the large cities of the United States are in hearty accord with the administration in granting to them the delivery system which they have at the present time. The hon. minister made the statement that in a few years it would probably cost the people of Canada $25,000,000 to test rural free delivery. I would ask the hon. gentleman to take into consideration the following statement made by a congressman in a letter which I received to-day—I am sorry to say that the literature which he has forwarded to me has not arrived :

> I have sent you a lot of literature on the subject of the free delivery of mails in our rural territory. You will no doubt find in this material a good bit of information. The plan has worked very well with us. I think it makes a good deal of expense, usually creating a deficit of from four to eight millions of dollars yearly. This year the appropriation will be between twenty-three and twenty-five millions of dollars. You see how enormously it has grown in extent and popularity. As a large majority of our people live in rural districts, you will appreciate how greatly interested the country has become.

Now, Mr. Speaker, taking the population of the United States at 72,000,000, with an average deficit of say $6,000,000 on the rural free delivery system, and taking the population of Canada at 6,000,000, the deficit here would amount to about $500,000 per annum.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. How does the hon. gentleman prove that ?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am merely proving it by the figures given in the United States.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. How does the hon. gentleman prove that the deficit would be in proportion to the population ?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If the hon. minister will investigate the subject, he will find that the rural free delivery system, instead of extending over the sparsely settled districts, is confined to districts having a certain population, and there is no reason why the expense should be proportionately greater in Canada than it is in the United States. The hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) stated this afternoon that five-sixths of the territory of the United States had already been covered by this system. If that statement is true, we can readily see that the system is not going to be such an extravagant thing for the people of the United States as the hon. minister would lead us to believe. The hon. minister spoke of the cross roads in this country not being settled. If he had investigated the system of the United States, he would have learned that the boxes are placed along the highway, and that the free delivery man is not compelled to go down the side roads unless he is paid extra by the people he is serving. The hon. Postmaster General said to-day that the appropriation in the United States was large. I can only say that that fact should prove to the hon. minister the popularity of the system. I am very glad indeed that the hon. minster referred to the $14,000,000 deficit, because I understand that that covers all the postal deficiencies of the United States. All that we are asking the hon. Postmaster General to do at the present time is to make a thorough investigation of this matter. Would it not be wise to spend a few thousand dollars in obtaining all the information that could be gathered on the subject in the United States, and giving it to this House and to the people of this country, so as to enable us to judge whether or not the system could be introduced into this country with profit to our people? The present government seems to be legislating and catering to a large extent to the cities, towns and corporations of our country, and sadly neglecting the rural districts. I wish I could impress upon them the necessity of looking after the interests of the farmers of this country. Millions of dollars are voted away in this House each year for the building of piers and improving harbours, a great deal of which we approve of, no doubt ; and $2,000,000 is to be spent in erecting a mint, for which no minister that I have heard has been able yet to give a reasonable excuse. Under these circumstances, would it be asking too much that a few thousand dollars should be spent each year in making a test of the rural free delivery system in our country? If you investigate

the country post offices, you will find that we have to-day a most impoverished system. The postmaster of the little country post office is paid $25 or $50 per annum for looking after the mails, and a small pittance is paid to the man who carries the mails to and fro. The rural districts are not treated fairly under our present postal system. The hon. Postmaster General stated to-day that this would be vicious legislation to force upon the people of this country. I want to tell the hon. minister that the day is not far distant when he will be forced to take up this matter and investigate it. The people of this country will demand that he make a thorough investigation of the rural free delivery systems in different countries.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I did not say it would be a vicious system to introduce into Canada. I did not use that term. I said it would be a mistake from the financial standpoint.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I must have misunderstood the hon. minister. I will retract the statement, but I understood him to make the statement that it would be a visious system of legislation to force on the people of this country.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Unwise.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not wish to take up more of the time of the House at present, but I would sincerely urge my hon. friend the Postmaster General to have this matter thoroughly investigated and submit a report to the House at an early date.

Mr. LENNOX. I wish to say a word or two in reply to the hon. the Postmaster General. I am sorry that having begun so well and kept on until dinner time in a fairly rapid strain, he declined afterwards to pursue what he evidently intended before we adjourned. The matter is one which, presented in the manner I saw fit to present it, in a non partisan manner, I thought might have been approached by the hon. gentleman in a somewhat different attitude from that which he saw fit to assume ; and I certainly expected that after I had called his attention to certain misstatements, accidental or otherwise, which he made a year ago, he would have been careful to give the House accurate information on all the questions he dealt with this evening. I regret that he has not done so, and that on the important questions of deficits he gave to the House an entirely misleading impression of the facts concerning the United States. The receipts and expenditures in the United States, have resulted in deficits almost invariably for a long series of years. Turning to volume 17 of the House documents of 1902, at pages 12 and 13, the hon. gentleman will find a confirmation of what I say. There we have a table giving the receipts and expenditures in the United States every tenth year from 1792, and I shall put this volume at the disposal of my hon. friend if he wishes to use it. But in order to be brief, I shall begin with the year 1860. I find that in the year 1860 the recipts in the United States were $8,518,067 and the expenditure $19,170,610, leaving a deficit of $10,652,543. Yet the hon. minister saw fit to tell the House that before they adopted the rural mail delivery system in the United States, they had no deficit.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I made no such statement.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman will find in 'Hansard' what he said.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I never made any such statement.

Mr. LENNOX. He began with a certain year—I forget what year it was—and said that in that year there was a deficit of $2,000,000 or thereabouts.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My hon. friend has not quite understood what I said. I said that for many years, speaking from memory, the deficits in the United States post office had been very considerable, but that of late years, prior to the adoption of the rural mail delivery, the annual deficit had been gradually becoming smaller, and I thought had fallen to $2,000,000 or $3,000,000. But I had the deficit for the decennial period ending December 1902. And for that year the deficit was $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 ; and at that time they had scarcely expended anything on rural delivery. But since four years, during which they had been making large expenditures on rural mail delivery, the deficit had increased from $2,000,000 to over $14,000,000.

Mr. LENNOX. That statement bears out the proposition I started to make. My hon. friend saw fit to attribute the deficits to the establishment of rural mail delivery, and referring to the year 1902 he said the deficit was between $2,000,000 and $3,000,000.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I gave the exact figures for 1902.

Mr. LENNOX. What is the fact ? The fact is that they began in 1860 with a deficit of more than 120 per cent on the revenues of the post office. Then in 1863, in the face of that condition of things, the United States government took upon themselves to pursue a policy of expansion. They established free deliveries in the cities, and the result has been that since then, taking the gross volume of business, the deficit, instead of showing an increased percentage, has been showing a decreasing percentage. At pages 12 and 13, I find this report :

> With the phenomenal growth of population and other favouring conditions, the mail matter poured into the post office has rapidly helped

to lessen the percentage of deficiencies. Despite largely increased expenditures, the revenues gradually approximated the expenditure after each added outlay has marked a new standard.

That is not exactly what my hon. friend intended.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is precisely what I said.

Mr. LENNOX. I shall read it again :

In spite of the largely increased expenditure the revenues gradually approximated the expenditures after each added outlay——

Including the large outlay for rural mail delivery.

——has marked a new standard.

In the year 1899, when the rural mail delivery was introduced, it marked a new standard, and after each one of these standards, the Postmaster General of the United States points out that the revenues have gradually approximated the expenditures.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No, the hon. gentleman misunderstands the report he is reading. He must read it again. In 1899—the year it speaks about—the vote was $150,000 for the succeeding year. They only had voted that year $50,000 in 1898 for rural mail delivery in the United States. What effect could that have on the revenue of the United States post office for 1899? It could not have had the effect of a dollar.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LENNOX. Hon. gentlemen are very prompt in saying 'hear, hear ;' but if those same hon. gentlemen would honestly endeavour to study these questions and do something for the constituencies they represent, instead of from time to time interrupting with their 'hear, hears,' when they know nothing about the question—if they will study the question and then get up and tell the House what they know about it, I should be happy to give way to them, and for the present it will not take them very long to tell what they know. I do not profess to know everything about this matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LENNOX. It is a matter a very few have studied minutely. I do not think that my hon. friend the Postmaster General has shown any very great knowledge of the subject because he was unable to answer even the few questions put him by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) this afternoon. Nor has he been very clear in his elucidations, and it will be quite in keeping for him to take the 'hear, hears' of his followers to heart and study the question. We are asking to have the report of this investigation, which he instituted a year or two ago, laid on the table, so that the country may know what it is, instead of his pigeonholing it and keeping it as a state secret and then proclaiming of his own mere motion what he shall or shall not do. As to the establishment of rural mail delivery I may say that in 1901 the first large expenditure was made, an expenditure of $1,750,000.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That was not in 1901 at all.

Mr. LENNOX. That was the appropriation.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It was not made in 1902.

Mr. LENNOX. The appropriation was made in 1901 of $1,750,000.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman spoke of the expenditure of $1,750,000 in 1901 ; I say that the expenditure in 1901 must have been limited to the appropriation for 1901 which was $540,000.

Mr. LENNOX. The expenditure in 1901 was probably $450,000, and it will probably be gratifying to the Postmaster General to know that out of that $450,000 they succeeded in establishing 1,356 rural routes, representing on the average 100 families each, so that when the Postmaster General talks of starting with an expenditure of $2,000,000 and increasing that to to $25,000,000 in a few years, he shows, what the hon. gentlemen opposite know, that the Postmaster General does not know what he is talking about.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman explain how it was that the expenditure has risen from the year 1900, when it was $450,000, to the year 1906, the coming year for which the appropriation is $26,000,000. How could he satisfy the country that we are not likely to press on at an equal speed in expenditure ? These figures indicate the use that the people of the United States make of the system ; are we not likely to be equally enterprising once we start it ?

Mr. LENNOX. Now the hon. gentleman is trying to draw one of those fish across the track. We are not dealing with that question at all. It would be quite competent for the Postmaster General to tell us what he would do in this matter, but I am not here to outline a policy for the Postmaster General. I tell him that they have been extending their rural postal service at the rate of 700 routes a month, and that they have been answering the demands of the people in the interests of the people as they believe very rapidly, and beginning with a modest appropriation they have got up to $26,000,000 and they have still a very small percentage of expenditure for the rural service as compared with the city service.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. This whole $26,000,000 is for the rural service, not for the city service. Does the hon. gentleman

think that Canada can afford to spend $26,000,000 for rural delivery ?

Mr. LENNOX. No one in his senses would talk of an expenditure like that for rural delivery in Canada. We are spending only $4,500,000 for the whole postal service of Canada, and does any sane man—and I hope the hon. minister wants to assume that role—think of talking of an expenditure of $25,000,000 for a population of 5,000,000 people ? They are spending $26,000,000 not only in carrying on the rural mail delivery system in the United States, but in perfecting the system and establishing 10,000 new routes every year. They established 10,000 new routes last year and more than that are contemplated this year. In a few years, I think within a year or two if I understand the report aright, they expect to have a complete net work of free delivery routes over the whole territory of the United States, so far as necessary, upon the basis which they have adopted of establishing a route only where about 100 families can be embraced in a route of 25 miles or so.

This report goes on :

Despite largely increased expenditures, the revenues gradually approximated the expenses after each added outlay has marked a new standard.

In 1872 the receipts of the Post Office Department were in round numbers $22,000,000, against an expenditure of $26,500,000, a deficiency of $4,500,000, or 20·45 per cent of the revenue. In 1882 the receipts were $42,000,000, against an expenditure of $41,000,000, showing a surplus of $1,000,000. In 1892 the receipts had increased to $71,000,000, against an expenditure of $77,000,000, leaving a deficiency of $6,000,000, or 8·45 per cent of the revenue. In 1902 the receipts were about $122,000,000, with an expenditure of nearly $125,000,000, reducing the deficiency to about $3,000,000, or 2·46 per cent of the revenue.

I have read this for the purpose of showing that, while the Postmaster General singled out a certain year to show the existence of deficits in the United States service, as a matter of fact deficits have marked the whole history of the business of the United States Post Office Department since 1822 with the exception of one single year, 1882, when there was a surplus of $1,000,000. It will be noticed that although the deficits are increasing the percentage of deficits is decreasing. In other words by a wise policy the Postmaster General of the United States is extending the service as public demands require it, and although there is nominally a larger deficit there is actually a less deficit upon the total business of the country. The Postmaster General of the United States continues:

Deficits in the postal service are not to be viewed with apprehension. It is the policy, whenever the postal receipts exceed or come near the expenditures, to extend postal facilities and cheapen the cost of the service to the public. The receipts in 1882 indicated such a healthy condtion of the postal revenues and expenditures as to induce Congress to distribute the benefits of the surplus among the people in the reduction of letter postage from three cents per half ounce to two cents per ounce.

I thought the 2 cent rate was a discovery on our part of the continent, but it seems that they had discovered it first.

Inasmuch as the revenue received from first-class matter at the old rate of three cents per half ounce was about $16,000,000, the reduction of postage to those writing letters was in the neighbourhood of $5,000,000.

Under the seemingly double handicap of reduced rates and increased weights, the Post Office Department was compelled to face a newly created deficiency, which in 1885 was about $7,500,000.

The Postmaster General of Canada must have known these facts. The point to which I wish to call his attention is that when he was dealing with this matter and showing that by reason of their adoption of rural mail delivery they have plunged themselves into a large deficit, it would have been fair, it would have been honest of him, to have said that they previously had large deficits, far in excess, in some years, of what they had since the establishment of rural mail delivery. In 1892 it was $6,000,000, and from that year until 1897 the deficiency grew to about $11,000,000. So we find that the deficits that have arisen have not been caused by the rural mail delivery. The Postmaster shows the very contrary, he shows that increased receipts have resulted from the fact of the establishment of rural mail delivery. He says :

During all this time the beneficent grant of cheaper postage not only aided business, but promoted the exchange of personal communications. It helped the farmers to secure the free distribution of literature from State agricultural stations, which Congress authorized in 1887.

Now what is the argument to be deduced from the figures furnished by the United States ? The Postmaster General asks, Are we prepared to plunge ourselves into an expenditure of $25,000,000 ? Why Sir, the hon. gentleman shows that he has given very little consideration to the subject. In the United States, 13,000,000 of people are being served on an expenditure of about $12,000,000. The total expenditure of the United States in 1893-4, in connection with the post office was $152,000,000. Thirteen million are one-sixth of the population of the United States, and one-sixth of the total expenditure for the post office is $25,000,000. In other words, whilst they have expended upon rural mail delivery a matter of $12,000,000 or $13,000,000, a fair proportion of the total expenditure for the rural population for 13,000,000 people, would have been double that amount. Therefore I do not know that I could deduce any more conclusive argument to show, if not that this system should be adopted, at all events that it

should be seriously considered. That granted their expenditure of $12,000,000 or $14,000,000, or even $20,0000,000 or $26,000,000 in the United States on rural mail delivery, they are not expending one dollar more in proportion to the total expenditure in the Post Office Department for rural mail delivery, with vast benefit to the people of the United States, than they are for the service and the convenience of the rest of the population. Then take the receipts. The postal receipts in the United States last year were $143,000,000, one-sixth of that would be $24,000,000. They have expended in the United States a matter of $12,000,000 on the rural service being one-half the rate of expenditure elsewhere pointed out by the Postmaster General—and I hope our Postmaster General has read it carefully—they have vastly increased receipts from almost every source by reason of rural mail delivery. The mails are carried to every man's gate notwithstanding the idea of cross roads which the hon. gentleman put forward. Wherever a route is established the service is carried, and the necessity of each man going to a rural post office is dispensed with. The letters are deposited there for him and he deposits the letters that he wants to have mailed, not only to the country generally, but even to his neighbour. The man registers a letter with the carrier, he can get a registered letter from the carrier, the carrier will take a letter to any person within a mile of the route on the payment of an additional postage, or a money order, or a money parcel, for a postage of eight cents. The whole service has been estimated as costing an average of eight cents a mile, and the proportionate revenue from these 13,000,000 people is not less than $24,000,000. So if you take the total expenditure which is contemplated in the current fiscal year in the United States, you will find that the system will be self sustaining. There were several other minor matters that the Postmaster General referred to, but I will not take time to reply to them. He talks of a protest, and makes insinuations against the honesty and integrity of the Congress of the United States. Why would not the members of Congress of the United States, as members of parliament here, be heard in protest if there is anything that is wrong, just as we voice our protest against this government when it does wrong? It may be, as the Postmaster General says, that they were silenced; but for my part I believe there is as much honesty and integrity among the people of the United States, man for man, as there is in other countries; and if there were in the United States this giant wrong, this hydro-headed monster which the minister spoke of, we would hear a protest raised against it by the public men and people of the United States.

Mr. LENNOX.

Mr. FOSTER. I had not the pleasure of being in the House when the Postmaster General finished his remarks. I had hoped that the Postmaster General would have given us a concise statement of what the results have been in the United States, not only in extension of the delivery and of the routes, and the increased cost of that extension, but also, if the Postmaster General's reports in the United States give the data for it, and I imagine they do, to find out what had resulted from this movement, so that we could have had both sides of the account so far as it could be given, and know how it stood financially, as to whether with the large extension and large increase in the expenses for these routes as extended, there was also a corresponding increase, in revenue and what the total amount collected out of this rural delivery route amounted to, so that we could trace a comparison between the expenditures and receipts. Now I think, though I am not expressing any opinion on the advisability of introducing rural delivery into Canada, still this much is true: The people of the United States who live alongside of us are making very extensive, and I will admit, some very expensive experiments in rural delivery. They have gone from 1897 to 1905 and 1906 and have increased the expenditures very largely, showing that they are not playing with the matter, the indications going to prove that they are going to make still larger operations, and it looks as if they intended to make it permanent in the United States. Now it is impossible for us in Canada living alongside of the United States and finding the farmers and the people living on the other side of the line having all these advantages of rural delivery and free delivery—I say it is impossible for our people here to be content unless there is some earnest attempt made to collate the facts, and if it does not involve too great an expenditure, to give to the farmers and dwellers in rural sections of Canada the same advantages that the rural populations have in the United States of America. The hon. Postmaster General will see what I mean; that an experiment of that kind cannot be carried on for a series of years and which is at present going on as if they intended to make it a permanent advantage and privilege to the people of the United States without the people in Canada demanding the very same thing. We will find that we will have to give this to the people of Canada provided it can be done without too great an expense in proportion to the added revenue which will come from the extension. However, I had hoped that the hon. Postmaster General would have been able to give us a concise and comprehensive statement as to both sides of the question, as to what the added revenues were as cor-

responding with the added expenditures. The hon. Postmaster General, I have no doubt, has been looking carefully into this question. Has he any idea as to that part of the matter?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes; in a general way. When they established a rural mail delivery the expenditure was approaching the revenue. In the early years of the history of the United States post office there were large deficits.

Mr. FOSTER. That was for the whole system?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Without rural delivery. They were getting into a very satisfactory state, and they looked forward to the time when they hoped to have been able to have a self-sustaining department. The figures of the deficits will show that. But from the moment they inaugurated rural mail delivery deficits have increased, and in four years the expenditure on rural mail delivery has increased by probably $18,000,000, and the deficits in that time have increased from $2,900,000 to $14,000,000. While without rural delivery they were approaching a self-sustaining basis, since they have established rural delivery, each year, as they increased the expenditure on rural delivery, the deficit increased, and, whilst it is not conclusive, the presumption must be that the increased deficit has been occasioned by the increased rural delivery. Moreover, having looked over some of the reports of the Postmaster General of the United States, I think I can correctly say that they assign their increasing deficits to rural delivery.

Mr. LENNOX. No; you cannot find that in any of the last four reports.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Well, I will give a little experience from my own observation now. I was going through a city in the United States last December. I called upon the postmaster in that city, and I asked him if he would mind giving me a tabulated statement showing the revenue collected on the routes of his city for the month of January each year since the establishment of his system. He got a few of them up for me—three or four—and I found that the establishment of these routes had not led to any increase in the volume of business, and comparing them with the three or four years, I was surprised to find that for the last year the number of letters and the quantity of mail matter carried by the courier on some routes were even less than for the corresponding month of earlier times. It did not, in that case, have the effect of keeping up the volume of business done. If the United States Post Office Department in their reports had separated the sources of revenue we could get that information, but they have not done that. They have combined the collections from cities where they have a letter-carrier system with the collections and revenues from rural routes. There is a vast difference. It may be very wise and most necessary to have a letter-carrier delivery in large cities, but it is a different matter in sparsely settled districts. I would rejoice if it were possible, because I think nobody can accuse me of not desiring to develop the post office if I could feel safe or justified in inaugurating this system, but I feel satisfied that once the system was started, even in an experimental stage or on fixed lines, no government would be strong enough to resist the pressure for an extension of that system to all parts of the country. I believe that every member of Congress goes to Congress pledged to establish the same system in his district that is prevailing in other parts of the union. In this country we would labour under a great disadvantage, because our population is much more sparse than that of the United States. There are places where the country may be considered populous, but these are the exception. Then we would have to look into the question of the relative expense. The figures, as given by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), showing what he estimated to be the cost of the service, would hardly be a safe guide. It would be more expensive and more difficult in our northern latitude than throughout the United States. Whilst part of their country is in a northern latitude, taking it as a whole, they will not have such a widespread area covered by snow, or as difficult a country, by reason of the inclement weather, in which to carry on this service as we have in Canada. If I can get the United States government to give me a tabulated statement, I will endeavour to do so. I will send an officer to see if they will give it, or to see if I can get a statement which will give us some fair data to go upon. I have information that is of a semi-confidential nature. I had several officers accompany these couriers as far west almost as Chicago. They got information which was confidential. I rely upon the information they gave me upon this occasion, and I would say that some of the reports made, I think, to the Washington authorities as to the supposed volume of revenue were somewhat exaggerated, to put it very mildly. I recall one instance on one route where the carrier was reporting some 500 pieces of mail matter when my officer counted the number of pieces of mail matter he carried, and it was many-fold less than that put in the return.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). The statement made by the hon. Postmaster General in one respect is certainly satisfactory, and is all that I was pressing for. I do not understand that my hon. friends who have been discussing this matter this afternoon wish to involve Canada in a tremendous expense unless it is justified. It is just as I say, that if on a large scale

rural free delivery is given in the United States there will come a demand for it in this country, and the department particularly ought to be furnished with information so as to give a sufficient answer, if there is a sufficient answer, and if there is not a sufficient answer, why, to give the service, because one or the other will have to be given. I cannot think but what the United States officers, who are, I imagine, very competent officers, are not keeping pretty close tally on that, and that if there were some method of finding out about what revenue is being brought in from the extension of the free delivery system, and if the hon. Postmaster General can get hold of something satisfactory or trustworthy in that respect, so as to get at the basis of revenue to be hoped for from a free delivery system, we will have some ground upon which to go in our discussion of the subject. I will be very glad if the hon. Postmaster General can get that information for us.

Mr. H. S. CLEMENTS (West Kent). If the hon. Postmaster General decides to try the experiment at some future time, I want to remark that West Kent is a good place to begin with.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I suppose every riding in the Dominion would put in a plea.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) that the farmers of Canada are now clamouring for a rural mail delivery, and I would point out to the Postmaster General that we have a number of districts in the province of Ontario in which that mail service could well be established. The farmers are our heaviest tax payers, and it is high time that something should be done to bring to their doors the conveniences of civilization. I trust the Postmaster General will take the matter into his serious consideration and that he will consider the advantages of West Kent when he is about to establish a rural mail delivery.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE (South Essex). I am very much pleased to find that the Postmaster General is about to collect the information necessary to enable us to ascertain whether or not Canada can afford a rural delivery system. The hon. member for West Kent has spoken of his constituency as an excellent place in which to make the experiment, but I assure the House that I can offer an even more suitable territory, a territory nearer the border still, in the riding of South Essex. Before the opening of this session, a very compact township in that riding was so desirous of having a rural mail delivery, that the township suggested that it would be willing to pay half the cost if the government would undertake to pay the other half. I commend the enterprise of this township to the attention of the Postmaster General. The people of Essex have seen the system work satisfactorily in the state of Michigan, and they have a feeling that what is good for the United States is certainly not too good for Canada. If the expense is not excessive, it will afford great satisfaction to the farmers of our country should the Postmaster General be able to establish the system, because now a days the farmer takes his daily paper and he wants conveniences similar to those which may be obtained in the cities. I thought in the earlier part of the session that the matter was at an end when it was stated that the expense was too great for this country to bear, and that they were getting tired of it in the United States, but I am glad the Postmaster General has offered to procure the information necessary to enable the House to form a satisfactory opinion, as to whether or not it would be wise to adopt the system in Canada.

Mr. D. DERBYSHIRE (Brockville). I trust that when the Postmaster General is looking for a district in which to establish a rural mail delivery he will not forget the metropolitan district of Brockville. In no constituency in this grand Dominion can there be afforded such a splendid opportunity to demonstrate the successful working of this scheme as in the riding of Brockville. If it is possible to establish the system in any constituency in this Dominion I trust the Postmaster General will see his way clear to commence with Brockville.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I). I want to put in just a word for Prince Edward Island. Ours is the most thickly populated province in this Dominion; its inhabitants are almost altogether farmers, and since the object of a rural mail delivery is to benefit the farmers, the Postmaster General can find no better place that Prince Edward Island in which to begin.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (Prince, P.E.I.). I endorse the sentiments of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Hughes), but in the meantime I would ask that the Postmaster General should perfect the present system of mail delivery in Prince Edward Island. A few days ago a provincial by-election was being held in the province and as the constituency bordered on the port of departure for the boats crossing the straits, the boats and the mails were actually delayed in crossing in order to give employees an opportunity to vote for the Liberal candidate. It is a very poor postal system indeed which permits of delays to the mails for such a cause. Last year I made an appeal for a letter carrier service in the important city of Charlottetown, and to-day I repeat that request. However, if the Postmaster General is to experiment with a rural mail service he can commence in no better place than Prince Edward Island.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Are these all the ridings that want it ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Next.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I mentioned about some of this information being confidential, and subject to that I have no objection to the order.

Motion (Mr. Lennox) agreed to.

WELLAND CANAL—WATER-POWER LEASES.

Mr. WM. GERMAN (Welland) moved for :

A return showing all leases of water-power granted on the Welland canal, not included in the return made to an order of the House dated 3rd April, 1901 ; the names of the lessees ; the quantity of power granted in each lease ; the consideration named in each lease, together with the length of the term granted, and the amount of rental reserved in such leases unpaid, if any.

He said : I desire to bring a few matters to the attention of the government in connection with the water-power on the Welland canal, and to make a few suggestions thereon, which, if acted upon by the government, will result in great benefit to the operation of the Welland canal and advantage to the people of the country generally. In 1901 I obtained an order of the House for a return of all leases granted up to that time for surplus water on the Welland canal, the amount of rentals unpaid, the term of the leases, and the amount of rental reserved in each lease. I find in that return that water-power leases have been in existence for many years and that in some cases for a period of 15 years the rentals had not been paid. Since that time other leases have been granted. The old leases were granted on various runs of stone. The old mills then in existence ground by stones and each run of stone was supposed to use 10 horse-power, the rental being $6 a horse-power or $60 for one run of stone and $120 for two run of stone.

These leases are still in existence, many of them without having been cancelled ; lessees of water-power in later years have been obliged to pay a higher rental than was paid formerly ; and the whole matter in regard to leases of water-power on the Welland canal is in such a confused condition that it is working absolute injustice to the users of water. We find by the returns that people are using surplus water on what is called three levels, and the hydraulic engineers of the Department of Railways and Canals say that each of the levels above the locks will develop 450 horse-power; so that the people who are using the water of three levels have 1,350 horse-power, for which they are paying from $150 to $200 a year. We find that the late government, just before it went out of power, granted leases of large blocks of water-power at the rate of 25 cents per horse-power. Neither party can blame the other in respect to the management of the water-power leases on the Welland canal. I mentioned this matter to the late Minister of Railways and Canals, (the Hon. Mr. Blair) and desired him to put the whole matter in a position that would be fair to the consumers of the water, but for some reason or other he was unable to do it. I mentioned the matter to the present Minister of Railways and Canals, and I am free to admit that he has promised to remedy the present condition of affairs. I only trust that he will do it, and I am bringing this matter now to the attention of parliament in order to emphasize what I said to him, and with a desire to induce him to bring about a condition of affairs in regard to the rental of water-powers on the Welland canal that will result in even-handed justice being dealt out to all. I suggested to the minister that $1 per horse-power for undeveloped water-power was a sufficient charge. If that rate were charged for the few leases in and adjoining the town of Thorold, and the rental were collected, it would yield over $11,000 a year to the government more than it is getting now. At present we find that the Wilson Carbide Works are using over 1,300 horse-power for which they are paying less than 10 cents per horse-power, if we are to be guided by the Auditor General's Report as to the amount of money received last year. The Riordan Paper Mills pay about the same amount. Then we have McClary & McLean. These are old leases.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. When were these leases made ?

Mr. GERMAN. The Riordan Paper Mills pay $240 a year, and they are in arrears $120 ; and they have surplus power on at least three levels that would make over 700 horse-power. That was one of the leases made just before the late government went out of power. The John Riordan lease is another of the old leases. It is for the surplus water on Lock 17, for which $200 a year is paid. The return does not give the date of the execution of the lease. The difficulty is that many of these leases have changed hands and are not now in the hands of the persons to whom they were originally granted. Messrs. McClary & McLean use 450 horse-power for which they pay $216 a year. The Wilson Carbide Works have an assignment of an old lease. When it was issued does not appear in the return, but it was fully fifty years ago. What I contend is that these old leases should all be cancelled and new leases issued at a rental which would be fair to all. If that were done, the government would receive a rental from the power on the Welland canal which would go far to defray the expenses of the canal ; and this is a matter worthy of con-

sideration, because the Welland canal and the other canals on the St. Lawrence route are now free. Many enterprises would be established if the water-power could be got at a reasonable rate. Some parties are paying $4 per horse-power. It may be said that they were foolish to accept a lease with that rental reserved. They did it because they thought they could not get power at a less rental. When we see people using water-power for twelve or fifteen years without paying anything, and some using large quantities and paying only 10 or 15 cents per horse-power, it is unfair that others should be asked to pay $4 per horse-power. If all these old leases which expired years ago were cancelled, new leases issued, and all users required to pay the same rental, the Department of Railways and Canals would receive a considerable revenue, and even-handed justice would be meted out to all parties.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). There is no objection to this motion, but I wish to say a few words in connection with it. My attention was called to the condition of the leases on the Welland canal shortly after I became head of the department, and I am free to state that there has been no question in connection with the canals which has been more perplexing than this one. I have given it a good deal of study, and even now the department is taking very active steps with the view of applying some remedy. It is all very well to say that a great many of these leases should be cancelled, but in many of them it is a very serious question whether we have the legal power to cancel them. There is for instance an old lease which was entered into a good many years ago, and the question has arisen as to whether that lease was in perpetuity or for a period of forty-two years. That matter has been the subject of litigation. I have found also that many of these old leases bear a rental absurdly low. Perhaps at the time they were entered into, the conditions warranted such a low rental, but under present conditions such rentals would be considered exceedingly low indeed. I find also that many rentals are in arrears and have been put in the hands of the Department of Justice for collection; and during the fiscal year we have succeeded in collecting a good many of these arrears, and I hope will be in the position to have them all wiped out in the near future. In any event, the leases in which the arrears are not paid, will certainly be cancelled if we have the right to cancel them. The whole question is not only receiving the attention of the department, but my own personal attention. I have already had placed before me a statement of all the leases—their conditions, their rentals and their duration. Indeed many of the lessees or the assignees of the original lessee have approached the department with the view of securing further power and cancelling their old leases and have expressed their willingness to give high rentals. The department has been endeavouring to increase the rentals. As my hon. friend has stated there is one lease, with which he is thoroughly familiar, which was made at the rate of $4 per year. In some instances the rental is as low, I think as 30 cents per horse-power, which is entirely too low. Also many discrepancies appear. Apparently there are descriminations but in many instances these discriminations cannot be removed by the department on account of the terms of the original leases. From the standpoint of the department, a general increase is necessary. My hon. friend has certainly presented a strong case from the point of view of the rentals not collected, and no doubt his contention cannot be gainsaid, that we would have a greater revenue from low rentals, if we would collect them, than from higher rentals which are not collected. But judging from the excuses made, even had the rentals been higher, that would have made no difference as regards the collecting. I think that when the return is brought down, it will be quite apparent that the steps now being taken by the department and the inquiry I am personally instituting to obtain full information will be in the interest not only of the management of the canals but also of the lessees. On each of the canals we are making an effort to increase the rate per horse-power. That effort was made in connection with the Welland canal by my predecessor; and certainly after I have been able to study the matter a little more closely, I shall be in a position to advise my colleagues, and I trust that the conclusion reached will be such as to meet the approval of the House and the country.

Motion agreed to.

PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.) moved :

For copies of all memoranda, papers or documents submitted to the government of Canada on behalf of the several provinces of Canada, urging a readjustment of the provincial subsidies ; together with any replies thereto ; and all correspondence between the government of Canada, or any member thereof, and the governments of the several provinces, or any members thereof, relating to such readjustment.

He said : In moving this motion, I presume that I am drawing the attention of the House to a subject which is not new either to it or the country. But it is one which is of great importance to the great body of the electors, especially from a provincial standpoint. It is a matter of common knowledge that when confederation was consummated in 1867, the revenues which the provinces derived from customs

and excise were handed over to the Dominion authorities; and to compensate the provinces for the loss of these revenues, it was agreed that a certain amount of money would be paid them. It is unnecesary in this discussion that I should attempt to state in detail the principles on which these amounts were based. At that time no doubt the fathers of confederation had the idea that the amount set aside for the provinces would be sufficient to meet the ordinary expenses of local government, taking into consideration the revenues which they could raise within their own borders. I think it is also fair to assume that the framers of confederation had no conception that Canada would make such strides in advance as it has within the last thirty-seven years. No one could have conceived then that the revenues from these different sources in thirty-seven years would have amounted to the magnificent sum they have now reached. But while the revenues have increased from a Dominion standpoint, they have not increased as regards the provinces. On the other hand while the provincial revenues have not increased, unfortunately their expenditures have increased to an extent not then anticipated. That increase has become absolutely necessary. It will be admitted that it is impossible to carry on any business to-day as cheaply as it could have been managed some thirty-seven years ago. Nor can any one live as cheaply to-day. The country to-day could not be governed as cheaply as it was when confederation was formed ; and in addition, as regards the provinces, there are many matters for which the local governments have to provide that they were not then compelled to provide for. But outside of all that, the many necessary expenditures which have to be met by the local administrations have increased to such an extent that the amount at their disposal to-day is entirely inadequate. Take the question of schools, I shall not weary the House with a great array of figures, but take the figures in connection with this matter in the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. In New Brunswick alone in 1868 we expended the sum of $93,833 for schools whereas in 1904 that sum had increased to $192,735, and that does not include the expenditures or grants to colleges, technical schools and other institutions of learning but simply those to the ordinary common schools, high schools and grammar schools.

In Nova Scotia in 1868 the amount paid to schools was $145,280 and in 1904 that item had increased to the magnificent sum of $263,092. This also does not include the expenditure or grants made to colleges or technical schools.

What is true of the schools of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, I have no doubt will be true of the schools of the other provinces of Canada and what is true of the schools is very much more true of many of the other subjects which have to be managed and looked after by the provincial legislatures. We all know that the administration of justice is more expensive to-day than it was 37 years ago. We know that it costs more for legislation, that it costs more for the maintenance of prisons and asylums. In New Brunswick alone, after giving credit for all the income which we receive from the patients, we are spending to-day $50,000 in the management of the provincial asylums. Last year this was about one-eighth of the total grant we received from the Dominion government and what is true of New Brunswick must also be true to a great extent of the other provinces as well. Then too, in later years we have been compelled to make large grants to agriculture and I think that no person in this House or in the country can contend that the grants made to agriculture in any province are improperly made. But, Sir, perhaps the item which has caused the greatest amount of financial difficulty to different provinces and that which most reduced the amount of available money for expenditures for ordinary affairs, is the expenditure for the construction of bridges and the maintenance of roads which every person must consider to be necessary and above and beyond all that would be the amount of money expended in railway subsidies. It may be said, it has been said in the past, and I presume it will be in the future that many of the provinical governments have been improvident in their expenditures for railway subsidies, and I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that the same electors who elect representatives to this House elect the representatives in the local House and through these local members they demand these different expenditures. The very electors and the very people who contribute to the revenue of Canada are the people who demand the expenditures from the local legislature, and I say that in all justice these demands have to be met. It is a question for careful consideration how they are to be met.

In 1868 the total revenue of the Dominion from customs and excise duties together amounted to $11,580,968 and the total payment to the provinces amounted to $2,753,906 or 24 per cent of the total revenue of the Dominion from these two sources. In 1904 the Dominion received from these two sources of revenue the sum of $53,379,583 and they paid to the provinces altogether, exclusive of what it may have cost to maintain the government of the Northwest Territories which I did not take into consideration, the sum of $4,402,291 or a total of only 8 per cent of the revenue from these two sources. If you will add to that the proposed amount to be paid to

the new provinces by the Bill now under discussion, we will then be paying less than 12 per cent of the total revenue from these two sources or, in other words, we will next year be paying less than one half the percentage of the money which we receive now, as compared with the money which we received in 1867 at the time of confederation. Now, Sir, this gives rise to many questions, and it has given rise to discussion particularly by the members of the local government. Various means have been taken in order to remedy this difficulty and it is not necessary for me to go into details. I shall only call attention to the fact that in 1887 the assembled wisdom of five of the provinces gathered at Quebec and there made certain suggestions that I am sorry to say were not carried out. They did not meet with the approbation of the government of the Dominion of that day, and the difficulty, instead of decreasing, is increasing, the different provincial governments have found themselves face to face with greater problems every year until in 1902 the wisdom of the different provinces again met in Quebec and again passed a series of resolutions, and it seems to me that the time has arrived when something ought to be done, when I believe something will be done in order to meet the requirements of the different provinces, because I contend that a certain amount of the money should be expended by the provincial governments. They can get nearer the homes of the people, can better judge their requirements and can do more good by the expenditure than can this House, and therefore I think that we may well consider whether or not a revision of these subsidies should not take place by which a larger amount will be placed to the credit of the different provinces so that they would be in a position to better meet the requirements of the people than they are at the present time. Holding these views I felt it to be my duty to present them to the House in as brief a manner as I could, and I trust that this discussion may be the means of bringing about some arrangement between the federal government and the governments of the provinces, or rather of some arrangement being made by this parliament by which these subsidies will be re-arranged, so that the different provinces will receive a greater amount than they have received in the past.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). There is no objection whatever to bringing down the correspondence which is sought by my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell); on the contrary I think a good purpose may be served if the memory of the country is refreshed as to what has taken place upon this subject for the last 15 years or so. The correspondence upon this subject is now pretty voluminous. It commenced, if I remember rightly, in the year 1887 when there was a conference in Quebec between the representatives of the different provincial governments at which the subject of subsidies paid by the Dominion to the provinces was fully discussed. The tenor of this correspondence was that the principle adopted at confederation for the payment of subsidies out of the federal terasury was not entirely satisfactory, and that some other principle ought to be adopted. My recollection is that it was not so much an increase in subsidy that was desired as some principle of paying the subsidy to be given to the provinces, and if I remember rightly, the proposition was that this proportion of payment should move with the population as established in the decennial census. Although these resolutions were adopted in very solemn form at the time, no action was taken upon them by the Dominion government and for some years it was not pressed on the attention of the Dominion government by the provincial governments. At a subsequent date I think the federal government has received from all the provincial governments, either collectively or individually, a similar request pressing for a re-adjustment of the subsidies.

Two years ago another conference of the premiers of all the provinces met in the city of Ottawa. New resolutions were passed, much upon the same basis as those which had been adopted at the Quebec conference in 1887. Apart from these, the province of British Columbia, though it joined with the other provinces in a demand for a re-adjustment of the subsidies, put in a separate demand of its own, claiming that it was entitled to special treatment on account of special circumstances affecting that province and not the others. The matter has rested there, and it is not free from difficulties. I have had occasion more than once to express the view that I thought the principle adopted at the time of confederation of giving subsidies to the provinces, was not as wise as it might have been. But at all events, we find this principle in the Confederation Act to-day, and even if we do not agree with it, we must accept it and abide by it. I think if it were to be found that the principle adopted in 1867 is too drastic, that it should be more elastic than it is, perhaps the people at large would not be averse to taking the matter into renewed consideration.

But there are other matters besides the subsidies as to which the relations between the Dominion and the provinces are not as satisfactory as I think they ought to be. The question of the fisheries which, up to 1889 or thereabouts, was in rather a satisfactory condition, has been much disturbed by a judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and it is now difficult to know where the jurisdiction of the provinces commences and where the jurisdiction of the Dominion ends in fishery matters.

Up to 1889 it was generally expected that the Dominion had about complete jurisdiction over all questions affecting the fisheries, but since that judgment it has been found that there is a division of jurisdiction between the Dominion and the provinces as to certain fisheries. The question is not one, as I have said, which is free from difficulty. It has given rise to very complicated questions between the Dominion and the provinces, and I have thought for my part that it would be advisable to take some method of securing an adjustment of that question. I would be disposed—but in saying this I speak only my own mind, without having consulted my colleagues—I think the public interest would be served if the fisheries were vested altogether in one body or the other, but there should be no divided authority; and I believe that the fisheries had better be vested in the Dominion than in the provinces. It may be that is a question also as to which we might very well consult the provinces in connection with the subsidies. How to deal with these difficulties is a matter that has not yet engaged the attention of the government. We have other matters pressing upon us, and which have been brought to our attention more than once, but I conceive that some time or other this matter also will have to be taken into serious consideration. I may say—and again speaking my personal feelings, not having the authority of my colleagues—that I believe it would be advisable at no distant day to have a conference between the Dominion and the provinces to discuss these very questions. I am not prepared to subscribe to everything that is said in the resolutions that have been adopted from time to time by the provinces in asking for a readjustment of the subsidies. While I agree mostly with the views expressed in all the provinces that the present system is too drastic, that it should be given more elasticity, still at the present moment I would not commit myself beyond saying that I view the matter with a considerable degree of interest. If it is to be approached and dealt with at all, I see no other method than to have the question discussed fully between representatives of the Dominion and the various provinces in a conference to be called for that purpose. Again I express only my own views, but at the same time I would be prepared to put them before my colleagues. I shall make diligence to have the whole correspondence brought down at the earliest possible day.

Motion agreed to.

EXCHEQUER COURT—RAILWAY DEBTS.

House in committee on Bill (No. 59) to amend the Act respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to railway debts.—Mr. Geoffrion.

On section 1,—effect of sale in province of Quebec.

Mr. GEOFFRION. I explained the purposes of the Bill when I introduced it. When it was in committee before, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) raised some difficulty about it, and wanted time to examine it to see if he could not overcome that difficulty. I have had an interview with the minister and the deputy minister, and we have come to the conclusion that this Bill should be amended so as to read as follows:

Any sale ordered by the Exchequer Court or a judge thereof under this Act shall, as respects railways wholly situated in the province of Quebec, have the same effect for all purposes as a sale by a sheriff has according to the laws of the province.

The difficulty found by the Minister of Justice in the Bill as drafted before, was that the sale of a railway situated in two provinces could not come under this law, so I have made an amendment that it shall apply only to a railway under federal control wholly situated in the province of Quebec, because this parliament has control of federal railways as it has control of insolvency laws. This Bill is really an Insolvency Act.

Mr. BARKER. I was present when this Bill was discussed on a previous occasion, and I think it was left over for the consideration of the Minister of Justice. The words suggested seem on the face of them to cover the objections then raised. I suppose the minister has considered whether a sale within the province of Quebec by a sheriff under the law of Quebec might affect any question arising where a railway wholly within Quebec is yet for any purpose connected or affiliated with, or leased to, a company within another province. I am not sure whether that will affect the question. I only suggest that to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. When this Bill was introduced it seemed to me that it was objectionable from the standpoint that it was applicable to a railway that would communicate between two provinces and that, therefore, the law which might be applicable to one section of the railway would not be applicable to the other. I suggested the difficulty at the time and the result was that my hon. friend came down to the Department of Justice and we considered the Bill together. I asked him to confer with the deputy minister, in whom, I need not say, I have the most absolute confidence, and I pointed out to my hon. friend the difficulty that occurred. The result was that this amendment was changed, but I must now in all frankness and sincerity admit that I did not consider the aspect of the question which is now put by my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker). While I think the Bill in its present form might go through,

I would not like it to be finally disposed of by the House until I had had an opportunity of considering the matter further.

Mr. BARKER. I quite admit the hon. Minister of Justice has met every question that was raised on a previous occasion.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think we had better report the Bill and allow it to stand for the third reading.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers) makes a suggestion which is a valuable one on the same lines. He points out to me that the Bill does not provide for those safeguards to the general public which were provided in the Insolvency Act and which are contained in the Winding Up Act. We should make provision that the sheriff's sale is to have in respect to the railway the same effect as the sale of ordinary property, and we should make the same requirements in respect to the giving of notice. Under our system it is necessary to give one month's notice of a sheriff's sale and it is to be published in such a way that everybody interested shall have ample notice and ample opportunity to come forward and bid. Therefore, I think that the suggestion ought to be considered and I would ask that the committee rise for the purpose of making provision for the giving of notice of sale. Then we can consider the objection of my hon. friend from Hamilton at the same time.

Progress reported.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BARKER. What business will we take up to-morrow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think we will take up Bills to-morrow, first the Bill to amend the Seamen's Act and some other matters and after that we will take up supply, going on with the railway estimates.

Mr. BARKER. Which Bill will be taken up first?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The first Bill, perhaps, will be the Bill to amend the Seamen's Act, then the Bill to amend the Franchise Act and then Supply.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) should be present in connection with the Bill to amend the Franchise Act because practically it is to give effect to a suggestion of his.

Mr. BARKER. He will certainly be here to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 9.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 7, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 99) to incorporate the Title Guarantee and Trust Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 100) respecting the Guelph and Georgian Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 101) to incorporate the Winding Ledges Power and Boom Company.—Mr. Costigan.

THE LATE MR. E. F. CLARKE, M.P.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The attendance of the House yesterday, Mr. Speaker, was so small that after conference with my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, we both agreed that the moment then would not be opportune to call the attention of the House to the great loss we have sustained in the death of one of the most prominent members of this House, the late Mr. E. F. Clarke, member for Toronto Centre. We had been aware for some weeks past that Mr. Clarke had been suffering from an illness which his friends and admirers knew to be severe but hoped would not be fatal. We all cherished the belief that his strong constitution would be stronger than the disease which was attacking him, but by a strange fatality, it so happened that his death occurred on the evening of the very day when the press bulletins informed us he was out of danger and when it was hoped and believed that within a very short time he would again occupy the seat in this House which he held so long and well, but which is to be his no more. Such is the uncertainty of our lives. I am sure that when we parted last session, no one would have believed that our late colleague, then so strong and hearty, then in the full flush of health and activity, would have been the first victim in this parliament of death's relentless hand. This is but another illustration of the old truism, that we can never be sure of to-morrow, and that the future is ever full of uncertainty. When Mr. Clarke came here in 1896 he had already achieved in another sphere a very high reputation for ability. He had been long connected with municipal affairs in his own city of Toronto. Of that city he had been several times elected chief magistrate, and he had also won for himself a prominent position in the legislature of his province. It was therefore no surprise to us who had followed the politics of Ontario to find that as soon as he came here he commanded at once a prominent position. Those who had the pleasure of sitting with him in the last two parliaments will agree with me that he was one of the

ablest debaters we have ever had in a Canadian parliament. His speeches were always to the point, put in strong but never offensive language. There is no record that an offensive word ever passed his lips. He had the faculty of making his points as strong as they possibly could be made, without at the same time attacking anybody personally. I well remember the speech he delivered on rather a ticklish, if I may use the expression, subject, when resolutions were introduced some years ago in favour of Home Rule for Ireland. The speech he made on that occasion was to my mind a model in every respect. I did not agree with him in his views, but it would have been impossible to present his case in stronger and more manly language. I need hardly say that his loss is one not only to that side, but to both sides. In saying this I am sure I echo the voices from my side as much as I do those of the other side. We may therefore sadly, but in the most united assent, convey to the family of our late colleague, the expression of the grief, not only of his colleagues of his own party but also of the party opposed to him in politics, and upon this occasion pay this last tribute of our sincere admiration for his many great qualities and our deep sorrow at his loss.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) On behalf, Mr. Speaker, of those on your left, I wish to thank my hon. friend the Prime Minister for his very feeling and eloquent reference to our late colleague, Mr. E. F. Clarke. My right hon. friend has not said one word too much in his praise. The death of Mr. Clarke is not only a loss to his party in the House of Commons but it is, as the right hon. gentleman has well said, a loss to the whole House, a loss to his native city, a loss to his province and above all a loss to Canada. Mr. Clarke was a man of very earnest and intense convictions, but at the same time he was a man of broad ideas and a great generous heart. He was gifted with an unusual power of clear and vigorous expression, yet with all his intense convictions and earnestness, no word of his, as my right hon. friend has well said ever left any sting of bitterness in the hearts of his political opponents. Those who sat with him in this House as his colleagues from 1896 until his death, especially those on this side of the House, look upon his loss as that of a dear brother. He has passed away in the fulness of his powers and in the enjoyment of a love such as it has fallen to the lot of few men in any country to gain among their fellow countrymen. More than that, he has left behind him a legacy of strong conviction, wise moderation and above all of intense faith in the future greatness of his country which he loved so well.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). May I too, Mr. Speaker, add on this occasion a few words to the expressions which have fallen from our leaders on both sides of the deep sorrow we feel in the loss we have all sustained. The death of no other man in Canada, I believe, could bring such widespread sorrow and such deep sorrow to so many homes. In the warm hearted feeling of respect, admiration and sympathy which he gained among all classes, he excelled any man it is my privilege to know. He was a strong man and yet—what is most unusual in this world—he had not an enemy. As a rule a strong man makes enemies, but Mr. Clarke made none. Everywhere, even among those who differed with him, he created the conviction that he was absolutely fair. In him labour found a friend such as perhaps no other man in this country has proved himself to be; and yet capital had absolute confidence that he would never do an injustice as between labour and capital. He was, as we all know, a strong Orangeman, an Orangeman from conviction, and yet no man in the city of Toronto had as many dear, warm friends as he among the Roman Catholics. His home life was simply an ideal one. His unselfishness he carried to such a degree that he neglected his own interests practically from the time he devoted his energy to the cause of the public in municipal, local and Dominion affairs. Lives such as his furnish examples that are badly needed in these days, when human energy is devoted almost entirely to material objects. In our late colleague, Canada has lost a man, and we have lost a friend, but lives such as his leave enduring recollections which will ever tend to soften the asperities and bitterness of political strife and incite public men to higher, broader and more unselfish ideals.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I would like, Mr. Speaker, as coming from the province of Quebec, to add also my meed of praise to the well deserved tributes which have just been rendered to our late lamented friend. I became acquainted with the late member for Centre Toronto when we entered parliament together in 1896, and I found him one of those men with whom acquaintance soon ripens into friendship. No doubt we all without exception appreciated his many qualities, but those who had the advantage of being near to him in the exercise of their daily duties can testify more particularly to his extreme kindness, to the gentleness of his nature, and to the firmness withal of his convictions. Mr. Clarke had the rare gift of being able to urge his convictions with great force and yet give offense to nobody. I can well endorse the tribute my right hon. friend paid to Mr. Clarke for the manner in which he presented his views on a certain occasion to which he particularly attested. Mr. Clarke then rose to the height of great eloquence upon a thorny subject, bristling with difficulties, he spoke with great warmth, but yet not one word escaped him

which could give the slightest offence to those who held different opinions. What impressed me particularly in our late friend, was his earnest advocacy, on every occasion of the rights of the working man. It was easy to see that in his early life he had known the struggle which many of us have had to go through, and never missed an occasion to promote and make perfect, by means of that eloquent and argumentative ability of which he was so absolutely a master, every measure which could in any way advance the interests of that important class of our community. Mr. Clarke was too rare a visitor to our own province of Quebec ; but when he came he made hosts of friends amongst all classes. I am not surprised at all that the city with whose life he was identified should have thought fit to do his memory special honour. We cannot have too many men of his stamp in this House. The place he has so ably filled in this important assembly will be hard to fill now that he has gone.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). As one who was intimately associated with the late Mr. Clarke for many years, perhaps I may be permitted to say that I appreciate personally the very sympathetic references to his early demise and agree with every word that has been said, and so well said, on that subject. In every relation of life in which we were brought into connection with the late Mr. Clarke, he was regarded as one of the highest types of manhood—sympathetic, forbearing, intelligent ; a man of strong views and aggressive in maintaining what he believed to be right, but never desirous of interfering with the rights of others. In his death, not only has this House lost a valuable member and his constituency a very respectable and intelligent representative, and his city one of the important links between the various nationalities and the civic life of that important centre, but this country has lost a man whose place it will be hard to fill. He seemed to be a connecting and uniting force between what otherwise might have been divided elements of our community. Even those who might seem to be the antipodes of public thought and feeling he brought together in relationship pleasing alike to all. But while this House and the city of Toronto and this country, have sustained its loss, nowhere will that loss be felt as in his own home where his loving wife and his family remain. The hand of death has taken from them one who was there sustainer, their comfort and their joy. It is to be hoped that the fact that he had so high a place in the affections of the people will have some effect in assuaging their grief. It was with deep sorrow that the people assembled yesterday to pay their last tribute of respect to him. They were there in very large numbers, and it was felt and expressed by many that one of the most dearly beloved men Toronto had ever known was yesterday consigned to his last resting place.

ASH WEDNESDAY ADJOURNMENT.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved :

That when this House adjourns this day it stand adjourned until Thursday the 9th of March instant.

The reason for this motion is that to-morrow, Ash Wednesday, is a statutory holiday.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Before this motion is adopted, I desire, if possible to get some information from the Prime Minister. The second reading of the Bills to establish autonomy in the Northwest Territories is expected to take place some time soon. There are many members who desire to be present on that occasion. In referring to the matter, I am not in any way intimating a desire to have an early second reading of the Bills, because the later this comes on the better for our aims and our desires. My object is to ask the Prime Minister if he will be good enough to set a day —and that as late as he conveniently can—for the second reading. There is very deep interest in these Bills throughout the country, and I entertain the hope that, even if the leader of the government does not now realize the strong sentiment that obtains throughout the country with regard to some of the provisions of these Bills, he may become aware of it at a later stage and may be influenced somewhat in the amendments to the Bill that, we are told, he is about to make.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The House will be entitled to know some days in advance at what time the Bills will be taken up, and I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) that reasonable notice will be given in advance to prepare for the debate.

Motion agreed to.

FRANCHISE ACT, 1898, AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 52) to amend the Franchise Act, 1898—Mr. Fitzpatrick—was read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Hon. G. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). What is the explanation of this Bill ?

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). The object of this amendment is to provide that a copy of the electoral lists which bears the imprint of the King's Printer shall be prima facie evidence when it is produced in any court of justice. At the present time it is necessary in order to prove the qualification of an elector—for instance in an election petition—to produce the list in possession of the Clerk of the

Crown in Chancery, which is an expensive proceeding, or to produce a copy of the list certified by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. Inconveniences have resulted from the latter practice. The intention here is to make the imprint of the King's Printer on the copy of the list prima facie evidence of the contents to the same effect and to the same purpose as the certificate of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Mr. BERGERON. If I remember rightly, under the old clause, in the event of a controverted election, the clerk of the Crown in Chancery had to go to the court and submit the list which had been used. If I understand, it is now the intention to replace that procedure by making an ordinary list signed by the King's Printer sufficient.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. A list which purports to be printed by the King's Printer.

Mr. BERGERON. It would not be the list which had been used, but a copy.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is not a copy; it is a duplicate, a duplicate original.

Mr. BERGERON. Before long a case may come before the courts where the lists which have been used have been tampered with and a duplicate from the King's printer would not practically show the list used at the time of the election.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not know the case which my hon. friend has in mind, but he will realize at once that the present law which requires that the production of the original list by the clerk of the Crown in Chancery is somewhat expensive. But if, in future, any one desires to incur the expense of doing so, he may send a subpoena to the clerk of the Crown in Chancery and make him appear. This amendment will not prevent any one doing that. Under the present system you have perhaps a preliminary objection in an election petition, and it is necessary at the very outset to prove the qualification of the petitioner. Now, for that simple purpose it would seem to be unnecessarily burdensome for the clerk of the Crown in Chancery to have to go down. Under this amendment the petitioner will simply produce any copy of the electoral list on which appears the imprint of the King's Printer, by which it will appear that the list was printed in the King's Printer's office and the fact that he has printed his name on that list will be sufficient. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and myself had some conversation about this and there has been an agreement.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand the point; it is only for the simple purpose indicated, and the papers to which I have referred can be brought down just the same.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It does not at all prevent that. Any step of that kind which could have been taken in the past can be taken under this amendment. I would like to say to the Minister of Justice that I submitted this Bill to one of the counsel who had brought the matter to my attention, and while I have not been able to give his suggestions very careful consideration, nevertheless I have so much confidence in his judgment and in his study of the question that I would venture to submit his suggestion to the minister. He points out that the object to be aimed at, is not so much to give evidence of the original list, but substitute a copy for the original in every case in which you now have to subpœna the clerk of the Crown in Chancery to produce the list. He suggests as an amendment to strike out all the added words that have been suggested, that is, all the words which follow the words 'Clerk of the Crown in Chancery' and substitute for the words in the clause these words :

> And in every case in which the said original list could be received in evidence such printed copy purporting to be so authenticated shall be received in evidence in all courts without further or other proof than the production of such copy purporting to be so authenticated.

He has one other suggestion which is this:

> Subsection 2 of section 10 of the Franchise Act, 1898 is hereby amended by inserting after the word 'division' in the third line thereof the words 'or electoral district.'

I may be permitted to read what he says in regard to it:

> I have also suggested that subsection 2, section 10, be amended by adding the words 'or electoral district' after the word 'division,' in the third line thereof. The definition of a 'polling division' in section 4, makes it include, when used in reference to provincial elections, any territorial area for which there is a special voters' list, or in which a poll may be held, but it is not clear that in subsection 2, section 10, the expression 'polling division' is used in reference to provincial elections. It rather looks as if it were used in reference to Dominion elections.
>
> You will notice that 'electoral district' is also used in section 9, even in reference to provincial elections.

I shall pass the letter over to the Minister of Justice. I may say that this letter is in reply to a letter of mine inclosing a copy of the Bill now under consideration.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Under these circumstances I would move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again in order that I may have an opportunity of examining this suggestion.

Progress reported.

SEAMEN'S ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 38) to amend the Seamen's Act.—Hon. Mr. Préfontaine—read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1.

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). This Bill is introduced at the special demand of the board of trade and shipping interests of British Columbia. It will have the effect of allowing the ship masters, mates, &c., who are engaging crews in British Columbia to do so through the shipping master and to permit them to pay a reasonable price for getting these crews. At present it appears that in British Columbia, as the fact has been represented to us, shipping mates and masters have found it impossible to procure crews in Victoria, or Vancouver, or other places where they could be procured. They are obliged to go to Puget Sound on the American side to get crews, because, according to the laws that govern the shipping master, he cannot charge more than fifty cents per head for the men whom he engages or furnishes to the vessels. It is represented even that shipping masters have been fined, as provided by section 18 of chapter 74, $40 for procuring crews and charging more than fifty cents per head which is the fee provided by the law. At the present moment it is quite impossible to procure crews in British Columbia ports, and last year very strong representations were made in the sense that the law should be amended so as to provide that the shipping master at any port can delegate his power to a deputy or any one he chooses, and that he can charge whatever price he thinks reasonable for procuring crews. I would suggest that the first line and part of the second line of section 1 of the Bill be struck out. This Bill was prepared last year, it was intended to be put in force at the end of the session, and the date then fixed for putting it into operation was the 1st of September. There is no reason this year for these words to appear in the section, and I propose that they should be struck out. They are 'on and after the first day of September, one thousand nine hundred and five.' I also propose to strike out the words 'shall be' in the third line and substitute the word 'is.' By striking out section 18 we strike out the section which provides for the fine. Section 18, of chapter 74 reads as follows :—

> Every shipping master or deputy shipping master, and every clerk or servant in any shipping office who demands or receives any remuneration, either directly or indirectly, for hiring or supplying any seaman for any ship, except the lawful fees payable under this Act, shall, for every such offence, incur a penalty not exceeding forty dollars, and shall also be liable to be dismissed from his office by the Governor in Council.

This is a very strong enactment which was put in the statute book some years ago in order to prevent crimping.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the fee now?

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Fifty cents, but under the Bill the shipping master can charge more than fifty cents in British Columbia without incurring the fine.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the hon. minister be good enough to read the clause of the Bill now under consideration as he proposes to amend it ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It will read as follows :—

> Section 18 of the Seamen's Act, chapter 74 of the Revised Statutes, is amended by adding thereto the following subsection :—
> 2. This section shall not apply to the province of British Columbia.

It is intended to provide that section 18 shall not apply to the province of British Columbia.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the hon. minister be good enough to explain, because I did not quite catch his remarks in that regard, on whose petition or memorial or request this amendment is being made ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It has been suggested in a long memorandum transmitted to the department on the 2nd of May, 1904, by the secretary of the Board of Trade of Victoria, B.C.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the reasons ? The hon. minister has not given any reasons. The only thing that is stated is that this change has been requested by the Board of Trade, but it seems to me that either the hon. minister or the department speaking through him should inform the House what the reasons are. My hon. friend knows that reason for this law was to curtail and get rid of the very great nuisance, hardship and outrage which were perpetrated of old in the ports in order to get sailors to man vessels. This Bill does away with that protection and has the other objectionable feature of introducing an exception to the general law which the hon. minister will agree is not a good thing to do if it can be avoided at all. These two things being taken into account the minister ought to give us some reasons on his own behalf or on behalf of the Board of Trade.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The reasons that I gave in explaining the measure were to the effect that during the past couple of years it has been represented to the department that crews could not be procured at all in the harbours and ports of British Columbia.

Mr. FOSTER. What have they been doing the meantime?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They have been securing them in Seattle and other American ports. The letter which accompanies the memorandum reads as follows :—

May 2nd, 1904.

The Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—This board has had under consideration the disadvantage under which vessels loading in British Columbia are operated in consequence of it being necessary to go to United States ports in order to secure crews.

A committee has reported upon the matter and I am instructed to transmit the accompanying copy of their report and on behalf of the board to ask your good offices in securing the desired relief.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) F. ELWORTHY,
Secretary.

Then, the report reads as follows :—

To President and Members
Victoria, B.C., Board of Trade.

Gentlemen,—Your committee appointed to report upon the conditions under which crews are at present shipped on foreign going merchant vessels in British Columbia ports beg to report as follows :—

The regulations now being enforced in regard to the shipping of crews on foreign going vessels are prejudicial to the interests of Canadian trade on this coast and must inevitably work in favor of United States ports.

The shipping masters will not undertake the responsibility of finding crews for out-going vessels and captains are not permitted to employ any other person to assist them in securing crews.

In a recent case in Vancouver, that of the ship 'Linlithgowshire,' five men had been shipped by a boarding house master and a prosecution was instituted, fines being imposed amounting to $500.

It was disclosed that this prosecution was instigated by the Puget Sound boarding house masters for the purpose of preventing crews being obtained in British Columbia ports, and with this object in view it is understood that agents from Puget Sound frequent the British Columbia ports for the purpose of compelling the authorities to enforce the regulations to the utmost to the serious injury of Canadian shipping interests.

Vessels arriving here from long voyages invariably lose a portion of their crews by desertion, and often the whole crew of seamen has to be replaced by the time the vessel has completely loaded.

The Canadian regulations have always made it difficult to secure crews with facility, whereas the boarding house masters in the United States ports on Puget Sound are always ready to supply crews, and in many cases have yearly contracts with the shipowners.

Although the charges made by these men are often extortionate, owners of vessels would sooner pay these excessive charges than have their vessels delayed after loading, and it has been not unusual to tow vessels, after loading, to Puget Sound ports to pick up their crews.

The extra cost involved by this course has caused a discrimination in freight rates against British Columbia, and it has also resulted in vessels obtaining their sea stores in the United States port instead of at the British Columbia loading port. Recently the authorities at Vancouver have refused to give clearance to a loaded vessel unless the full crew was first shipped, the captain desiring to proceed to Puget Sound to procure a crew.

The position, therefore, is that the captain is unable to secure a crew in Vancouver, because no one is permitted to give him the necessary assistance, unless gratuituously, that he cannot legally bring in a crew from Puget Sound and that he cannot get a clearance, even for Puget Sound, without a crew.

Nothing but harm is done to Canadian interests by the creation of such a deadlock, and it is evident that the present regulations should be modified without any delay.

Owing to the proximity of American ports to Canadian on this coast, the conditions are quite different to those on the Atlantic coast and if the shipowners find themselves under disadvantage in British Columbia ports the injury to trade is immediate and direct, owners protecting themselves by raising freight rates. At the present time the shipments from British Columbia ports by cargo vessels consist of lumber, coal, salmon, ore and general produce, and it is vital to all these trades that shipments should be made at as low freight rates as are current elsewhere on this coast and especially on Puget Sound.

It has not been easy to keep a supply of seamen for foreign going vessels in British Columbia ports owing to the inducements held out by the agents of the Puget Sound boarding masters.

The shipping masters have never made any effort to provide crews for vessels and the only assistance to the shipping interest in this essential matter has been given by boarding house masters.

The majority of unemployed seamen in Pacific coast ports having left their previous ship without being paid off, the only remuneration which the boarding house master can receive must be out of the seamen's advanced note, and any sum paid by captains for procuring crews.

In the past in British Columbia ports, under, perhaps a not too strict interpretation of the law, certain boarding house masters have undertaken to provide crews, with results satisfactory to both captains and seamen.

Your committee is informed that the fee charges here have been $10 per head and on Puget Sound from $35 to $80 per head. On the other hand the wages paid to seamen here have usually been twenty-five per cent higher than on Puget Sound, where the seamen are made to accept lower wages to compensate for the extra amount charged the captains by the boarding house masters.

Your committee is of the opinion that a continuance of the practice of boarding house masters charging a moderate fee for securing crews in British Columbia ports will be to the advantage of seamen and all other parties concerned, and your committee would recommend such an amendment of the regulations as will permit this. It seems to your committee that under subsection 'C' of clause eleven of the Shipping of Seamen Act, shipping masters should be allowed to license not more than two reputable persons in each port who would be authorized to assist captains in securing crews, and that for such services a fee of not more than $10 per head should be paid.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Sgd.) J. J. SHALLCROSS,
JOHN G. COX,
HARRY F. BULLEN.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this the first representation, or has it been before the department for a number of years ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This is the first official representation to the department since I have been minister. When I visited British Columbia last fall, the boards of trade of Victoria, New Westminster and Vancouver, made strong representations on the subject.

Mr. MACPHERSON. This amendment to the law has been pressed for a number of years by those interested in the shipping industry of British Columbia, on whom the existing law imposes a very great hardship. When a ship loads at our mills with lumber or at our docks with salmon, in 99 cases out of a hundred she goes to Puget Sound ports to complete her crew. The result is that the ships purchase their supplies at the American ports to the great loss of the merchants of British Columbia. The small sum of 50 cents which is allowed by the law for each seaman is not sufficient to interest any boarding house keeper to go into the business of supplying crews. A case occurred last year which brought this question to a head. A boarding house keeper in the city of Vancouver who runs a sailor's home, undertook to supply a crew for a ship about to sail for the old country. He secured a number of men for the shipping master in contravention of the terms of the present law and a prosecution was entered at the instance of the Puget Sound boarding house masters, so I am informed—who, of course, did not appear in the prosecution although privy to it—and this man was fined $500. We wish the law to be amended so that the shipping masters of Vancouver, New Westminster, Nanaimo or other ports can appoint one or two men to supply sailors to ships. If this be done it will be of great service to the shipping interests of our province. I may state that many of the boats loading in our harbours take supplies for their whole voyage which in some cases amount to from $6,000 to $10,000, and of course, when they take these supplies at American ports it is so much lost to the merchants of British Columbia. I trust the House will consent to this alteration in the law.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not quite understand what the prosecution referred to was for.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The prosecution was instituted because there was an infraction of some sections of the Act which provide that the shipping master or deputy shipping master shall alone engage crews at the rate of 50 cents for each sailor employed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What did the shipping master do in this case ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. He charged more than the legal fee. The ordinary fee in British Columbia is $10 per head, whereas the legal fee is only 50 cents.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There must have been something beyond that. It would seem that the boarding house master was involved in some way.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Perhaps I can explain. The Seamen's Shipping Act provides for the hiring of all seamen by the regularly appointed shipping master who receives the fees fixed by sections 16 and 17. In times past, certain difficulties arose over the shipping of seamen in the city of Quebec, and as my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) will remember, also in Halifax. Section 18 was introduced to put an end to these occurrences. Shipping masters were then in the habit of entering into contracts with boarding house keepers under which the boarding house keeper supplied the seamen for the captain on the understanding that the shipping master would receive from the captain, in addition to his fees, a somewhat large remuneration which he divided with the boarding house master. When sailing vessels used to come to Quebec, it was a common practice for the boarding house master to induce seamen to desert a ship, and then the captain was obliged to go to the shipping master who in turn applied to the boarding master to get a crew. This resulted in a crew being induced to desert from one ship to another ; the boarding master getting very large commissions in this way. As a result of this, a dreadful murder was committed at Quebec. A boarding house keeper who was attempting to 'crimp' a seaman from a ship was met by the captain—a man named Pelletier whom I knew very well—and was forbidden to go on board the vessel. The boarding house keeper persisted and the captain killed him with an axe. He was tried for it, and the original law, 36 Victoria was enacted to prevent such an occurrence. I understand that the object my hon. friend has in view, with respect to British Columbia exclusively, is to enable the shipping master to apply to a boarding house keeper for a crew, and to authorize the shipping master to receive, in addition to the fees provided in the Act, practically an additional remuneration, which he would divide with the boarding house keeper. I would like to point out that while the Bill amends section 18 and relieves the shipping master of the penalty, the opportunity for extortion remains ; so that if the object of the law is a desirable one, I think that in addition to amending section 18, it would be necessary to amend sections 15 and 16 as well.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The difficulty to which the hon. Minister of Justice draws attention is one very well known, not only in this country, but in England, to such an extent that men were knocked down in the street, dragged to one of these boarding houses and kept drugged until they woke

up and found themselves at sea. That took place in the days when it was the practice to press men, not only for the navy, but in connection with merchant shipping also. If you are going to amend the law so as to permit a shipping master to enter into a compact of this kind with a boarding house keeper and to divide the profits, are you not taking a rather serious step ? It seems to me that to authorize an officer of this government to enter into a partnership, as it were, with a boarding house keeper, under no restrictions whatever as to the amount that may be extorted from the seamen, is going very far indeed. We must remember that these seamen are not only the wards of the courts of the country, but the wards of parliament, and that these fees have ultimately to be paid out of the seamen's wages.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They are advanced out of the seaman's wages.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I know that. It may be wise legislation, but I doubt it, and venture to think we ought to look around before applying such a remedy to an evil that does not exist.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The hon. leader of the opposition is looking at the matter in the worst possible light. I do not think the intention of the Bill is to allow the boarding house keeper and the shipping master to act in collusion and charge an exorbitant price to the seamen and then divide the profits. I know that this House would not agree to anything of that kind. At present the Puget Sound people are supplying practically all the crews leaving our ports for foreign ports and charging exorbitant prices for them. The resolution sent to the hon. minister names a fee a good deal higher than any I ever heard suggested. I understand that from $10 to $15 per man is asked in British Columbia ports and is always got. I think there ought to be some provision specifying a certain sum, beyond which a boarding house keeper could not charge, while giving him sufficient latitude so that he will be remunerated for what he is doing for the benefit of the port. He may have to keep these men four or five weeks at a time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is proper that he should be remunerated for the board of the men during the time they stay at his house ; but the Bill seems to go farther than that, by allowing the boarding house keeper to charge a certain fee for providing these men, and allowing the shipping master, although an officer of this government, to divide up that fee with the boarding house keeper.

Mr. MACPHERSON. There is no such provision in the Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is the way it would work out. In fact, I think it was suggested in the memorial that a shipping master might select three or four of the best boarding house keepers and make an arrangement with them. That arrangement would involve some division of the fees. My hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Law) has some knowledge of this matter, being largely interested in shipping, and I should like to know what he would think of a proposal of this kind.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I may have possibly misconstrued the object my hon. friend has in view ; but it seems to me that we must understand what we are providing for. I understand that the object my hon. friend has in view is to enable vessels that go to British Columbia ports to supply themselves with crews there instead of going to American ports. That is a most desirable and laudable object, and we ought to carry it out.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Certainly.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. How are we going to accomplish that by the amendment ? Are we going to accomplish it by saying that the shipping master shall not be liable to the penalty if he charges more than the rates fixed in sections 15 and 16 ? That does not provide the remedy. We must offer some inducement to the boarding house keeper to procure men for the shipping master. My hon. friend has properly suggested that the shipping master will authorize the boarding house keeper to procure these men; but he cannot do that unless some remuneration is to be paid to the boarding house keeper. If that is the object, we must see how far we can go to carry that object into effect.

Mr. FOSTER. In the last analysis, it comes down to the boarding house keeper, who is the medium through whom the shipping master acts. Could it be provided that any amount that is paid over and above a reasonable fee shall in no case come out of the sailor's wages ? There are three things to be considered. There is the difficulty experienced by the ships that come into port of having their sailors taken away from them, referable to the desire of the boarding house keeper to get his fee from them on their being re-engaged. Then there is the idea of cruelty in the way of getting these men, by drugging them and the like of that. Then the poor sailor in the end, when he wakes up, finds that this unearned fee has been deducted from his wages. Could not legislation be secured to meet that difficulty ? First, by fixing a reasonable fee, and then by providing that if anything was paid over and above, that it would be at the expense of the shipping men themselves, and could not be taken as an advance on the sailor's wages. I can see the difficulty, and only wish there had been more general representations in the matter. It would have been better if the other

boards of trade and shipping men generally had given their views as well. We ought if possible to keep the trade in our own ports, and it is a grievance that these large vessels should be obliged to get their men at the American ports, because that naturally entails their buying at these ports the supplies they need. On the other hand, we should be careful to protect the sailor, and I would suggest that no part of the advance, except a reasonable fee, should be taken from his wages.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The sailors go to Puget Sound to ship and there these advances to them are taken from their wages.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why do they go there ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. It comes back to the question of the boarding house keeper. At present it does not pay any man in Vancouver or Victoria to go into the business of keeping a sailor's home. A sailor gets broke and wants to ship. He then goes to a sailors' home and says to the keeper : I want to go on the first boat that sails. Well, there may not be a boat sailing for three weeks and during that time he has to be boarded somewhere, and is charged by the keeper of the sailors' home say $5 a week, so that by the time he ships he is in debt $15. But before the boarding-house keeper will give him credit, the sailor must agree that the boarding-house keeper shall be paid the amount due when he sails, and that amount is paid by the shipping master and charged in his fee. It is subsequently deducted from the sailor's wages. But that cannot be done in Vancouver under the law.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not understand how section 18 affects this.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Supposing ten men owe the boarding-house keeper $15 a piece, making $150 all. When he ships these men, he is not going to take 50 cents apiece for them, or in all $5, to pay for that debt.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But section 18 does not deal with the boarding-house keeper at all.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I recognize that thoroughly, but you have to come back to the boarding-house keeper. The shipping master is not going to put himself to the trouble of hunting these men up for the sake of fifty cents apiece. But if the boarding-house keeper could go to the shipping master and say : I have ten men for the first boat, but must be paid what they owe me, say $150. Then when the first boat goes to the shipping master and asks for ten men, the shipping master will reply : Very well, I will furnish you with the ten men, but you will have to pay $150. The ship master of course will deduct that amount from the wages at the end of the voyage. I fully recognize the possibility of grave injustice being inflicted at times and will gladly support any measure to avoid it, but we are working an injustice at present by continuing the present system.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would it not be better to fix a higher fee for the shipping master rather than leave the amount to be taken from the seaman indefinite ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. That might be a very good idea, but I do not see how you can fix a fee that would meet every case. $100 might be due the boarding-house keeper, and it would hardly do to make the fee $100.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It does not seem that section 18 is very much concerned with what the sailor owes, because it does not deal with moneys advanced to him. It deals altogether with another matter and that is the fee to be paid the shipping master.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The difficulty is this, the boarding-house keeper keeps a sailor a certain period of time. Then when the sailor is shipped, he goes down with him to the shipping master and makes his bargain with the captain, and the captain gives the shipping master not money, but an advance note. That advance note is to the effect that three days after the final sailing of the ship with the sailor in question on board, the amount shall be due. There is this inconvenience, that the boarding master cannot always prove that the ship has gone with the men in question on board, and the result is frequently the money is lost. The object here is to make provision that hereafter that amount of money shall be made payable to the shipping master for his services in supplying these men and shall be paid by way of a fee instead of by an advance note as at present.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In other words, the intention is to relieve the shipping master from the necessity of proving that the man has gone on board before he can be paid the advance note. But is this not an awkward way of accomplishing it ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It does not accomplish it. It is always a thankless task to interfere in legislation of this sort, but if I may offer a suggestion, I would suggest that we allow the Bill to stand so that we may see whether we cannot find some way of accomplishing the object in view more effectively.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not the Department of Justice draft all these Bills ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not always.

Mr. FOSTER. They always do it if asked.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The correct practice in these matters is this : When it is in-

tended to introduce legislation, the promoter should go to the law clerk of the House of Commons and give him the instructions, and he drafts the Bill. It is only for my own convenience that I deem it my duty to take up all these Bills and revise them. I do not say this for the purpose of unburdening myself of any responsibility.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In this case the correct custom was followed ; the Bill was prepared by Mr. McCord ; it was then transmitted to the Department of Justicie, and it was returned to me as being correct.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, you have it amongst you.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Better let it stand.

Progress reported

SUPPLY—IMMIGRATION OF PAUPER CHILDREN.

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

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox and Addington). Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the government to a matter that seems to me of great importance. A general meeting of the poor-law guardians of Great Britain has been called to consider the advisability of sending young paupers out to the colonies. It is stated by Dr. Barnardo that the mortality among the children of five and six years of age whom he has in charge has been very great—as high as two hundred out of every thousand. There is a Mrs. Close who has taken a very active part in promoting a scheme of immigration for pauper children. She intends to send out children of from two to three years of age. And she has had some correspondence with the Department of the Interior upon the subject. She has been very modest in her demands. She has asked for one-half section of land—that is, 320 acres—for each party of four adults and twenty children. These locations are to be within an hour's drive of the railway. She asks for government timber to construct the necessary buildings. And, in cases where the children are young, or, for any reason it is thought best not to send them to the Northwest, she asks to be furnished with farms between Ottawa and Montreal, farms of 80 acres each. Now, I think this a matter well worthy the consideration of the government. Personally, I am entirely opposed to this kind of immigration. We are opposed to having adult paupers come into this country, and we have deported quite a number of them during the past year. This lady to whom I have referred does not even propose that these children whom she intends to bring here shall be permanent settlers in Canada. She proposes to have the right, when they have grown to twelve or fourteen years of age, to say what number of them may go back to England for such purposes as she sees fit. I am sorry that the letter from Mr. Smart that the First Minister gave me the other day says that the Minister of the Interior is considering the matter favourably. I do not see anything in this proposition that will promote the best interests of this country. We may have our sympathy with the poor people of other countries ; and we may say that we have a great country, with plenty of room for all. But we must not lose sight of the fact that our first duty is to our own people. We have a splendid country, we have a population that, I believe, is second to none, and we do not want to do anything to degrade it or lessen its efficiency. I do not wish to take up time in discussing this matter, because I expect that, at a latter stage we shall have a discussion on immigration generally, when we can go into the matter more fully. But I wish to call the attention of the government to the subject, that they may do what I think they ought to do—nip this scheme in the bud.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). In the absence of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) I would say that the matter to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. U. Wilson) has referred came before me personally a little while ago. The Department of the Interior has had a certain proposition laid before it by an English lady who was instrumental in securing that meeting at the Mansion House in London, to which my hon. friend refers. The department is in no way committed to that scheme ; it is a proposition which, at present, is, perhaps, a little more clearly defined in the mind of the promoter and others interested than in anybody else's mind. But I would point out to my hon. friend that, when any child immigrants come to this country, they come subject to the careful inspection of the officers of the Department of Immigration. And, if arrangements were entered into for bringing child immigrants to this country, those children would certainly be subject to that same inspection and careful supervision.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. May I ask the minister a question ? I would like to know whether the government entertains favourably the idea of bringing to this country pauper children of two or three years of age ?

Mr. FISHER. I am not prepared to say. I do not think the government has come to any conclusion on such a subject, so, I could not give a categorical answer to my hon. friend. But, as he says, it will be discussed at greater length at some future time. At present, the question is entirely in the air—in this respect, that it has not been decided upon even by the authorities

in England. Apparently there are great differences of opinion among them concerning the scheme. Some are opposing it very strongly, and others are supporting it as a scheme that might be worked out to advantage. Until it assumes more definite shape, and until there seems to be a more definite prospect of anything being done, I would not say anything in the name of the government as to how it will be treated. The suggestions made will be dealt with by the department here.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). While it seems almost inhuman to prevent these children coming to our country, still we must guard the interest of our own people. The minister says that even if they came they would be under very careful inspection before being allowed to land. I want to say as a medical man that, even with the greatest care and with the most rigid inquiry and examination, it is impossible to know the inherent ailments to which these children are subject. There may be hereditary taint in the individual which will develop afterwards. I have observed this in the case of a considerable number of children who were brought from the old country. While, apparently, in first-class health, they afterwards showed evidences of hereditary diseases that were very intractable ; so that, in some cases within my own knowledge, these people became practically wards of the state because they were unable to support themselves. My fear would be that we might suffer from something of that nature and that no inspection or examination could avoid it or foresee what would be likely to occur with many of these young children. So if they are allowed to come I would suggest that not only should a careful examination be made, but also a careful inquiry into their history, so as to ascertain, so far as possible, that they are of healthy parents or of somewhat healthy parents, so that they might not afterwards become burdens on the state.

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

Murray Harbour branch and Hillsborough bridge, $357,400.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Will this complete both contracts for the bridge and the railway at Murray Harbour ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. LEFURGEY. That will complete both contracts ?

Mr. EMMERSON. As far as the estimates are concerned it will.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Do you contemplate any more work next year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is no more work.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The railway is entirely completed ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Murray Harbour branch is completed, except that there is certain work in the estimates for which this is to be paid.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Has it been taken over by the government ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was taken over November 5.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Has the contractor been fully paid for the work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We have paid the last estimate.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Then this amount is to complete the bridge, is it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What is to be done to the bridge yet ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is the erection of the substructure and some work on the approaches that is not yet completed.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Was there not some trouble with the substructure ? Was there not some recommendation that the piers be enlarged ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I understood last year and it was acknowledged last year, that there was some difficulty with the piers ; they had listed or something and it was found necessary to enlarge them.

Mr. EMMERSON. One of the piers settled to one side, but that was remedied last summer. The foundation settled, but that has been entirely straightened up.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Is the substructure all in Charlottetown ready for being placed in position ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think it is practically all there.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What has been the cause in the delay of completing this work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In the first place, the contractor who had the contract to transport it across the straits from Miramichi to Charlottetown was delayed in performing his contract.

Mr. LEFURGEY. When does the minister expect that this bridge will be open for traffic ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Some time in June, before the 1st of July.

Mr. LEFURGEY. And this amount in the estimates will complete all the work that is to be done ?

Mr. EMMERSON. All the work that is under contract, all the estimate.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Then do you contemplate any new work on the bridge ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We do not contemplate any new work.

Mr. LEFURGEY. We have never had a satisfactory explanation about this work. We find that when the estimates for the bridge and railway were under discussion in 1899, the minister said that the cost of the railway line was estimated to be in the neighbourhood of $470,000, and that the cost of the bridge was to be in the neighbourhood of $800,000. Now, from the remarks of the minister upon these items, the other day in the House, I find that the cost of the bridge is to be $1,494,000, providing that this sum in the estimates will complete it. This is nearly double the first estimated cost of this bridge, and we find that the railway which was to cost only $470,000, will cost $1,031,000, provided there is enough in the estimates now to finish the work. This matter has been up before the House on several occasions. The minister may say that he knows nothing about the past estimates of this contract, but it certainly is up to the government to explain to this House why two contracts that were to cost together in the neighbourhood of $1,270,000 have now cost over $2,494,000. We have never had a very satisfactory explanation. There must have been some very grave mistake in the estimates for this work or some very grave waste of material and extravagance in method of construction.

Mr. EMMERSON. I can repeat the explanation that has been given to the committee not only by myself last year, but also by my predecessor in office. I do not know whether any explanation that I would make would be satisfactory, because my hon. friend qualified the word 'explanation' with the word 'satisfactory.'

Mr. LEFURGEY. We will say a reasonable explanation.

Mr. EMMERSON. I can certainly give that. It must be within the knowledge of my hon. friend that there was some change in connection with this bridge after the original estimate was made. That was explained on the floor of this House by Mr. Blair in his day. In the first place, the location of the bridge was changed whereby there were three or four additional spans necessary and that required two abutments and one pier to be added. There were required four pneumatic piers, increased in size, and one of the abutments was built by the pneumatic process. The character of the approaches was changed from mere crib work to earth and stone embankment. This has been explained time and again. This vote has been made yearly, and there have been explanations given of these changes, so that necessarily the cost of the bridge, the character of which was entirely changed, enlarged and improved, was very much more than the original estimate.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I notice that on January 30 my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Martin) asked certain questions in reference to the stations which were to be built on this railway, and it was stated by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that :

> Three booking stations are proposed to be built, one each at Uigg, Murray river and Murray harbour.

And that :

> Two shelters are proposed to be built, one at Surrey and the other at Belle River. The question as to building stations at Grand View and at Newton Crossing is under consideration.

Grand View and Newton Crossing are important centres and, although it was stated in a return made on the 31st March, 1904, to this House that stations were to be established at these places, it is now stated that they are only under consideration. I notice in the return that stations are to be built at Vernon River, Uigg, Grand View, Iona, Surrey, Melville and Belle River. The policy of the government it seems is that there shall be no station built at Grand View, or at least it is now stated that it is under consideration. I think in a matter of this kind it should be made clear where these stations are to be built before the money is granted. It is necessary that these stations should be built, and the hon. minister should be able to state where they are to be located. I do not wish to take any exception to this in any carping spirit, because I think the road is a necessary work. It was handed over to the government on the 6th November last, but there has not been one train run on the road yet, and goodness knows when any train will be run. This road, fifty miles in length, was commenced on the 13th April, 1899, and it is not completed yet. No trains are running over it. I think it is only right that the hon. minister should explain why this road has taken such a great length of time to complete, and why the estimate of $470,000 has been departed from to such an extent as it has been in this case. In my opinion, and in the opinion of a great many people in that section of the country, this road could have been constructed for $470,000. There is no doubt that if the moneys had been properly handled all the roads that were asked for by the Liberal-Conservative party in 1896, and which were then promised by the Finance Minister, could have been constructed for the amount of money which has been expended on this road and on this bridge.

Mr. BLAIN. How long is it ?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. The road is only fifty miles long. The first portion was forty-two miles, but an additional number of miles was added to it since the contract

was let, making the total length fifty miles. I think it is nothing but right and just that the hon. minister should explain to this committee why it is that such a large sum of money over the estimate was necessary to be expended in the construction of this small public work. He told us a few days ago that some grades were met which were not anticipated at the time, but when you consider that there were several surveys made before a blow was struck, and that the government were in possession of all the information before they commenced it, that they are in possession to-day, I think it is nothing but right that a full explanation should be made as to the reasons why over $600,000 more than the estimate has been spent in the construction of this road.

Mr. EMMERSON. I made the statement that this contract had been finished on the 4th or 5th of November, but that did not relate to the contracts for building the stations. I think the contract that I referred to was that of the contractor who had charge of the roadbed and track-laying. The Messrs. Schurman & Company have contracts for the construction of certain stations. They are not completed, but the money is being provided for that in this estimate. In respect to the location of certain stations, I may say that I am not familiar with the circumstances myself. There was a complaint made to me that certain stations, one at Grand View and another at another point, would be too near together if built where proposed, and that they should be more widely separated. I have promised to look into the matter, and, pending the information, I am not in a position to determine the question. It was represented to me by some gentlemen from Prince Edward Island that the two stations, as now located, by some subsequent location apart from the original arrangement, made these booking stations very near together, and that the original plan would be perhaps the better arrangement. I, of course, am not in a position to determine the matter, because I do not know the locality ; I do not know the settlement, and I am in no sense familiar with the conditions. I have thought that when I am in that locality in the early spring in connection with the Charlottetown station I would inform myself as to the stations in question.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. In reference to these stations which the hon. minister refers to, it seems that in 1904 the department had decided upon a station at Uigg and another at Grand View. But now it seems that two gentlemen came up here, self-constituted delegates, Messrs. Warburton and Prowse, from Prince Edward Island, and they held an interview with the hon. minister. It appears that at that interview some cold water was thrown upon the construction of a railway station at Grand View. I do not see why the opinion of these gentlemen should be taken in a matter of this kind after the government had determined that these stations should be built.

Mr. EMMERSON. How close are they together ?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Some five or six miles, I presume.

Mr. EMMERSON. Does my hon. friend know the original arrangements for stations there ?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I know what is contained in the original statement as laid on the table of this House. This is a return dated the 31st March, 1904. The stations are stated here to be Vernon River, Uigg, Grand View, Iona, Surrey, Melville, Belle River, Wood Island, Hopefield, Murray River and Murray Harbour. If that arrangement is carried out, the people of that locality would, I think, be perfectly satisfied, but the minister is getting away from the question ; what I asked him was if he could account for the cost of the road being so largely in excess of the estimated detailed cost.

Mr. EMMERSON. Was it in connection with the bridge or the road?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. The railway.

Mr EMMERSON. In the case of the railway it was simply a matter of scheduled prices. I do not know what the original estimate was.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. $470,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. For that whole distance?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Yes.

Mr. EMMERSON. The contracts were let at schedule prices. The estimated cost of the branch from Murray river is $926,460.70, and for the extension to Murray Harbour $104.600. In addition to that there is the rolling stock and the cribwork at Murray Harbour which would be $270,000.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Some years ago a return was brought down to this House giving the detailed estimated cost of all the work to be done on that first section, and for the first forty-four miles it would average according to the engineer's figures $10,000 a mile. According to the figures now given by the minister of the actual expense, it has cost, not $10,000 a mile, but in the neighbourhood of $32,000 per mile. That is a very grave difference. Even if we add the $200,000 for rolling stock and the $70,000 for crib work the estimate cost would not amount to anything like the actual cost. The minister has given no reasonable explanation as to why this work has cost such a vast sum of money.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will take my hon. friend's word that there was such an esti-

mate, but I have no record of it. It certainly could not be based upon any survey of the engineers, because my hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) knows that is a very rough country.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Do you call Prince Edward Island a rough country?

Mr. EMMERSON. Generally speaking Prince Edward Island is not, but the locality through which this railway runs is a rough country. My hon. friend knows it is undulating and hilly and there have been a great many cuttings. There were no long rivers or streams which could be followed by a railway and in many cases the embankments have been quite extensive. In addition, a great deal of rock cutting was developed as the work progressed. I do not think that any such estimates could be based on the survey of an engineer.

Mr. INGRAM. The first estimate brought down was $8,000 a mile.

Mr. EMMERSON. Who says so?

Mr. INGRAM. That is the first estimate brought down and yet the minister now tells us this is a hilly country and a difficult one in which to construct a railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. Will my hon. friend point out that estimate to me; this is the first I have ever heard of it. This item is largely a revote of last year, and then the matter was discussed and the same figures were given by me as are given to-day and they were not called in question.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Whether it is a revote or not has no bearing on the fact that the estimated cost of $10,000 per mile has become an actual expenditure of $30,000 per mile. The estimate brought down for the first 44 miles was $10,000 per mile which we are referring to was the detailed estimate brought down to the House.

Mr. EMMERSON. When?

Mr. LEFURGEY. It was brought down four or five years ago when the work was first undertaken.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think that is correct.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I have here the return brought down and it deals with each mile up to 44 miles and the cost per mile is given. This return is worked out in detail and it gives the cost of the railroad down to Murray river bridge, not including the bridge over the Hillsborough river, at $10,445 per mile.

Mr. EMMERSON. Are you quoting from the original return brought down?

Mr. LEFURGEY. If it is not the original it is an exact copy.

Mr. EMMERSON. If that were sent over to me I might be able to tell what it is.

Mr. LEFURGEY. To show you how nearly the estimate tallies with the minister's statement in 1899 as reported in 'Hansard,' I find that he placed the cost at $477,000, while the detailed estimate was $470,419. With the estimated cost differing so largely from the actual cost, the minister should certainly give some more reasonable explanation than he has seen fit to give the House this afternoon.

Mr. EMMERSON. Carried.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the minister can ask this item to be carried after that statement. Here is a return brought down from the Department of Railways itself, giving the detailed estimates, which total about $470,000, while it now turns out that some $800,000 have been spent on that same section of road. The minister has given us no explanation, but what he has tried to do is to throw doubt on the accuracy of that return. The minister was not in the department at the time the estimate was given, but his engineers were there, the men who are responsible for giving estimates to this House. They got their vote of $470,000, and after that had been got, we find that the cost has been doubled. There may be some reason for that, but it has not been stated by the minister. I do not think the minister ought to ask that this item be passed until that is cleared up.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have asked two or three times to see the papers.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. There are other branches in Prince Edward Island that ought to receive attention; and when their claims are urgent, we are met with the statement that a great deal more money has been spent in Prince Edward Island than has been necessary. I would like the minister to explain why that has been the case.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I understand that the first eleven miles of this road were let after tenders had been advertised for, and that afterwards the department, instead of following the usual method of calling for tenders for a work of such magnitude, simply handed over the balance of the work to the same contractors at the same figures for which they built the first eleven miles. Perhaps that would enable the minister to explain the large difference between the estimate and the expenditure.

Mr. EMMERSON. If the contract was let at schedule prices, that would not affect the cost. It may be that a certain amount of money was asked for based upon the first estimate of cost, but that subsequently, as sometimes is the case, the department found that a very different railway at a larger cost would be necessary. Then the question was, was the department justified in going on? Apparently they did go on, and their action was ratified, not only once, but twice.

Last year $650,000 was voted, of which $300,000 has been expended. It was then known and stated by me what the cost of these different branches would be, and everything the department has done; and asking now for a revote of $350,000 of that $650,000 is not like asking for a new vote to pay for expenditures which have not been made known to parliament. I remember that there had been a discussion annually in regard to the Hillsborough bridge and the Murray Harbour Railway, ever since I have had a seat in this parliament. Both last year and the preceding year the facts were gone into thoroughly in connection with the estimated cost and the contract.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask the hon. minister how much has been spent on the Hillsborough bridge to July 1, 1904? I find that in answer to a question in this House, on April 28, 1904, the hon. gentleman gave the expenditure from 1899 to February 29, 1904, as $966,181.60 on the Hillsborough bridge, $736,200.88 on the Murray Harbour branch, and $110,212.18 on rolling stock for the Murray Harbour branch. In other words for these three services between the dates I have mentioned there was expended $1,812,594.66. If the hon. gentleman will inform the House what amount has been expended from February 29 to July 1, 1904, we shall get at the correct figures of the expenditure on these three items.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have the amounts expended to June 30, 1904, but they are not tabulated.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman will find in his own report, at page 22, the statement that the expenditure on the Murray Harbour branch to June 30, 1904, was $983,671.70. The estimates of last year up to 1895 were $650,000 of which he has a revote for $350,000. That means that $300,000 were had since June, 1904, and he is asking another estimate now of $357,400, which, I take it, means for the Murray river branch or altogether, $1,640,000 including his present estimates. Taking the 50 miles, that would make $32,800 a mile.

Mr. EMMERSON. That of course includes the rolling stock and the crib work. We got a vote of $650,000 last year, and it is estimated we will spend $300,000 before the 1st July of this year. Up to the 30th November last we expended on these works from the 30th June, 1904, $96,102.79. That would be on the bridge and the Murray Harbour branch. I have not yet separated those accounts. When the estimates were prepared a month ago, a statement was tabulated up to that period. I would have to go to the department to get the items separate because the whole thing has been carried through as one vote—the Murray Harbour branch and the Hillsborough river bridge. The amount asked for last year was for these works combined, and there is a revote.

Mr. BARKER. Will the hon. gentleman separate them now and tell us what each required last year? This is another instance of what I have been complaining of, namely, the way he mixes up his estimates. Why have two such important works been thrown together?

Mr. EMMERSON. Because they are practically one work.

Mr. BARKER. In the hon. minister's report they are not found together. There are different contractors and different expenditures. When he makes a report of what is done, he gives the details; but when asking for the money, he will not condescend to give that information.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am stating exactly what amount is asked for.

Mr. BARKER. How much of this money is for the bridge and how much for the railway?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think that that is necessary or essential, because it is one work. The point is this, that they were connecting Charlottetown with Murray Harbour. There are separate contractors on these works as there are separate contractors on every line of railway. Even on a railway itself there are separate contracts for the roadway and the rails and the sidings and stations. The bridge itself was under a different contract, but it is part of the one scheme, and I think that the minister of that day was justified in asking parliament for a sum to build a certain work, namely, the work of connecting Charlottetown with Murray Harbour by railway. True the bridge was a very important feature of the whole work, but I do not think it was necessary to separate it, and I do not think that parliament has in any way been prejudiced by the vote having been taken in that way.

Mr. BARKER. At page 22 of the minister's report he separates these two items. He gives the capital account of the bridge and the railway separate up to the 30th June, 1904. If there was any object in doing that, why should they not be kept separate in the estimates, and the hon. gentleman tell us what money he wants for each?

Mr. EMMERSON. I did give the other night the expenditure on capital account on the Murray Harbour bridge and the Hillsborough river bridge but perhaps my hon. friend was not here when that statement was made. Up to the 30th November last, there was expended from the beginning on the Hillsborough river bridge, $1,217,744.98 and on the branch to Murray Harbour, $70,121.91, and on the rolling stock, $145,992.35.

Mr. BARKER. Is that any reason why the hon. gentleman should not tell us how much he wants on capital account for the future for each of these. More than that, I would ask him to explain why it is that he has been buying $141,000 worth of rolling stock when he is not using the railway. It has never been opened. How long ago has that $140,000 been spent ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We had hoped to have this railway opened last summer, but in consequence of the delays on the extension to the bridge we were not able to open it. By taking considerable risk it possibly could have been opened at the time of the exhibition in Charlottetown last year. The people there were anxious it should be and we had prepared to have it open, but I did not feel like accepting the contract at that time or assuming any risk. The cars had been under construction from time to time at the car works of the government at Charlottetown. Engines have been purchased from the Kingston works.

Mr. BARKER. When ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Last year.

Mr. BARKER. Were the cars built last year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Some of them were. The work has been going on.

Mr. BARKER. For how long ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Each year there has been a statement in the accounts showing the expenditures in the construction of these cars.

Mr. BARKER. For how many years ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot recall, and I have not the statement before me.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman seems to have got them well in advance of the completion of the railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is true. We wanted these cars to be built in Prince Edward Island. Unless we began before the completion of the road, we could not have them, as we have not great car works there. We began this work anticipating the completion of the road, in order that Prince Edward Island might have the benefit of the outlay of the money.

Mr. BARKER. When were the first cars completed ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have just told the hon. gentleman that I have not that information. It is not likely I would have it in memory, particularly when I was not personally connected with the matter. And even the general manager cannot give me the date. The Auditor General's Report will show.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The statement of the minister last year showed that $110,000 had been spent, and there is only $35,000 more up to the present time.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. In the statement which the hon. minister submitted last year I find the following :

1899-1900..	$ 7,531 81
1900-1901..	41,990 85
1901-1902..	35,210 74
1902-1903..	9,526 26
July 1, 1903, to Feb. 29, 1904 ..	15,952 52
	110,212 18

I would like to ask if this rolling stock was used by the contractors, and if so, what return they made for its use ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was not used by the contractor. The contractor did hire from the Prince Edward Island Railway some rolling stock, but it was old rolling stock.

Mr. BARKER. But these cars, some of them, were constructed six years ago.

Mr. EMMERSON. The construction of cars has been going on from time to time, anticipatory of the completion of the road.

Mr. BARKER. Were the locomotives that the contractors used old ones ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. Belonging to the Prince Edward Island Railway ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. Some of these cars were bought six years ago ? Where have they been used ever since ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They were manufactured in Charlottetown, and I do not think they were wholly completed. They are nearly all there now ?

Mr. BARKER. The statement made in 'Hansard' shows that a certain sum was expended in 1899 for rolling stock. The question is what has been done with that rolling stock ever since ? It would seem that the hon. gentleman has been charging to capital account the construction of rolling stock and using it for the purposes of the railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. There were about forty old cars taken off the Prince Edward Island Railway and rented to the contractor of the Murray Harbour branch. And, in the estimates made up from time to time, there are charges against the contractor for the cars.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it the noted gentleman by the name of Kitchen who had the contract, without tender, for the full thirty miles of this road ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not understand what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) means. There is a Mr. Kitchen who has a contract on the road. I do not know that

he is 'noted.' He is a very respectable gentleman, a man who stands very high in the estimation of the people of New Brunswick and of the city of Fredericton, as I am sure my hon. from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) can testify. So, I do not think it becoming in my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) if he will pardon me for saying so, to apply the expression 'noted' to Mr. Kitchen, for that would indicate something that would reflect upon that gentleman. There is nothing in Mr. Kitchen's record as a contractor, as a citizen, or as a gentleman, that would justify any reflection upon him. Mr. Kitchen got the contract under tender, as I am informed; he got it under certain schedule rates. That contract was extended, so far as the Murray Harbour section was concerned, because legally it was a part of the original contract. And the money was voted to pay Mr. Kitchen.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. As to the word 'noted,' from what I can learn of Mr. Kitchen, he is one of the largest contributors to the election fund of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) wants to indulge in discussion of that kind, I wish to say distinctly that Mr. Kitchen never, directly or indirectly, so far as I know, contributed to an election fund of mine——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. EMMERSON——and I think I can say beyond all question that he has not done so either at this or at previous elections.

Mr. FOSTER. Easy! Easy!

Mr. EMMERSON. I am speaking of the facts. We can surely discuss this Hillsboro bridge matter without indulging in discussion such as my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) seems inclined to provoke. If that sort of thing is to be gone into, let us understand it. But I prefer, so far as I am concerned with these matters, to discuss each item on its merits. And, if there has been anything wrong in connection with any of them let us hear what it is. I do not fear criticism, but I want fair criticism. I do not think it is necessary for us to travel beyond the merits of each question. And when a statement is made by an hon. member who comes from another province, and who, in speaking of these matters must simply say what has been pumped into him, reiterating some hearsay story, I wish to correct him at once and say that if he harbours the idea that Mr. Kitchen contributed in any way to election funds, he is absolutely astray, because nothing of that kind has ever occurred.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Then, will the minister state that, so far as Mr. Kitchen is concerned he was not given the contract for the last thirty miles without tender?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know what occurred previous to my coming into the department. But I know that, in so far as the last six miles of the road is concerned, that is from Murray river to Murray Harbour, the matter having been submitted for legal opinion, it was deemed to be a part of the contract he had for the building of the line to Murray river, and he has gone on with it.

Mr. HAGGART. He made that excuse for the extension—and this is the first time we have ever heard of it—that under a legal interpretation of the contract he was entitled to the whole 40 miles.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not said that at all; my hon. friend has certainly misapprehended me.

Mr. HAGGART. The last six miles.

Mr. EMMERSON. I was speaking of the last six miles, from Murray river to Murray Harbour.

Mr. HAGGART. What are the facts of the case? A person gets a contract for 11 miles of this road which is extended to 40 miles without any tender and without any competition and then under the contract the minister says the legal interpretation extends this contract for six miles more.

Mr. BARKER. I wish to remind the minister that a few minutes ago when I asked for an explanation of the rolling stock that the government had acquired for this 50 miles of road, before the road was opened, the minister said that last year, in anticipation of the immediate opening of the road they had bought cars and locomotives.

Mr. EMMERSON. Oh, no, excuse me, if my hon. friend gathered that from my remarks, it was not what I intended to say. I said that in anticipation of the final opening of the road the railway had purchased the cars not last year, but from time to time from the very beginning.

Mr. BARKER. That is the second explanation.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was intended to be the original. If I used any words capable of any other construction I certainly did not intend to use them, because there was no such purchase of cars last summer in anticipation of the opening of the road. But there had been from time to time with a view to having the cars constructed on the island, in anticipation of the final opening of the road, certain cars constructed so that the railway would have sufficient cars to operate that road. These cars had been constructed on Prince Edward Island.

Mr. BARKER. That was either explanation No. 2 or explanation No. 3. The first explanation made by the hon. gentleman

was that, anticipating the opening of the road he got his rolling stock ready, or he might have got it ready for an exhibition that was coming on, the St. Louis exhibition or something of that kind. He did not want to take any risks on it. However, my hon. friend here read from 'Hansard' answers that had been made on a previous occasion, and the minister then began to recall something about building some cars year after year, and now it appears that he began this building when he saw the approaching completion of the railway. We will now see what the facts are and then perhaps the hon. gentleman will give us a new phase of the matter. I find in 'Hansard' of April 28, 1904, page 2,186 that in 1899-1900 the first expenditure took place on the Murray Harbour branch of the railway and the expenditure in that year was $20,970. I find that in that same year, the very first year of the expenditure on the railway, he expended $7,531 on rolling stock. He began the construction of the rolling stock equipment at the same time as he began the construction of the railway, and this is very significant considering the friends who have had the contract. The next year, 1900-1901, he expended on the railway $73,673 and in that same year he expended for rolling stock on a railway that was 6 years from completion $41,990. That is he expended on rolling stock more than one-half of what he expended on the railway. The next year, 1901-02, they were getting on with the work and he spent $237,193 on the railway and in the same year he spent $35,210 for rolling stock. Then he spent in the following year $331,326 on the railway and $9,526 on rolling stock. So it goes on year by year; from the very beginning of the construction of this road, he has been buying or building rolling stock. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that unless he can make a very clear explanation everybody in this House will arrive at the conclusion that this rolling stock was obtained for the contractors and for nobody else.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have made the statement that not one of those cars was used by the contractors. Of course if that statement will not be accepted it is so much the worse for me, but these are the facts, that the rolling stock thus constructed from time to time was not in use by the contractor, nor for him directly or indirectly. If the department had waited for the completion of the road, they could not have had the rolling stock constructed on Prince Edward Island. They would have had to go to the mainland to get it, which would have entirely frustrated the object the department had, in having the expenditure made on the island.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Is this rolling stock used at the present time?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, I think not.

Mr. LEFURGEY. On the main line of the Prince Edward Island Railway?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes it is.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Was any of it taken across to the Murray Harbour side, to Hillsborough?

Mr. EMMERSON. None of it was taken over on Mr. Kitchen's contract. Mr. Haney when building the Southport bridge and the Hillsborough bridge did have two engines during the past summer taken over there, but the general manager is not in a position to tell me whether they were the two engines that were purchased for this road or whether they were the ordinary engines of the Prince Edward Island Railway. But Mr. Kitchen who had the Murray Harbour branch had no portion of this rolling stock at all.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I understood last year from the superintendent when they had a very great shortage of cars for the mussel-mud men and for cordwood service in the western part of the island, that the freight cars that might have been available for this work were over on the Murray Harbour side. If I understood him correctly at that time, and I do not think I was mistaken, a large part of the rolling stock consisting of flat cars was over on the Murray Harbour side.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have already said that there were forty old cars belonging to the Prince Edward Island Railway, under rental of Mr. Kitchen; but that not one of the cars that form a part of the rolling stock of the Murray Harbour branch was ever in possesssion of or used by Mr. Kitchen. I cannot be more explicit. I have no personal knowledge of the transaction at all; I am simply making the statement on the authority of the general manager.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I did not make any allusion as to whether the cars were being used or not. I simply said that I understood they were over there.

Mr. EMMERSON. These particular cars?

Mr. LEFURGEY. The cars that were supposed to be for the use of that branch. I do not know any particular cars.

Mr. EMMERSON. Do you mean in so far as they were available for the trunk line of the Prince Edward Island Railway.

Mr. LEFURGEY. It was a fatal piece of policy on the part of the government to run the main line short of cars for the purpose of carrying on the work of the contractor.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is another phase of the question. It is a question of fact.

Mr. LEFURGEY. It is important for the committee to know why the railway costs

so much more than the estimate and of course this is one of the phases of the question that is naturally brought into the discussion. One reason, I presume, is that the contract is let without tender. Another reason is that possibly the contractor was favoured a lot and that he had the cars which should have been available for use by the people of Prince Edward Island along the main line in order to help out his work. This has a great deal of bearing on this question. I would like to ask the hon. minister if all of the rolling stock including coaches is to be built in Prince Edward Island or if only flat cars are to be built there ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Coaches, freight cars and all.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister asked for the original statement given to the House in respect to the expenditure on this road.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would have been disappointed if the hon. gentleman had not produced that.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend asked across the floor of the House that some one should produce the original statement. Although he is rather severe on us who come from the province of Ontario, I propose to say something. At page 9211 of 'Hansard' of 1899 the hon. minister will find the following :

Towards the construction of a branch line——

Mr. EMMERSON. What year was that—last year ?

Mr. BLAIN. No, some years ago, 1899, when the road was first proposed to be constructed. I am assuming that this was an estimate given after the survey of the road was made and the plans and specifications prepared.

Mr. EMMERSON. What was the amount of the vote ?

Mr. BLAIN. $250,000. The estimate is as follows :

Towards the construction of a branch line from Charlottetown to Murray Harbour, including bridge over the Hillsborough river, $250,000.

Mr. SPROULE. This is a new work, is it not ?

The MINISTER RAILWAY AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). This is for an extension of the line of railway to Murray Harbour.

Mr. WALLACE. Has the hon. gentleman a map of it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I have no map of it. . . . It is estimated that the railway and all permanent works in connection with it will cost $470,000.

I suppose the committee are anxious to know upon what plans and specifications prepared by the department the Minister of Railways and Canals made this statement to the House when asking for $250,000. Now, as the hon. minister of Railways and Canals has increased the expenditure until it reaches, I think, the neighbourhood of $2,000,000 including the bridge, I suppose the committee will be anxious for the hon. minister to produce the plans and specifications that were prepared by the department on which this larger amount was asked by him. That seems to be reasonable information to be furnished the committee, so that the committee shall know where the money is going and where it has gone.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think that my hon. friend desires to convey the idea that the $470,000 was to complete the bridge and the railway as well.

Mr. BLAIN. No, I did not make that statement at all.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman's remarks were capable of that interpretation. I do not think he wished to convey that idea and therefore I mention it. I am sure he will recognize that whatever discrepancy there may be between the original estimate and the actual cost, it is one simply between the $470,000 and the final estimate of the railway down to Murray Harbour. I can very well understand that in the original estimate perhaps rolling stock was not taken into consideration. I can very well understand that the extension from Murray river to Murray Harbour was not taken into consideration. I think the survey had not then been made. I am not familiar with the circumstances, but it may be that at that time a thorough survey had not been made. But it appears that subsequently, after this had been done, this contract was let by competition on schedule prices. There cannot be any very great wrong in connection with the expenditure of the money, because it is based on schedule prices and the lowest prices in competition, and it is a question of measurements from time to time. Certainly everything was considered correct in that respect because the itemized figures appeared in the Auditor General's Report. More than that, in so far as this committee is concerned, it is a matter to be justified as regards the estimates in 1902, in 1903 and in 1904—the two preceding years by my predecessor and the last year by myself, when I asked for $650,000.

Mr. INGRAM. What was the estimate the hon. gentleman gave when he asked for the vote last year?

Mr. EMMERSON. I gave the estimate that I repeated here to-day. The estimate was that the bridge would cost $1,494,097.15. The estimated cost of the road to Murray river and Murray Harbour was $1,031,061.02. There was estimated for rolling stock $200,000 and for cribwork at Murray Harbour,

$69,770. This is the only statement with which I have had to deal during my connection with the department. There has been no advantage taken of parliament. The expenditure of $350,000 during the current year was based on two representations to parliament and the same is true in respect to the expenditure of 1903. Of course, it is well for us to consider these matters, and if there was a mistake on the part of the department it has been condoned by the action of parliament itself, so I do not think any reflection can be made on the department in connection with the expenditure of money during the past year, because parliament knew exactly the position.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the minister attempt to say that in the year 1899 parliament was in possession of the information he has now given us?

Mr. EMMERSON. My statement as to that was confined to the past three years.

Mr. INGRAM. In the first instance the government asked for $470,000 for the railway and $800,000 for the bridge. According to the hon. gentleman's own statement he has asked for and expended $2,234,559, and that is only the expenditure up to the 30th of November, 1904. In addition to that he wants money for the work from the 30th of November up to the present date and he is asking for $357,400 more, which, if you total up, you will find comes to $2,591,000. If the Minister of Railways had asked for $3,000,000 in the first instance we probably would have no reason to complain, but what we do complain of is that parliament was asked to pledge itself to an expenditure of $1,270,000 and that the actual cost was run up to about $3,000,000. Every one knows that the manner was in which the contract for this railroad was let was the subject of a scandal, and the then Minister of Railways was found fault with because the contract was given to this man without tender. He was contractor for one portion of the railroad, but the other portion was let to him without tender, when the department and the minister should have insisted upon tenders being called for. That is what we complain of.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest to the minister that after dinner he should give the information that has been asked for. This is one of the strangest things I have ever seen ventilated in parliament with reference to a public work. I for one—and I am sure every gentleman on this side of the House is of the same opinion—I propose to have all this cleared up before this item passes even if it takes all summer.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think it is necessary to threaten. What information is required?

Mr. FOSTER. The minister has given us absolutely no information this afternoon; he has talked and talked, but has given us no information.

At six o'clock, the committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The minister is to give an explanation.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister does not appear disposed to speak. He appears to be balky. That is only in accordance with what I believe is the prevailing sentiment on that side of the House at present—there is a general balk. We shall have to prevail on the minister to say something, or else take it upon ourselves to move that the committee rise. I do not suppose that we are called on to vote these estimates in the dark. There have been a good many precedents for that, not only during the present session, but during the last four or five years. The minister may as well understand that we are making a respectful protest against this kind of thing. He may as well realize, and the other members of the cabinet, so far as they are present, though there is only one, may as well realize that we are here for business and not for humbug. We are not here for a farce or to consent to a farce; but the manner in which the public accounts are being dealt with in this House is becoming farcical. The hon. minister is a gentleman of large experience in parliamentary life, a gentleman who had a distinguished career before he came to this House, and is having a distinguished career in this House, more one of silence than anything else; but he must realize that reasonable information must be given to the committee. Let me say, moreover, that the time has come when attention should be called to the fact that it would be in the interest of the public that the mere fact that other ministers' estimates are not under discussion is no reason why they should not be present. I understand that they have joint responsibility; the items run into one another to some extent; and yet we have had this unfortunate state of things, that if the minister whose estimates are under discussion happens to know nothing about them—and that has been painfully evident on more than one occasion—there is no other minister to come to his assistance, and we are at a dead lock. We are almost in that condition to-night. We did think that on the suggestion of the hon. member for North Toronto the minister would avail himself of the couple of hours that have elapsed so as now to be able to give us some information. For my part, I listened this afternoon during the whole time these estimates were under discussion, and I have come to the conclusion, very definitely, that if it is necessary to suspend operations, or to get up and talk, in order to prevent estimates going through,

when no reasonable information has been afforded to the House, I am prepared to assist as far as I can in order to see that the people's interests shall be fairly protected. Now, I do ask the minister to make an effort to explain this estimate, and not waste the time of the House by absolutely refusing, as, in affect, if not in words, he is refusing to give information to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the minister would give it piecemeal in answer to questions. So far as I am concerned, I simply want to get at the foundation of this matter as far as I possibly can. As it has been developed during the afternoon, it looks to me like a very peculiar transaction. I am not saying that there is anything shady in it. It may be extravagance, or neglect, or error, or anything else; but that there is something wrong appears to be certain from the facts as far as we have them. The minister this afternoon seemed to think that because this was largely a revote, and the matter had been gone over before, he ought to be excused from giving detailed information. That, I do not think, can be allowed. It is not possible for the committee to allow any excuse of that kind to stand as against any information they require, whether it is the first vote, or a supplementary, or a revote, or whatever it may be. We have, in the first place, a project thrown into parliament to build an extension of the Intercolonial Railway in Prince Edward Island, from forty-two to fifty miles in length, to build a bridge over the river, and some other necessary things which have been added. We had an estimate put before us at the time of the first vote—and it was all figured out, over the signature of the chief engineer of government railways, as made in 1898—that the 42·8 miles of railway would cost about $472,000. The minister has stated that up to the 30th of November, 1904, that identical piece of road has had expended upon it $870,121. He has also stated that last year his own estimate was that it would be finished for $1,031,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was apart from the rolling stock and the cribwork.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not taking into account the rolling stock, nor was it included in the original estimate. It is also stated, and I believe is not denied, that tenders were called for, and a contract was given for 11 miles, and 11 miles only. It is also stated, and I believe not denied, that no other tenders were called for and no other contracts were given upon tenders, but that in some way or other the remaining part of the fifty miles, over and above the 11 miles, were given for construction to the same contractor, and were built by the same contractor. Now, whether the 11 miles of the first contract were of exactly the same character as the remainder of the 50 miles we have not been told. We have not been told, and it is important that we should know. You cannot take a stretch of 50 miles in a country like Prince Edward Island—you might do it in the prairies of the west—and be sure that the very same expenditure in the construction per mile of the whole 50 miles would apply as on the 11 miles, the prices of which had been determined by tender. And in some way or other in the building of the remaining number of miles, the estimate of $470,000 has been run into an estimate made in 1904 of $1,031,000. When we asked the minister for an explanation, he cannot give us one that is satisfactory. He talks about the contracts being let on schedule prices and says that if the schedule prices amount to so much, that is what they amount to, but I do not think that is satisfactory. The engineers of the department surveyed the ground, made their estimates, moneyed it all up, and came to the conclusion that it could be built for $470,000. In that way—in some way certainly not hitherto explained—has it been made to cost nearly three times as much as the original estimate, and according to the cost of the first 11 miles of contracts, which were given after tender and awarded to the lowest tender as I understand. The minister has not given us any satisfactory answer to that. But I want to ask him one thing more. His estimate last year was that that would cost $1,031,000. What is his estimate to-day as to what that 48 or 50 miles will cost when completed, because he probably is nearer the end of it and could make a nearer approximate estimate than he did last year. Will it cost more than $1,031,000 or not so much?

Mr. EMMERSON. The figures that I gave last year are those I still hold and the estimated cost to Murray Harbour is $1,000,000 exclusive of rolling stock and the crib work.

Mr. FOSTER. I have already said that we have not taken into consideration the rolling stock and cribwork in all these figures. Now we come to the Hillsborough bridge. The estimate given by the minister, on the authority of his department when he got the money for it, was that it would cost $800,000. Up to November 30, 1904, the actual cost was $1,217,744, and the estimated total cost, to which I imagine the hon. gentleman adheres the same as in the other case, will be $1,494,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the estimate which parliament was given and on which it gave the votes. These were made on the statement of the department and the minister that it could be done for $800,000, but we find it will cost $1,494,000 or $694,000 more than the estimate. I believe my hon. friend

has given some explanation as to that. I have not heard it myself, but it will require a pretty lucid explanation and a pretty full one to justify the department in making an estimate for the work, with all the engineering ability of men familiar with the ground, at its command. That road does not lie in the far west or far north, but where materials are easily available, right on the travel routes of the country, and if anywhere a very close estimate could be given, it ought to be there in a construction of that kind. Yet here we have $694,000 more spent than was estimated. We should have a very full explanation as to that. But there is another thing. The minister tells us, and other ministers have told us, that they have been accumulating rolling stock, laying it up for a rainy day so to speak. When they commenced the initial sod turning of their construction, they began to accumulate rolling stock to be used on that road when some six, seven or eight years afterwards it would be in a condition to utilize rolling stock. It appears that the minister began in 1899. He then made his first appropriation on capital account to get rolling stock for this extension and for nothing else. It was not for the Intercolonial Railway or for the other parts of the Intercolonial in Prince Edward Island, but for this extension alone, and from year to year at first as much was spent on rolling stock as on construction; altogether, $145,992 up to November 30, 1904. The question I want to put is this. Part of this rolling stock was made in Charlottetown. The excuse for getting it so long in advance was that it had to be built gradually. There may be something in that. The shops are not extensive, and the department went on the idea that it would do as much as it could afford each year, and that by the time the road was ready these cars would be built. I want to know how many cars are represented in that $145,992 ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I will give the exact number in a few moments. But approximately about 80 cars and six engines.

Mr. FOSTER. Are they all flat ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, some are box cars.

Mr. FOSTER. How many are box cars?

Mr. EMMERSON. I will be in a position to give the information in a moment.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose 80 cars were built by the time this money was expended, have any of them been used or are they all there, new rolling stock for this extension and bridge ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They are all there, but some of them have been used from time to time, as they were needed, in connection with the Prince Edward Island Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. What proportion of them ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They were used as they were needed. This bridge is to be used in connection with the Prince Edward Island railway system and is a part of it. Of course, they have been completed from time to time, and, if necessary, they have been used. There are 12 passenger cars, and 88 freight cars.

Mr. FOSTER. These were all new cars built there in the shops ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, the minister's answer practically is that, from 1899 up to the present, he has been, from time to time, building freight and passenger cars out of a vote on capital account for this branch and extension, and these cars have been used for the Prince Edward Island road generally. I suppose there would have been no sense in storing them and keeping them out of use. But the question is as to the accounts. Practically the minister admits that he has been getting a vote on capital account for rolling stock for this branch and he has been using it for the road in general on revenue account.

Mr. EMMERSON. With this qualification—that 40 of the old cars of the Prince Edward Island road, and 4 locomotives were used on this new branch in connection with the construction of the branch and the bridge.

Mr. FOSTER. That was the contractor's business.

Mr. EMMERSON. Of course, that was the contractor's business. But the cars and locomotives were under rental, and, in making out the estimates an allowance was charged for the use of this rolling stock.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, does not the minister see that what he has been doing is to get a vote on capital account for new cars for this branch, turn the new cars over for use on the road in general that he might be able to take from the road old cars and loan them to the contractor ? In other words he has been drawing on capital account to build rolling stock to rent or loan to the contractor. If 40 cars were taken off and it became necessary to replace them, as the minister himself has said, and if they were replaced with 40 new cars built for this extension, it is simply six of one and half a dozen of the other—he might as well say in the first place that he has built cars in order to help the contractor by renting them to him. There are two other questions I would like the minister to answer. In the first place, does he invariably charge the contractors a rental for the use of cars and engines ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Under the contract, 25 cars and 2 locomotives were to be furnished to the contractor. That was part of the consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. Under which contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Under the original contract.

Mr. FOSTER. Under the contract for eleven miles ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The original contract was not given for the whole line. The first contract was for eleven miles. And the minister now says it was a part of that contract that the contractor was to have so many engines and so many cars for the eleven miles.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was in the extension of the contract.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, I have the minister exactly where I supposed he would get to——

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman has me exactly where the facts bring me. And I always give the facts.

Mr. FOSTER. We are getting the facts, but we now have something we never had before.

Mr. BARKER. Absolutely new.

Mr. FOSTER. And how did we get it ? By threatening to stay here until summer——

Mr. EMMERSON. That is a very heroic way.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me the only way to bring the minister to his p's and q's. Now, I would like to know if the minister will bring down the agreement that was made with Mr. Kitchen—the contract for eleven miles ? Was there any agreement in the first contract for eleven miles for the loan of cars and engines as part of the consideration ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not the contract here, and, of course, I cannot get it to-night. So, I cannot give that information. The matter was discussed last year, and I did not suppose that it was necessary to bring the contract here. If my hon. friend wants that information, we need not waste further time on this item——

Mr. FOSTER. Time will not be wasted, unless the minister wastes it——

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend (Mr. Foster)—I understand that he wants this information.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. EMMERSON. We cannot get this information to-night, and so we might as well pass over this item.

Mr. FOSTER. But there is other information we want that the minister may have.

Mr. EMMERSON. Oh, very well.

Mr. EMMERSON.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister make a note of this point : We want the first contract for eleven miles, and the agreement made afterwards without contract for the building of the remaining part of the line. And will he answer this question : To what account did he charge—but there was no rental charged on some cars.

Mr. EMMERSON. Twenty-five cars and two engines—for these there was no rental ; for the remainder there was a rental.

Mr. FOSTER. To what account was that rental put ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That was credited to the Prince Edward Island Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. That is, the minister was taking from capital account and crediting to the revenues of the road ? Now, will the minister say how many engines have been bought out of that $145,992, and at what cost for each engine ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Six engines, at $59,-000 for the six.

Mr. FOSTER. When were these engines bought ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Two were purchased in 1901, two in 1902 and two last year. The two engines that were used were the old engines built away back in the seventies.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the two that were loaned to the contractor ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then you had six new engines. Have these six been in use from the time you bought them severally until the present time ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. On the Prince Edward Island road ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I want to be understood. The contractor had two under the arrangement as part of the consideration ; in addition to that he had two more. That made four engines, all of the old type, not these new engines.

Mr. FOSTER. So he had four ; he had double the number loaned.

Mr. EMMERSON. Two were under rental and two were not.

Mr. FOSTER. Were these engines old engines of the Prince Edward Island road, or were four of these new engines bought at Kingston ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They were four old engines off the Prince Edward Island road.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the six engines bought as rolling stock for the Murray Harbour branch of the road, as they were bought were turned out loose on the road

and were engaged in doing work on that road.

Mr. EMMERSON. Two of them were rented to Mr. Haney last year.

Mr. FOSTER. Then 55 freight cars and 6 engines have been in use on the Prince Edward Island road for from one to four years.

Mr. EMMERSON. Hardly that.

Mr. FOSTER. Two of them were bought in 1901 ?

Mr. EMMERSON. But this is only 1905.

Mr. FOSTER. Has any charge been made to the Prince Edward Island Railway for the use of these freight cars or engines during that time ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the information I was after, coupled with the contract and with the agreement and unless other gentlemen have some information to ask, for, so far as I am concerned I have none and I will agree to the minister's plea that this item should stand.

Mr. EMMERSON. Perhaps the hon. member will allow it to go through and then I can bring down the information ?

Mr. FOSTER. No, we must have a full explanation of this, and a full investigation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the amount of the rental of which the minister spoke a while ago as having been charged against the revenue account of the Prince Edward Island Railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. $5 a day each for locomotives, and 20 cents for the cars.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Can you state it in a lump sum ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not the figures.

Mr. BARKER. Were these new or old engines ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They were old engines built in 1870.

Mr. BARKER. Used for construction purposes ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Used for construction purposes.

Mr. BARKER. And will the hon. gentleman say after consultation with the general manager that $5 a day is a reasonable charge for the use of a locomotive on construction ?

Mr. EMMERSON. You must remember that these are the small locomotives on the Prince Edward Island Railway.

Mr. BARKER. Is it a reasonable charge for such a locomotive as these on construction ?

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in speaking of the first proposition of the Department of Railways and Canals omitted to mention one of the conditions submitted to this House when the item of $470,000 was asked for, that the people of Prince Edward Island were to contribute one half of the cost of this bridge. They agreed to pay 3½ per cent, on half the cost of the bridge and one half the cost was supposed to be $400,000. They were to pay annually about $12,000. I have not heard the minister say whether that part of the programme has been carried out or not. The other evening, I took occasion in this House as representing a constituency in one of the other provinces to say that all provinces, whether large or small should be treated in precisely the same way. I complained then of the older provinces having to contribute to the smaller or newer provinces to complete and construct their railways. In Prince Edward Island we have this railway, the construction of which was commenced in 1899. That may be a very proper thing and I have no fault to find with it, but if the government undertakes to construct a bridge which is not interprovincial as the bridge between this city and the province of Quebec, if a bridge is purely within the province, then, in constructing a railway bridge it should be purely and simply a railway bridge. In this case the government have constructed not only a railway bridge, but a bridge for the use of foot passengers and teams. Whether the government thought at the time that the offer made by Prince Edward Island was a good and sufficient offer, that is to say, that they would pay one half of the cost, and by reason of the people of Prince Edward Island agreeing to do that the government were willing to accommodate them in respect to both passenger and team traffic over this bridge, I am not prepared to say, but I would like to know as one representing a constituency in a different province whether the people of Prince Edward Island have carried out their part of the programme. In addition to that, before six o'clock I complained of the method of extending the contract for this line of railway. They have extended that 11½ miles of construction which they gave under contract. They extended the contract to Mr. Kitchen for the construction of some 32½ miles additional, it is claimed, with the same scale of prices as they allowed for the 11½ miles. If the statement of the hon. minister that this is a rough and hilly country is correct, any man knows perfectly well that the conditions surrounding the construction of the 44 miles of railway would vary and that the prices would vary very materially.

Mr. EMMERSON. You mean the total would vary ?

Mr. INGRAM. Probably two miles of the road would cost as much as 10 miles in another locality.

Mr. EMMERSON. The cost of excavation per cubic yard would not vary very much.

Mr. INGRAM. The material you would have to excavate would vary.

Mr. EMMERSON. But you had your schedule prices for that.

Mr. BARKER. A yard of material hauled 500 yards would cost very much more than a yard of material hauled one yard or 100 yards.

Mr. EMMERSON. I know that two and two make four.

Mr. INGRAM. I am not so green in regard to the matter of railway construction as the hon. minister may suppose, because I have had some experience in that line myself.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not setting up any great knowledge in respect to railway construction.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like the hon. gentleman not to interrupt by dragging a red herring across the track. Any man knows very well and an engineer ought to know better than any other man, that if you tender for the contract to build 44 miles of railway you can afford to do it on much better terms than if you undertake to construct 11½ miles. If the government had constructed this line of railway what would have followed ?—reasonable wages would have been paid to the men employed. But instead of that, the contract was extended to Mr. Kitchen, and Mr. Kitchen took very great pains to grind down those employed on the road to the lowest wages in order that Mr. Kitchen might make a big profit out of the enterprise. In addition to that there is a political feature which must not be lost sight of. In the riding of Queen's, I think it was, they issued a circular saying that if any man wanted employment on this road he should vote for Mr. McKinnon and promising that if he voted for Mr. McKinnon he would be employed. It appears that this is not a matter of hearsay, but that it is a matter of record.

Mr. EMMERSON. When did all that happen ?

Mr. INGRAM. If my hon friend will refer to the records of the court in Prince Edward Island, he will find the statement to be correct. If he has any doubt about it, all he has to do is to turn around and ask one of his followers from Prince Edward Island and he will assure him of the truth of the statement.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is not answering my question. I asked when all this happened ?

Mr. INGRAM. This was in the election in which Mr. McKinnon was elected to this House. I think it was in 1900 that Mr. McKinnon first came here and I presume it was during that time.

Mr. EMMERSON. Then the hon. gentleman is not referring to the general election?

Mr. FOSTER. It makes no difference if it is a by-election or a general election?

Mr. INGRAM. It is the same thing whether it is a by-election or a general election. The method of extending this contract is what we find fault with. We also find fault with the action of the government in coming down in the first instance and asking for this estimate. That is what we are complaining of day after day and week after week, and that is the reason why we are obliged to remain here for many months. It is for the purpose of getting information from ministers of the Crown who decline to give it unless it is actually dragged out of them as this information has been dragged out of the hon. minister to-night. We hold that when a minister comes down with his estimates he should be prepared to give a candid statement of the actual facts in connection with it.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the contract price for the first 11½ miles ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot recall that.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman make a note of that.

Mr. EMMERSON. You will have that.

Mr. FOSTER. There may be something more than the contract; it may be that there are extras.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. There was one remark made by the hon. gentleman who preceded my hon. friend from North Toronto, that I take exception to. My hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) endeavoured to imply that the cost of railways in the lower provinces such as Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia was paid by the larger provinces.

Mr. EMMERSON. By the province of Ontario ; they pay for it.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I do not quite agree with the hon. gentleman. Take for instance the question of railway subsidies ; there has been voted for railway subsidies since 1883 something like $56,000,000. Not one cent of that was expended in the maritime provinces ; at any rate not in Prince Edward Island. We have no canals in the maritime provinces and I think we are about even on that score. Probably the account is in favour of the maritime provinces. Prince Edward Island has paid for its own railways something like $3,000,000. The only railway we have got since 1873 was a small piece of line to Cape Traverse. We

are now asking for more railways, but I take exception to the way in which the government are spending the money in connection with this branch. When the estimates for these railways in the maritime provinces are exceeded by something like $24,000 per mile it is time this House took hold of the matter and made an attempt to discover what the cause of this unnecessary outlay of money is.

Mr. FOSTER. That is our point. Nobody objects to the legitimate expenditure of money in Prince Edward Island for legitimate purposes. What we object to, and as a friend of Prince Edward Island what I object to and what my friends from Prince Edward Island object to is not to a work which should cost so much, but what we object to is, that by some hocus pocus or other, the work did cost two or three times as much as it should and that it is charged up against Prince Edward Island. That is the main point to be kept in mind. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island stated that this road which was estimated at $470,000 could, he believed, have been built for $470,000. If you make it cost $1,100,000, then you have by that extravagant use of money there, made Prince Edward Island's case just that much worse instead of better. You have charged up to its account a large amount of money spent extravagantly and uselessly which for all time to come will stand as an expenditure in Prince Edward Island. What my hon. friends from Prince Edward Island stands for and what we stand for is that money shall be economically spent in Prince Edward Island as in every other province, so that they shall get the worth of the money in the work turned out as the result of these public expenditures.

Mr. INGRAM. I am sorry that my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. A. A. McLean) misunderstood me. I have argued before and I wish to argue again that this system or method of expending public money is objectionable whether it be in Prince Edward Island, or Ontario or in any other province. I want to give a sample case in the province of Ontario for the purpose of illustrating my argument. We will say, for instance, that this parliament declare that it is necessary to build a line in the province of Ontario and in the neighbourhood of Ottawa simply for the purposes of the operation of the railway. But, when you include the building of a bridge for foot passengers and teams to pass over and when you go beyond the accommodation of the railway, then I say that is a system which has not been adopted in the province of Ontario. My point in respect to Prince Edward Island was simply this ; Prince Edward Island had agreed to pay 3 per cent on half of the cost of the bridge. I presume that one of the reasons which induced them to do that was that in addition to the railway bridge they got facilities for crossing it as a highway. I merely asked the minister if the people of Prince Edward Island who were so willing to contribute had carried out their part of the bargain and paid the 3 per cent on one-half the cost of the bridge ? The people of Prince Edward Island themselves made the proposition and no man from Prince Edward Island should object to me asking if they had carried it out. We must not be too sensitive, even if we do come from Prince Edward Island or from Nova Scotia or from any other province.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not think the people of Ontario will find any fault with the government for spending a little more money so as to make the bridge afford accommodation to the people of the neighbourhood. If it is necessary to have a bridge there it would cost only a trifle more to make it a thoroughfare for teams and passengers while the work is under construction, and I do not believe the people of Canada will find any fault with the government for doing that. When he gave a subsidy of $500,000 to rebuild the Victoria bridge at Montreal it was provided that the Grand Trunk Railway should give accommodation to the general public to cross that bridge, and it has proved a very great convenience. I do not object to the opposition asking for all the information necessary to properly discuss these items, but I do protest against this useless waste of time. The whole afternoon and evening has been used up in frivolously and uselessly discussing an item which should be passed in a very few minutes. This is an old question which has been discussed year after year. All the information asked for has been given to the House in past sessions, and considering that the present Minister of Railways has not been long in the department I must say that I never saw a man who gave more information and who was more ready to answer questions. On a vote for the completion of a work it is not to be expected that all the information that has been given for several years past should be repeated. And because, forsooth, the minister does not happen to have at his finger's end all this information the mighty opposition say : We are going to hold it up if it takes all summer. It is amusing to hear the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) talking about the enormity of a bride that was estimated to cost $800,000 costing considerably more. When an estimate is brought down to the House we hope the work will be done inside the estimate, but unforeseen difficulties may occur, and unless the opposition can show that the money has been wasted it is useless to discuss the fact that the estimate has been exceeded. To hear the hon. member for North Toronto talk, one would suppose that this thing never occurred before. He was Minister of Finance for a good many years. Does he recollect the

Langevin block that was to cost $400,000 and that cost $800,000 of the people's money under his regime? Does he recollect the St. Charles branch railway, 13¼ miles long? The estimate brought down to the House of Commons—I believe by himself or by the party he supported—was that it would be completed for $500,000, but before we got through it cost us $2,300,000. That is his record. And yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) holds up his hand in holy horror because a certain work has exceeded the estimate and he threatens that he is going to keep the House here all summer long. Well, he has not much to attend to and I suppose he might as well stay here as any where else. He is fresh; he has been out of the House for the last four years and he wants all the information that has been given to the House during his absence. It is a well known fact that in all large works done by private individuals, as well as by the government, the first estimate is generally exceeded, and unless these gentlemen are prepared to show that in the construction of this bridge and railway money has been unwisely spent, they have no warrant for detaining the House. Does the ex-Minister of Finance recollect the Curran bridge in Montreal? The Curran bridge was estimated to cost $175,000, but it cost us $430,000. He forgets all that. The Liberal party was able to show that the money was wasted in that cause, and that it was not expended in the public interest, and if these gentlemen opposite can show that a single dollar of this money has been squandered they could make out a case. But, Sir, I protest against this long, useless, wearisome discussion on an item that has been discussed over and over again.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member (Mr. Campbell) challenges us to show that one dollar has been wasted and I accept his challenge. If he will turn to the Auditor General's Report and follow me he will find where $60 was wasted.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How many cents ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Never mind the cents. The Minister of Railways sent an agent to purchase oils for the Prince Edward Island Railway and another to purchase oil for the Intercolonial Railway. One of these agents went to a political friend in Charlottetown and he purchased 289 gallons of raw linseed oil at 72 cents per gallon and he bought 89 gallons of boiled oil at 75 cents. The minister sent another agent to Halifax and he purchased his raw oil at 50 cents a gallon and his boiled oil at 53 cents, so that just on that 365 gallons of oil for the Prince Edward Island Railway 23 cents a gallon more was paid in one place than in the other, which shows a loss of about $70 given to political friends. Nearly all the supplies for the Intercolonial Railway are bought in this way, and the money is dribbled out to political friends of the government. In some cases they do not even go to the trouble in these items to make a distinction between the raw and the boiled linseed oil. My hon. friend will certainly admit that there is a dollar wasted there.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If the hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) had been here this afternoon, I do not think he would have spoken of this transaction as a trifling matter. I think it is one of vital interest to the people of this country ; and as for the minister hinting this afternoon that because I am from Ontario I have no right to take part in this debate, I wish to tell him that I consider it my bounden duty to take a direct interest in it.

Mr. EMMERSON. Will my hon. friend pardon me ? I certainly took no exception to my hon. friend as coming from Ontario taking part in this debate. I did take exception to this, that living in Ontario, and not having a knowledge of the citizens of New Brunswick, he should have endeavoured to cast a slur on a very worthy man, who stands as high in his community as does my hon. friend in the community from which he comes ; and I have a right to assume that he stands very high in that community, or he would not be here. My hon. friend who represents the county of York (Mr. Crocket) can, I think, speak of the citizenship and standing of Mr. Kitchen. I took exception to the hon. member referring to him as 'that noted character Kitchen.'

Mr. FOSTER. No, no.

Mr. EMMERSON. He used the word 'noted,' with a slur in it.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I beg to differ with the hon. minister. I did not use the word with a slur, as he would lead the House to believe. I made the statement that a noted gentleman by the name of Kitchen was deeply interested in this matter ; and if I were referring to the hon. minister, I would look upon him as somewhat noted. As I said before, the hon. member for Centre York is evidently not acquainted with the subject before the House, or he would understand that the original estimate of the cost of the Murray Harbour Railway by the engineer of the Intercolonial Railway was only $474,000 and the estimated cost of the bridge was $800,000. If the hon. gentleman will compare these with the actual cost of the bridge and the railway up to the present time, he will find that it amounts to considerably over $1,000,000 in excess of the original estimate. I do not believe it is right or fair to the people of this country that the minister should come to this House and ask for votes based on low estimates, and then expect to go on and expend an extravagant amount of money. As has already been shown, a contract was let for

eleven miles of this railway, and that contract was completed ; and then the government, of which the hon. member for Centre York is a supporter, instead of inviting tenders for the construction of the balance of that road, extended the original contract for some thirty miles, and the present Minister of Railways and Canals has again extended the contract for six or eight miles. Yet the hon. member for Centre York would lead the House to believe that this is the proper businesslike way of conducting the affairs of our country. I do not believe he would dare to go into his riding and make such a statement as he has done to-night.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Oh, yes ; I have done it for years.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I think this House will find it advisable, before this vote is passed, to have this whole matter investigated by a commission. I believe that would be in the interest of our people, and I would urge on the minister to consider whether that is not the best way out of the present difficulty.

Mr. EMMERSON. There seems to have been a good deal of steam put on to-night in the attempt to make this matter appear to be something out of the ordinary ; but I think the attempt has been a dismal failure, and the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat have been one of its most dismal features. Some reference has been made to the bridge. Hon. gentlemen opposite, in utter disregard of anything that has been said, and in the effort to convince themselves that there have been no explanations and no reason assigned for any changes or for increased cost, have entirely overlooked the fact that there were special reasons why the cost of the bridge should have exceeded the original estimate. I cannot speak personally of what transpired in this House when the original estimate was presented. It is not an unusual thing, as has been pointed out by my hon. friend from Centre York (Mr. Campbell), to have the estimate exceeded by the expenditure. That occurs very frequently, sometimes under exceptional circumstances. This very bridge was started as a railway bridge. It was to cross the Hillsborough river at the head of the harbour of Charlottetown, over a wide and shallow expanse of water. An estimate was made of the cost of the bridge built on a cheap scale. Naturally, the people of the island were deeply interested in getting the bridge, which furnished the connection between Charlottetown and a flourishing section of country. However, the project widened out, and it gradually began to dawn on the people that it was essential that the bridge should be a combined railway and highway. This may not have been intended at its inception, but it was considered necessary to make it a better bridge, and to that end steps were taken. After the original estimate, negotiations were had with the province of Prince Edward Island, and hon. members will find two Acts of this parliament ratifying agreements which had been entered into between the province of Prince Edward Island and the government of Canada with respect to the construction of the Hillsborough bridge, whereby it was provided that if the government of Canada undertook to build the bridge and to provide certain facilities, the province of Prince Edward Island agreed that there should be withheld from its subsidy annually after the construction of the bridge the sum of $9,750 in half-yearly payments. This is a part of the statute law of this Dominion. That is an agreement which was entered into in the year 1900 between Prince Edward Island and the Dominion.

Mr. FOSTER. That is in force yet.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What amount of money ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The original was $12,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the minister ever have a calculation made to ascertain what amount that would be of present money ? I have no doubt he has.

Mr. EMMERSON. I fancy there may be something in the department but I have not got it before me. In addition to that the provincial government was to keep in repair the planking of the highway portion of the bridge. I understand from hon. gentlemen opposite that the original estimate was presented to parliament in 1899. In 1900 this agreement was entered into, but I think it was not finally concluded until a later date. In the meantime the character of the bridge was determined in so far as the plans and specifications were concerned. It was deemed requisite that instead of crib work, the approaches over that long stretch of lagoon should be an earth and stone embankment, and I think that the change was a very wise economy. Of course that would cost more. They required to enlarge the waterway. That involved a change with respect to the cost of the superstructure. It required two abutments and one pier additional, and they found it necessary to have four pneumatic piers. Any one at all familiar with the construction of pneumatic piers and who has any knowledge whatever as to the practical construction of a bridge such as that across the Hillsborough river must realize that this is very expensive work. One of the abutments also had to be constructed by the pneumatic process. All this involved a larger expenditure which is justified by the conditions, and a contract was entered into whereby the contractor was held down to the schedule rates. That was done after inviting competition. My hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) complains

about $1.52½ cents, or something like that, was expended more on the Prince Edward Island for linseed oil.

Mr. TAYLOR. $83.95 more.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am glad my hon. friend has figured it out, but let me say this to him. It is all very well for him to insinuate that the department sends an agent to Halifax to purchase supplies at a certain rate, and then sends another to Charlottetown or Summerside to purchase there at different rates, but he ought to know that these purchases on the Intercolonial Railway are made by annual tender and contract and the same is done with respect to purchases in connection with the Prince Edward Island Railway. Any material required in the operation of the road is purchased after tenders have been called for, I have observed that the prices on Prince Edward Island for certain articles are higher than those on the mainland. Whether that is due to the isolated condition of the island, whether it be because they have to furnish a certain proportion of the material during the winter when things cost more, I do not know, but I know that the tenders on the island are perceptibly higher than those on the mainland, but we accept the lowest, and it was under those conditions that this linseed oil was purchased. It was a terrible thing that it should have cost so much more, but it was purchased at the lowest tender price.

Mr. TAYLOR. Were public tenders asked for, because I only see in the Auditor General's Report the names of my hon. friend's political supporters figuring in the furnishing of supplies ?

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend will look through the Auditor General's Report, he will find there contractors of all shades of public opinion, not only in Charlottetown and Halifax, but clear away up to the county represented by himself, and I am calling for tenders from day to day from all these people.

Mr. COCHRANE. But you do not accept them ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I accept the lowest very naturally. These contracts which my hon. friend asked for were here, if I mistake not, two sessions ago.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I do not think they were ever produced.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am pretty certain they were. They were not produced last year, because I was not asked for them.

Mr. BARKER. They were produced in this fashion. If the hon. gentleman took one up from the manager and said he had a contract, that is the way those things are produced in this House.

Mr. EMMERSON.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend will not say that I produce papers in that way.

Mr. BARKER. I do not say so. I am speaking of what is being done.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am always anxious to give all possible information. As far as I have knowledge of this transaction, it is better to give the facts and the information to the House rather than withhold them. I can see no good reason why these matters should be withheld. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) indulged in a little mock heroics just previous to recess. He said they were going to stay here for ever so long and that this was a peculiar transaction. Well, we have heard that kind of thing often before. If this is a peculiar transaction, we had so many of them in the days when my hon. friend was responsible, that he need hardly have become so excited. Take for instance the St. Charles branch, the expenditure on which my hon. friend must have fresh in his memory, but as that has been referred to by my hon. friend from York (Mr. Campbell) I shall not refer to it any farther. But I only invite attention to it to show that it is not necessary any hon. member should indulge in language of that kind with reference to any transaction which has been before parliament. Perhaps it was the misfortune of my hon. friends opposite that they did not have my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) here during last parliament. He evidently thinks it was or he would not now be asking that all this information should be again brought down and rehashed over after the vote has been taken and parliament has approved of the work and appropriated the money for it. It did not seem to me necessary that all that information should be brought down again before this committee. But, if, in the judgment of the committee, this is necessary, I submit to that judgment and will be glad to furnish the information.

Mr. LEFURGEY. May I ask, with regard to the approaches to the bridge on the Charlottetown side, if the value of the land has been arrived at and a settlement arranged ?

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend refers to the Warburton lands ?

Mr. LEFURGEY. I do not know the name.

Mr. EMMERSON. There were lands known as the Warburton lands. A certain area was expropriated, but an appeal has been allowed, and the matter is still before the court.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What was the quantity of land and the amount awarded by the court ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The area was 4¾ acres, and the amount $5,000, I think.

Mr. BARKER. I wish to make a remark upon the intervention in the debate on this subject, for the first time in the four or five years in which it has been discussed, of the hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell). That hon. gentleman has been in the House every year during which this matter has been discussed. But his only intervention in the debate up to this time has been by pulling down his hat over his nose and a calling 'carried.' It became, as everybody in the House knows, a subject of laughter and derision. The hon. gentleman never wanted any discussion. And the only object of his intervention to-night—and it was with some success—was to draw a herring across the track, to divert the discussion from the subject before us. Everybody who was in the last parliament knows that this question of the Murray Harbour branch has been discussed year after year. From 1901 onwards, I took part in this discussion. I endeavoured to get at the facts. From the former minister, I never got one solitary bit of information of a useful character more than we have got from the minister (Hon. Mr. Emmerson) to-night. Year after year he got off on some side issue. And the minister to-night gets off on the plea that he was not the minister the year before last——

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not crawling out of it on that.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman was in the House, and he knows that this question of the Murray Harbour branch has excited great interest in the country. Yet, this year, he puts into the estimates a very large sum for this work, and, instead of preparing himself to give information which he knows the House has been endeavouring to obtain year after year, he does not know any more about it than do gentlemen about him not connected with the Railway Department. He has been forced, step by step, to give certain information. He has produced some little paper, handed him by the officer in the department, and he reads that as if it were something that he had been considering before he brought down this item. He actually tells us that we ought to reflect that this work is developing, that it is not what it originally was. One would suppose from what he says that there had been great changes in it. I defy him to show that there is one feature of the work that was not contemplated when the matter was first explained. I do not speak of matters of small detail, of course. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) speaks of it as a great highway for the people there. But that is not new. When the work was first proposed and we were told it would cost $470,000, this is what the minister of that time said :

I may explain that the bridge will be not only a railway bridge but a highway and traffic bridge for vehicles and pedestrians.

The whole structure as we have it to-day is as it was originally contemplated. We were told the railway would cost $470,000 and the bridge apart from the superstructure $800,000 ; that is the whole work, apart from the superstructure of the bridge, was to cost $1,270,000. It has been before the House for the last four or five years, and the hon. member for Centre York has sat there with his 'carried' and voted three and a half million for that work. He has never questioned it, and he would not have questioned it had it been ten and a half millions—it would have been all the same to him ; what does he care about it ? He sits behind the minister and calls 'carried ?, And yet this gentleman who treats important matters of this kind in this way stands up and criticises gentlemen on this side who are endeavouring to do their duty. Now, I understand the minister is willing to give us the information we have been asking for. And if I understand him, he is willing to let the item stand until he has given us the information. I hope he will. Let him take this from the beginning and compare the estimate for the work with the expenditure before the House and let him give us a fair statement of what has been done and what is proposed, and he will find no obstruction on this side. We are prepared to spend any necessary sum for public works in Prince Edward Island or any other part of the country. But we object to standing before a minister who practically tells us that he does not know what he is asking for, but refers us to discussion on the past.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am obliged to the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) for the lecture he has given me. It is true that I have not occupied as much time in discussing these items as he has. Possibly I have been a subject of derision as he says. But I can tell him one thing—if I was the subject of derision, it was when I was in my seat and not on my feet making a fool of myself. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) has taken up a great deal of the time of the House. He poses as a great railway man ; he is the railway expert of hon. gentlemen opposite. And, for the last four years he has had this question up, asking the same questions and desiring the same information.

Mr. BARKER. I never got an answer.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I venture to say there never was a subject upon which fuller information was given. The minister has referred hon. members to the Auditor General's Report giving all the information any man could expect. He has told you the amount of the first estimate and the cost, the arrangement made with the Island government and the amount that that government paid and he has furnished all the information that any man would want. It appears to me that the hon. gentlemen do not want infor-

mation. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) let the cat out of the bag when he said they would stay here all summer. That is the idea, it is to obstruct and keep back instead of getting information. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has got his information every year for four years and he has gone over the same questions all afternoon and again tonight, and I venture to say that again next year the same formula will be gone over again the same questions will be answered and we have to stay here and take it.

Mr. HENDERSON. Poor fellow.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am sure we shall give to the protest of the hon. member from Centre York (Mr. Campbell) all the consideration that it deserves. I would like to say to the minister that as this estimate was made very much in detail, as it shows that the cost of 42·85 miles was to be $447,000 to which is to be added $22,800 for a wharf at Murray bridge, making a total of $470,000, and as the total cost of that work has not been confined to the $470,000, but has extended, as I understand, to $1,030,000 or nearly $600,000 more, as you have in detail here all the items of expenditure, and as there has been that enormous difference, I would think that the minister ought to be prepared, when this matter is again taken up, and when he lays before the committee the information that has been asked for this evening, to go over this estimate a little in detail and show us in what items the enormously increased expenditure has taken place. The estimate is made in the utmost detail, and includes about 30 different items comprising clearing, close-cutting, cropping, earth excavation, rock excavation, ditching, fencing, public crossings, farm crossings, ballast, rails, fastenings, culverts, sidings, stations,—everything is set out in the utmost possible detail. The information for which I have asked must be in the possession of the department, and I think it should be furnished to us. Some one has spoken of unforeseen difficulties; I think it was the hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell). I do not remember whether the minister spoke of them.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was in connection with the bridge?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not speaking of the bridge just at present. Then there were unforeseen difficulties so far as the railway is concerned?

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot speak as to that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That makes the situation worse. There are no unforeseen difficulties.

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not say that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I beg pardon.

Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. EMMERSON. I said I could not speak as to that; I could not give that information.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I must say, with all deference to my hon friend, that when he comes to justify an increase in expenditure of more than $500,000 he should be able to at least inform the committee whether or not there were any unforeseen difficulties, because if there were not, the increased expenditure seems to me to be of a very peculiar character. However, the minister himself, suggested that the item should stand, and I think it is a very wise thing to have it stand, I bring to the attention of the minister these matters to which I have just referred, in order that we may have a more detailed explanation of the increased expenditure when the item is next presented for the consideration of the committee.

Mr. EMMERSON. Some hon. member has made the statement that the railway cost $32,000 per mile. That statement, taking the estimate which I brought to the notice of the House last year, is very far from the fact. The actual cost, according to the estimate of the expenditure as detailed by me, was less than $25,000 per mile. It was about $24,600 per mile, which includes the rolling stock, but does not include the Hillsborough river bridge and wharfs.

Mr. BARKER. That is part of the railway is it not?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, the Murray Harbour wharf was a work that was to be built for the railway; it is not being built, there has been no expenditure made on it; there is an estimate with respect to it that it would cost about $70,000, but the total expenditures—and I have given them right to November 30—and indeed the total estimated cost is as I have stated somewhere about $24,600; so that the hon. gentleman who made the statement that it cost $32,000 was very much astray; at least he was $8,000 astray. I do not think he would wish that statement to go on record or to misrepresent me.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that the remark was made, I think, by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., but as the minister did not have the different items separated, that is the bridge and the railway, he inadvertently included the $200,000 for rolling stock.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have given that time and time again; I gave the information the other night.

Mr. LEFURGEY. This remark was made the other night and if the hon. gentleman did inadvertently make the mistake of $8,000, he is surely less to blame than the government, who, from the minister's own statement, made a difference between the estimate and the cost of construction of

some $16,600 a mile. This work was not to cost over $10,000 per mile according to this sheet which we have here, and the minister himself declares that it has cost $24,600 a mile, so I do not know which is to be blamed the more, the government or the hon. member for Queen's.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think he is to blame at all; I think he wants to correct the error.

Mr. LEFURGEY. We from Prince Edward Island are very sorry to have this matter brought before the House year after year, but I know that since I have been in the House we have asked time and time again for information about both of these works. We were always met by the cry that it was going to cost so much more. No excuse or no explanation was given, excepting that it was going to cost so much more, and that so much more money was needed. It was $470,000 for the railway and $800,000 for the bridge. Next year $200,000 more was asked for the contractors. There should be no great cry raised against the opposition for inquiring into such a state of affairs, and I think it is due to the people of Prince Edward Island, and due to the members of this House, that some explanation should be given for the increased cost of these works. Prince Edward Island is certainly entitled to a great deal more than she has received, even if these works cost the enormous sums which the hon. minister has placed before the House. The Conservative party is not complaining about these works being constructed in Prince Edward Island. The Conservative party was pledged in 1896 to the construction of these works, and the Liberal government is only carrying out what is actually due to Prince Edward Island. In view of the immense amounts of money that have been expended in subsidies to railways, in building the canals and in numerous other works, particularly the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme, which does not directly benefit Prince Edward Island, Prince Edward Island has received a very small share of the public works and of the moneys that should have been expended, and we hope and believe that if this government is true to its pledges it will construct other lines in Prince Edward Island which are necessary. If the government is sincere and true to its pre-election promises, we believe we will get these lines. But it is due to us to know and to feel that the moneys of this Dominion that are expended on public works in Prince Edward Island are expended legitimately and fairly. That is all that this side of the House is asking of the hon. minister.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. minister remember to bring down the information as to what the wharf cost ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The wharf ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes ; the hon. gentleman will see that it is not included in this item.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is not yet built.

Mr. FOSTER. But you have expended some money on the harbour improvements there.

Mr. EMMERSON. Nothing was expended up to the 30th November on the wharf at Murray Harbour.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there anything out of this vote that is to go to the wharf or to cribwork there ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What is that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. $69,955 is to go to the wharf at Murray Harbour. It is included in this vote that we are asking for of $357,400.

Mr. FOSTER. But the hon. minister will see how very inconvenient it is that large sums of money shall be completely hidden in a vote which gives not the least indication at all of the service to which that money is to be voted. I would suggest, if the hon. minister would consent, that we should put it in this way :

Murray Harbour branch, Murray Harbour wharf and Hillsborough bridge.

You are only taking money for the Murray Harbour branch and Hillsborough bridge, and I can tell the hon. gentleman that the Auditor General would find a very excellent excuse for refusing to certify any money for anything else except the Murray Harbour branch and the Hillsborough bridge. All these should have been under three separate heads. You should have put in what you wanted for the Murray Harbour Branch Railway, for the Hillsborough bridge and for the Murray Harbour wharf.

Mr. EMMERSON. We will consider that when the matter is again taken up. This vote is to stand.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Do we understand that the estimates before us to-night will complete the work ; or, if not, how much more will be required to complete both the bridge and the railway, with stations and necessary sidings ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That completes the estimate.

Item allowed to stand.

To improve water service, $10,200.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The water service on the Intercolonial Railway is by elevated tanks, and they fill the tenders from these tanks. On the Prince Edward Island Railway they have to pump the water by an inspirator, and, as it takes a great deal of time, we are changing the method of doing this. Last year we took a vote of $26,800. The estimated expenditure will be $15,000.

We are asking for a revote for 1905 of $10,200.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the total amount estimated for the whole improvement ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The total estimated cost was $30,000, but we are only asking for $26,800.

Mr. FOSTER. So that in order to complete there will have to be a further vote ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There will be a small further vote.

Branch line from Cardigan to Montague bridge, $75,000.

Mr. LEFURGEY. To what extent has this work been carried on ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This line was let. Mr. Kitchen was the contractor for this work. The total estimated cost of the line is $195,-128.

Mr. LEFURGEY. How many miles are let ?

Mr. EMMERSON. About six and a half miles.

Mr. LEFURGEY. That makes about $30,000 a mile. Is this a difficult section ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, it is considered very difficult, I believe.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Were tenders asked for ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. LEFURGEY. How many tenders were there ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Three or four.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Who were the tenderers ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was advertised in the newspapers and there was only one tenderer, Kitchen & Co.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What was his tender?

Mr. EMMERSON. I will give the details as to the estimate : Contract price for grading, $121,000; for ties, $7,080; for rails, $13,-200; for fish plates, $1,144; poles, $460; spikes, $969; land for right of way, $14,325; bridges at Brudenelles and Vichy creek, $24,000; telegraph lines, $650; snow fences and land, $4,000; contingencies, $8,000.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Will you give us the cost per mile?

Mr. EMMERSON. I will give you a detailed estimate of the $121,000.

Mr. KEMP. Does the minister say that public tenders were asked for and that only one contractor tendered? How does the minister account for that?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know how to account for it. It was advertised in the newspapers of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec and also in the newspapers of Prince Edward Island and by posters there.

Mr. LEFURGEY. It was not advertised in Ontario?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not sure, but I do not think these advertisements usually escape the newspapers.

Mr. KEMP. It is the most remarkable case I ever heard of.

Mr. EMMERSON. There are lots of similar cases every day. I am often surprised that with respect to materials advertised for there is often only one tender. I suppose it shows that every one has as much work as they can attend to.

Mr. KEMP. The hon. gentleman says he advertised in all the newspapers.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would not say 'all.'

Mr. KEMP. All the prominent newspapers?

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, the choicest; the truthful ones.

Mr. KEMP. The minister must know that there are a great many contractors ; they are to be seen on the streets of this city and in the lobbies of this House, anxious to get work. In the provinces in which the minister advertised for tenders for 6½ miles of railway to cost $190,000 there must be two and a half millions of people and yet there was only one tender. This railway in the province of Prince Edward Island is to cost $30,000 a mile and yet the Minister of Finance estimated last year that the National Transcontinental line through the Rocky mountains would not cost much more than this. Here we have $30,000 a mile to build a railway through a level inhabited country and all there is for bridging on that six and a half miles is $24,000—what is the gauge?

Mr. EMMERSON. Narrow gauge.

Mr. KEMP. And a narrow gauge railway at that.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The main line of the Prince Edward Island Railway throughout its whole length only cost $8,000 a mile.

Mr. KEMP. If the minister does not feel at liberty to make any further explanation as to this extraordinary thing, I suppose I will have to leave it at that.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Will the minister bring down the schedule of prices under which the contract was let to Mr. Kitchen?

Mr. FOSTER. Before tenders were asked for did the engineers of the department make a survey and an estimate of the cost?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes. $195,128 is the estimate made by the engineers of the de-

partment, and that is based on the surveys made by those engineers. The contract is made at the scheduled prices.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister no explanation to make as to why six and a half miles of road in Prince Edward Island alongside of the main line cost so much per mile, while the main line cost so much less ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have given the details of the engineers' estimates, which is the only information I can give to my hon. friend. The estimates are based on the engineers' report made upon the surveys under instructions from the department, and I have a right to assume that they did the work correctly and honestly. I am in their hands in that respect, and I am giving exactly what they have furnished to me through their general manager. Last year I asked for $100,000. We anticipate that $25,000 of this, will have been expended by the 1st of July, and we are asking for $75,000 of a revote.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this road being built on any better grades, or is it of a higher standard than the main line ?

Mr. EMMERSON. As to alignment it probably would be, because the alignment of the Prince Edward Island Railway was certainly very defective, and it has been necessary since the original construction of the line to expend a great deal of money in straightening it. But otherwise, I do not think there is any higher standard asked for.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister, of his personal knowledge, know, or can his officers inform him whether the country through which these six and a half miles run, is of a much different character from the general country in Prince Edward Island through which the other roads run ? For instance, the Murray branch road, even at what it has cost, is being built for a good deal less than these six and a half miles.

Mr. EMMERSON. The chief engineer, Mr. Mackenzie, told me that it was a very difficult section of country through which to build a line of railway. This information came to me during the last session of parliament, at the time the original vote was taken. I was surprised to learn that the cost of the road would be so much, but it was on a line with the chief engineer's report. In Prince Edward Island there is this difficulty, that there are no large rivers with valleys which you can follow up in constructing a railway.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would like to ask the minister if the survey has been prepared for a branch line from West Cape to O'Leary or some other place on the main line ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That survey has not been made.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Can the minister assure me that in the spring when the weather conditions permit, the survey for that branch will go on ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We have a vote for it. I had expected that the survey would have been made before this. I have that survey in mind.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I know that section of country very thoroughly and its absolute need of a branch line. It is one of the most fertile sections in Prince Edward Island, there is a stretch of 10, 15 or 20 miles where they have absolutely no method of getting their produce to railway except by teams, and for a good many miles along that section there is no accommodation for vessels to carry their produce to the other side. It is certainly very necessary that some railway accommodation should be given these people, and the natural course of the territory over which that railway would go would make its building very economical. I trust that the hon. minister will have in the spring a survey made on this line so that the work may be gone on with as early as possible.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I think that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), in the question he put to the hon. the Minister of Railways referred to the original railway of Prince Edward Island built some 30 years ago, whereas the minister evidently thought he was referring to the Murray Harbour branch. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) asked, was there any reason why this road should cost more per mile—was it broader or wider or was there anything to make it cost more. I understand that the dumps and the cuts of the proposed branch will be wider and that they are also considerably wider on the Murray Harbour branch.

Mr. FOSTER. That may be.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. In consequence of that it will be easier to operate as the cuttings being wider the snow will not lodge in them so easily, but that would be one reason for its costing more. The original road was what is called a surface road and was built in as cheap a way as possible. Consequently a good deal of expenditure has had to be made since to keep it in proper repair and straighten it. The culverts were also of as cheap a kind as possible whereas the culverts on this new road are of good masonry and of very much better character. I think that the cost of the old railway is greater than the sum of $8,000 per mile which was given by my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Lefurgey).

Mr. LEFURGEY. That has been stated on the floor of this House and not contradicted.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I am not prepared to contradict that statement, but the lowest

price I have heard given was $13,000 a mile. The $8,000 could not have included the rolling stock.

Mr. EMMERSON. If you are discussing the question of the original construction of the Prince Edward Island Railway, it must be borne in mind that for many years, that railway was not ballasted at all, and it was very far below the standard of the Murray Harbour branch or the proposed new branch. These branches are up to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway, but of course with a narrow gauge.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Do you mean to say that the main line of the Prince Edward Island Railway is not up to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am speaking of the original line. My hon. friend gave the cost as $8,000 per mile. I do not know whether that is correct or not, but I presume my hon. friend wanted to be correct.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I am not sure, but I have heard that estimate given. However, as my hon. friend from King's says, possibly that does not include the rolling stock.

Mr. EMMERSON. I want to point out that the original main line of the Prince Edward Island Railway was operated for many years without even any ballasting on the road. I think that the ballasting has been done since it became a government road.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What I would like at present is that this branch line should be surveyed from West Point to O'Leary, and I would like to have the assurance of the minister to that effect, because I have letters from people down there asking if it is necessary, now that the elections are over, for them to petition the government to have that survey go on.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is no necessity for any petition. The reason I could not have that line surveyed last year was because we had not sufficient engineers. I did the best I possibly could but expect to have engineers there this spring to make the survey.

Mr. INGRAM. The exact figures are $195,000. I did not understand that Kitchen & Company was the only firm that tendered.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have given the estimate of the department.

Mr. BLAIN. What is to be understood by doing this work at schedule rate ? The minister said that as there was only one tender he would not accept it, but the work was to be done by schedule.

Mr. EMMERSON. We asked for tenders at schedule rates—so much per cubic yard for concrete, so much for earth embankment, so much for excavation, stone foundations, abutments, culverts and so on, each class of work having schedule prices attached to it. If you only have to excavate 200,000 yards, instead of 300,000, your expenditure is so much less. It is not a bulk sum, and that is why all tenders are asked for at schedule rates.

Mr. BLAIN. How long has the work been going on ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This was only authorized at the last session of parliament, tenders were asked for in November, and the contract was entered into in December.

Mr. BLAIN. Does this contractor do the masonry and the grading and the laying of rails and all the different class of work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, only the road laying.

Mr. INGRAM. Is this the only method of letting contracts ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Not the only method, but the one that has been generally pursued on the Intercolonial Railway and in connection with other railways for some years. I know that the Murray Harbour and the Rivière Ouelle branches and other lines have been let according to that method. That also is the method which has been pursued on the canals for a great many years.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the hon. gentleman find that the contractors object to tendering on that principle ? Suppose you have 6½ miles of road to construct according to certain plans and specifications, would the contractors not prefer taking the contract to build under those plans and specifications rather than according to the scale the hon. gentleman mentioned.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not consulted the contractors ; I did not think it my duty to consider what would be better in their interest. I only know that this is the course pursued by the department in connection with the canals for many years, and, I believe, in connection with railway contracts also. The amount of work done can readily be ascertained and calculating it on the basis of the schedule prices, you demonstrate at once the value of the work.

Mr. INGRAM. What I was asking was whether the contractors have complained ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not recollect any complaints on that score.

Prince Edward Island Railway—Summerside, improvements at, $8,000.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What are these improvements ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Of this amount, $2,000 is to be expended in widening the wharf and extending the freight shed on the wharf

and on the land. There is some question as to other improvements needed there, but I have not been able to go into them personally. I want to go there when I am at Charlottetown this spring to consult the board of trade who have certain views as to work that should be done.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Is it something in connection with yards.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I thought it was for that, and I trust the minister will go there at the earliest day possible.

Mr. EMMERSON. As soon as I can get to Charlottetown. I will make one trip do both.

Mr. LEFURGEY. It is very dangerous to the public and very inconvenient as well.

Prince Edward Island Railway—branch line to Vernon river bridge, $30,000.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Has a contract been let for that work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, to Messrs. Schurman, Morrison, Mutch & Co.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. What is the amount ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The total estimated cost was $72,000.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Has the right of way been purchased ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, we have provided in this estimate of $72,000 a sum of $10,000 for the purchase of right of way.

Mr. FOSTER. For how many miles ?

Mr. EMMERSON. For 4·6 miles. This estimate covers also purchase of lands in connection with the railway, including a station terminal at Vernon river.

Mr. KEMP. This line of a little over four and a half miles is to cost $72,000. The estimated cost for six and a half miles of the other branch was $195,000. What causes the difference ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is of easier construction. Of course, the estimate is based on the survey of the engineer, who served under the same chief as the engineer in the other case. This is not at the extreme eastern section or down near Murray Harbour or Charlottetown where the land is undulating, making railway construction difficult.

Prince Edward Island Railway—swing span for Morrell river bridge, $15,000.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Has anything been expended on that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Nothing yet. The contract has been let and we estimate that the expenditure this year will be $10,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that on the main line of the road ?

Prince Edward Island Railway—to apply M. C. B. coupler to rolling stock, $11,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What does that mean ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We are going over the rolling stock of the line and putting on the standard coupler.

Mr. FOSTER. What does 'M. C. B.' mean ?

Mr. EMMERSON. 'Master Car Builders.' It is the standard coupler all over the continent.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is it made ?

Mr. EMMERSON. At different places in Canada, including Walkerville and Montreal, and at a number of places in the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. How does the department buy it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. By tender.

Mr. FOSTER. There is practical competition, is there ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Prince Edward Island Railway—to apply Westinghouse air-brakes and air signals, $20,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is the usual vote.

Mr. FOSTER. The usual ? It is not to go on for all time, is it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We are trying to get the whole line equipped with these air brakes and signals.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the estimated total expenditure ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Fifty thousand dollars.

Mr. FOSTER. How much has been spent so far ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Up to November 30 last $38,775.

Mr. KEMP. Have ordinary hand brakes been used on the cars and locomotives ?

Mr. EMMERSON. On freight cars ; but on passenger cars we have had the Vacuum brake.

To increase accommodation at Kensington, $2,200.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is to provide a balance of $2,200 in connection with the building of a station at this point.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queen's, P.E.I.). The minister informed the House, in answer to a question by the hon. the senior member for Queen's (Mr. A. Martin), that a survey had been made for a branch railway to New London, but that the report had not been handed in owing to the illness of the engineer who had made the survey. I would like to ask the minister if it is the intention of the government to proceed with the work

of the construction of that New London branch ? New London is situated on the north side of the island, and of late years the harbour has been filling up with sand, so that it is now almost impossible for a vessel of any size to enter the harbour. The people are handicapped owing to their having no facilities for shipping produce and other commodities. They are too far from the main branch of the Prince Edward Island Railway to make use of it, and they have repeatedly petitioned the government of Canada, and the matter has been brought up on several occasions, but nothing has been done towards providing them with railway accommodation beyond the making of a survey. I am informed that the engineer who made the survey has recovered from his illness, and I would ask the minister to obtain his report as soon as possible. I notice that there is nothing in the estimates for the construction of that line, and I would ask if it is the intention of the minister to proceed with this branch line ? It is perhaps the most necessary work in the province at the present time. I would also mention the branch to Rustico, which is also in contemplation by the present government. I would think that an amount would be placed in the supplementaries for the completion of the new London work. It is a small work, and I think it should be completed.

Mr. EMMERSON. As I stated, the surveys and the report of the engineer have not been placed before me, and I am certainly not in a position to submit any estimate to parliament. Last session we asked for a vote to enable us to have a survey ; the survey was made, but, unfortunately, the engineer was taken ill, and it is impossible to get the results of that survey in concrete form, so that the department would be in a position to decide the question which my hon. friend asks. Of course, it would depend largely on the result of the engineer's report, and I would hope that it may be considered in time for the supplementaries. Certainly it will be given due consideration.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I understand that the engineer has recovered from his illness, and probably, if the minister would ask, he could get the report.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not yet received the report. Mr. Ruel, I think, was the engineer.

To increase accommodation at Georgetown, $18,500.

Mr. EMMERSON. That requires some dredging and rails and fastenings on the wharf there. We also want a creosoted pile wharf there, and additional accommodation, and an extension to the freight shed.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister his detailed estimates there of what that will cost ?

Mr. EMMERSON (reading) :

Dredging to 20 feet of water	$ 3,840 00
Rails and fastenings	2,000 00
Creosoted pile wharf	27,511 11
Extension to freight shed	5,500 00
Engineering and contingencies	1,148 89
Total	40,000 00

The estimated expenditure during the present current year is $15,000. The warrant for this expenditure is found in the fact that Georgetown is the port of call in winter for the winter boats plying between the mainland and Prince Edward Island. They certainly need additional accommodation there for these boats, apart from any requirement they may have in connection with summer navigation. I have personally viewed the situation there, and I know whereof I speak.

Freetown—dwelling for agent at, $1,560.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is to furnish a dwelling for the station agent.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you not build these as additions to the station house ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a separate building.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the policy that is adopted ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, that is the policy that is adopted along the line of the Intercolonial Railway very generally where we have to furnish dwelling houses at all. In the larger places we have discontinued even furnishing any dwelling for the station agent.

Mr. FOSTER. Is not that a more expensive system than to have the dwelling in the station house ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There are some dangers incident to having the dwelling in the station, and I think it has been found by actual experience along the line to be a little more expensive having them in the station.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it customary to build houses for agents on the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The custom was established on the Intercolonial Railway because, when the Intercolonial Railway was built, it ran largely through a country that was not very well settled, and it was necessary to furnish the agents with living accommodation.

Mr. FOSTER. That was always done in the station house.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was the custom, but that was changed, because the judgment of the officials of the department was that it was more desirable to have them out of the station. There was less danger by having them in separate buildings. This

custom of having dwellings for the station agents grew out of the practice on the old Eastern and North American line of railway between St. John and Shediac, and also on the Nova Scotia branch. When these became part of the Intercolonial Railway, in 1875 or 1876, this custom prevailed and has continued. The same custom has been adopted on the line of the Prince Edward Island Railway. There was some question as to whether my hon. friend would like to take up the revenue item.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that would be a pretty large item for us to go into to-night.

Mr. EMMERSON. The item has been discussed. It is only the usual vote excepting that we have added authority for spending more on account of the increased wages on the Intercolonial Railway and the additional mileage.

Mr. FOSTER. That vote will cause a good deal of discussion.

Mr. BLAIN. Before the hon. minister leaves that railway question, I want to ask him what would be the difference in cost of constructing a standard gauge railway as compared with a narrow gauge railway ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I certainly could not answer that off-hand. Naturally a wide gauge road would cost more, because of the width of the road, the ballasting, the larger class of ties and the heavier rails. We are using for these branch lines in Prince Edward Island now under construction a heavier rail than was put on the trunk line of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. KEMP. Are they new rails ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In many instances we are taking off the Intercolonial Railway a heavier rail which is practically a new rail, because in many instances a great many of the rails taken off the Intercolonial Railway are really new rails to all intents and purposes.

Mr. KEMP. The hon. minister has made the statement this evening that most of the purchases were made by public tender. I notice in the Auditor General's Report that there is a number of very large items amounting to $40,000. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that supplies amounting to $40,000 are furnished by public tender and contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Purchases of railway ties, lumber and heavy material are made by public tender. There is a certain class of supplies furnished, the purchase of which is made, by what you would call public tender in a sense ; that is, we sent notices to those engaged in the trade.

Mr. KEMP. I will make it explicit. For instance in the Auditor General's Report I see the following items : W-160, I. & E. R. Burpee $5,575.11 ; W-161, B. J. Coghlin & Co. $16,752.56 ; W-163, Josiah Fowler Co. $8,474.07 ; W-166, T. McAvity & Sons $31,-449.13 ; W-168, McLean, Holt & Co. $39,-182.81 ; W-169, Portland Rolling Mills Co. $39,432.80 ; W-171, Starr Manufacturing Co. $10,066.16. Are these supplies purchased by public tender ?

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend will give me a memorandum I will procure the information as to that.

Mr. KEMP. And if they are purchased by public tender will the hon. minister be good enough to furnish us with the form of tender, the amounts of the tenders and who they were from ? I will be glad to furnish the hon. member with this statement.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like the hon. minister to bring down a list of the papers in which the advertisement for the Cardigan Branch Railway was published.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I find at page W-149 of the Auditor General's Report the following items : M. J. Haney, unloading cargo of stone, $15 ; derrick unloading pine timber, 3½ d. at $30. This was a little job for an ordinary derrick and he received for it $105.

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) does not care to go on with the item of revenue, the next item on page 40 is in regard to the National Transcontinental Railway for surveys, construction and other expenses. This is a large item, but I was going to say to my hon. friend in respect to it that I can furnish him with the information as to the expenditure that has been made up to this time, but there will be necessarily an item in the supplementary estimates which will enable a full discussion of the matter to be gone into and at that time. I will then receive from the commissioners the report which the chairman told me the other day would be furnished by the secretary at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. FOSTER. The trouble as to that is that supplementary estimates have a fashion of coming down very late in the session and being crowded into the last six or seven days in the session when the House is tired out and a great majority of the members have left, we have always found that it was most unsatisfactory when an item which requires full discussion is left over to be discussed on the supplementary estimates.

Mr. EMMERSON. If there is any objection to it I am not going to press it.

Mr. FOSTER. If we are going to have a discussion upon it I hope the hon. minister will be able to give us what we want to get hold of. One thing certainly that we want

to find is a channel of communication between this House and the commission. No one on the ministerial side seems to have been able to excavate a passage of communication between the commission and the House, and surely there ought to be such a passageway whether it is a pneumatic tube or an open air gallery or whatever it may be.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would judge that my hon. friend is in a mood for furnishing the dynamite to get through.

Mr. FOSTER. We must have some information in reference to what this commission is doing in regard to the old matter of the surveys and the like of that, and we want to know as quickly as the newspapers and other people outside of this House as to the nature of these surveys. We need a lot of explicit information which the minister says he has not in his pockets to-night. Will he please put on the suit in the pockets of which the information is and wear it when he appears next time ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am afraid I have no suit the pockets of which will hold all the information you are thirsting for.

Gratuity to family of late C. J. Carter, $103.50.

Mr. INGRAM. What is this item for?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is the usual gratuity of two months' wages to the family of an old servant.

Mr. INGRAM. I approve of the item, but I point out that last year I brought up the question of a person who lost his life in the government service through no fault of his own, and I asked that some provision should be made for the widow and family.

Mr. EMMERSON. That opens up a very much wider question. I am in hopes that such cases will be dealt with in a Bill that I am trying to bring before parliament.

Portion of interest on cost of double track between St. Lambert and Belœil, $2,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are you sure that is right?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is in accordance with the agreement which we have with the Grand Trunk Railway. We certainly need this double track to expedite the movement of trains on that portion of the line.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In glancing over the claims which have been made by the government against the Grand Trunk Railway in the arbitration proceedings, as well as those made by the Grand Trunk Railway against the government, I find that the government claim they have made a great many payments which they should not have made and which they are now seeking to get back. It would seem that a great deal of caution should be exercised in making these payments demanded by the Grand Trunk Railway, because it is very much easier to investigate them beforehand than after they have been paid. I do not object to this item passing, but we must have an opportunity of discussing the claims that have been made, and of ascertaining fully the position of the arbitration which is still pending between the government and the railway company.

Some resolutions reported.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken up at the next sitting?

Mr. FIELDING. There may be some Bills which will have priority and the Minister of Railways will continue his estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. No budget speech on Thursday?

Mr. FIELDING. No; there is lots of time.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 9, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 102) respecting a certain patent of the Gold Medal Furniture Manufacturing Company, Limited.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 103) respecting the Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Tobin.

Bill (No. 104) respecting the Northern Bank.—Mr. Bole.

Bill (No. 105) to incorporate the Ontario Fire Insurance Company.—Mr, Boyce.

Bill (No. 106) respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Black.

Bill (No. 107) respecting a certain patent of Celeste Joly.—Mr. Ralph Smith—by Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 108) to incorporate the Western Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Adamson—by Mr. Burrows.

Bill (No. 109) respecting the Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 110) respecting the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 111) to incorporate the Saskatchewan Bridge Company.—Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 112) respecting the Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Railway Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 113) respecting the Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Railways Company.—Mr. Dyment—by Mr. Parmelee.

Bill (No. 114) respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment—by Mr. Parmelee.

Bill (No. 115) respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Company.—Mr. L. G. McCarthy—by Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 116) respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment—by Mr. Parmelee.

Bill (No. 117) to incorporate the Athabasca Railway and Oil Company.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 118) regarding the Alberta Central Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 119) to incorporate the D. R. Fraser Company, Limited.—Mr. Oliver.

QUESTIONS.

THE ROYAL CANADIAN MINT.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What is the estimated cost of equipment of the Royal Canadian Mint in machinery and appliances for coinage ?
2. What is the estimated cost of working per year, including number and wages of staff ; and by whom will the working staff be appointed ?
3. What is the capacity of the mint ? What amount of gold bullion could be coined per year, exclusive of the necessary silver and copper coinage for use in Canada ?
4. What was the amount of gold held in reserve on January 1st, 1905, by the Dominion, and by all the Canadian banks, respectively ?
5. Is it the intention to coin free of charge all gold bullion brought to the mint ? If not, what charge is proposed ?
6. What charge, if any, is to be made for coinage of gold for the British government ?
7. How much is it estimated will be coined for the British government each year ?
8. What has been the face value of copper and silver coined for Canada each year since 1895 ; the cost of bullion therefor, the expense of coinage, and the cost of shipment to Canada ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Would the hon. gentleman let it stand till next question day? It calls for something more than the facts recorded. I hope to have the information next question day.

NATIONALIZATION OF LIVE STOCK RECORDS.

Mr. A. MARTIN—by Mr. FOSTER—asked:

1. What steps have been taken to secure the nationalization of the live stock records of Canada ?
2. Are national records likely to be established in the near future, and under what conditions ? If not, why not ?

Hon. SIDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). Last year at a convention held in Ottawa of gentlemen interested in live stock from all over the Dominion, the question of the nationalization of the live stock records was discussed, and a strong resolution in favour of that proceeding was passed, and representations were made to me as Minister of Agriculture asking me to take steps to bring about the nationalization of live stock records. As a result of that request discussion has been going on amongst those interested in the live stock record. Just lately an agreement has been practically come to on behalf of the Live Stock Record Associations, organized and incorporated under the Act 63-64 Vic., chap. 33 of this parliament called 'An Act respecting the incorporation of Live Stock Record Associations,' by which these associations have undertaken to remove their records to Ottawa. These associations have been heretofore provincial in their character and incorporated under provincial laws, but they are now incorporated under the Dominion Act and have become Dominion in their character. A form of agreement has been submitted to these associations and to myself as Minister of Agriculture under which it is expected that the records will be removed to Ottawa from the places where they now exist, and in case there is no present record of any particular breed of live stock such an association shall be formed under this Act as will make such an agreement in future. Under this agreement the records are to be established in Ottawa, to have their home in the Department of Agriculture, where they will be supplied with house room, stationery, &c. The control and management of the methods of the keeping of the records and everything in connection with the financial affairs of these associations shall be entirely and wholly left in the hands of the associations themselves, the department assuming absolutely no responsibility or control in these respects. But, in view of the nationalization of the records, I have been asked as minister to affix the stamp or seal of the Department of Agriculture to the pedigrees or certificates which are to be hereafter issued, and in so far as supervision of the correctness of the records necessary before the affixing of the seal is concerned, the Department of Agriculture shall have so much supervision and only so much supervision in regard to this work. At the present moment a very great number of the record association of the Dominion have agreed to this proposition—the great majority of them—and I believe it is in the interest of live stock that the organization should be proceeded with, and that it should be completed in regard to all record associations with the concurrence and full approbation of these associations.

MONTREAL HARBOUR—PERMANENT SHEDS.

Mr. PICHE asked :

1. By what engineers were the plans for the construction of the permanent sheds, now in

course of erection at the port of Montreal or of part of the same prepared ?

2. By whom were the specifications and estimates thereof prepared ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries).

1. The plans of the permanent sheds now being constructed were prepared by the harbour engineers and by a staff of engineers of the Dominion Bridge Company, for which an account was rendered by the Dominion Bridge Company for $1,200 from September, 1903 to September, 1904.

2. The specifications and estimates were prepared in the same manner.

MONTREAL HARBOUR—GRAIN CONVEYERS.

Mr. PICHE asked :

1. What engineer was employed by the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal to prepare plans for grain conveyers in connection with the grain elevators which have been lately constructed by said corporation, under the supervision of the government ?

2. Have these plans been submitted to the government ?

3. What is the estimated cost of such grain conveyers ?

4. How many piers or wharfs will be served by said conveyers ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries).

1. The general plans of the grain conveyers were prepared by the harbour engineer and detail plans of the galleries and machinery have been prepared by the J. S. Metcalf Company of Chicago. Only the framing of the gallery over one shed is yet constructed.

2. The general plans were submitted to government and approved of, but the plans of machinery have not been submitted and are not ready for submission.

3. The construction of the conveyer galleries and their supports is included in the contract for building the sheds and the cost has not been separated. The estimated cost of the machinery equipment which is not included in the shed contract $230,000.

4. Two piers and two shore wharfs comprising ten ships' berths will be served by the conveyers.

EXAMINATION OF IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. URIAH WILSON asked :

1. Are immigrants coming from the United States into Canada required to undergo any examination as to their qualifications to become settlers in Canada ?

2. If so, what is the nature of such examination ?

3. At what points on the boundary line between the two countries do the said immigrants enter into this country ?

4. What steps are taken by the department to ensure that the aforesaid immigrants are desirable settlers in Canada ?

Mr. PICHE.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister).

1. European immigrants coming to Canada from the United States undergo the same examination at the United States ports as do immigrants destined for the United States.

2. The examination includes replies to all questions on the manifest, such as the amount of money, age, ability to read or write, occupation, and nationality. The amount of money, occupation and destination are the points upon which the boards of inquiry determine whether or not any immigrant is likely to become a public charge, if so he is excluded.

3. The immigrants enter Canada from the United States chiefly at the several boundary ports leading to Montreal, at St. Albans, Malone and Newport. Some few arrive at Ogdensburg, Niagara Falls, Emerson, and Northport in British Columbia.

4. Hitherto the department has depended upon the examination made by the United States immigration officers as to fitness of immigrants to become settlers in Canada. Settlers from the United States, the bulk of whom come in via Gretna, Portal, &c., undergo no examination. Lately the department has been considering the advisability of establishing a medical inspector at New York, but no final action has been taken in that direction.

GRAEME HUNTER AND THE ASSOCIATED BRITISH CANADIAN SOCIETY.

Mr. RALPH SMITH asked :

1. When did the department first become aware of the society known as the Associated British Canadians, of which Mr. Graeme Hunter is president ?

2. What are the aims and objects of this society ?

3. When was the first complaint made to the department that Graeme Hunter was not, in all cases, carrying out his agreements ?

4. What action did the department take when these facts became known ?

5. Was anything done by the Glasgow police ?

6. What further action was taken by the department to make known Hunter's operations in England ?

7. Were any representations made by the Trades and Labour Society of Toronto ?

8. Were any representations made by the Ontario Government Employment Bureau in Toronto, that mechanics from Scotland were arriving in Toronto with the promise of work, but were unable to find any ?

9. What were the results of Mr. Bruce Walker's inquiries ?

10. Was Hunter prosecuted ?

11. Are there any other specific cases of misrepresentations on file in the department ?

12. What evidence was submitted by Mr. Preston ?

13. Has the department definite knowledge of the indictment ?

14. Has any evidence been taken by the commissioner from employers of labour in Canada, who were getting men through Graeme Hunter?

15. Is there any definite knowledge that employers of labour were in communication with Hunter to secure mechanics, &c. ?

16. What is the general policy of the department with regard to the encouragement of mechanics, &c. ?

17. Was any reply received from the Colonial Office as to what action, if any, was taken by the Home Office to suppress these fraudulent employment agencies ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister).

1. By letter dated April 26, 1904, from Mr. Bruce Walker, agent in Glasgow, who did not seem to be favourably impressed with the society or its operations.

2. Apparently to send to Canada, farm labourers, mechanics, &c., for whom situations are guaranteed on arrival.

3. On May 23, 1904, David Dickson, a mason, and 10 others came to Quebec under an agreement with G. Hunter, a copy of which was furnished to the department, by which they were to be met by Hunter's agent, and directed to situations, but they found neither agent nor work.

4. A cable was sent to Mr. J. Bruce Walker, Canadian Government Agent in Glasgow, to make known by advertisements that Graeme Hunter was sending out mechanics evidently under false representations, and that his and other similar organizations were in no way connected with the department. Mr. Walker was also instructed by letter (May 27, 1904) to place the matter in the hands of the Glasgow police. In addition to this Mr. Dickson was asked for a list of the names and occupations or trades of the members of the party who came over with him.

5. A cable was received from the government agent that detectives were investigating Hunter's operations.

6. The Colonial office was informed that designing persons were apparently making use of the bona fide immigration movement to Canada for the purpose of defrauding and deceiving people in the United Kingdom, and sending them to Canada under false representations, and they were asked to communicate the substance of this despatch to the home office with the request that steps be taken to prevent the continuance and recurrence of these frauds.

7. Mr. John O'Donohue, an officer of the society made representations to the department.

8. Yes.

9. He found that Hunter advertised himself as a 'strike smasher,' and that while Hunter received some orders from manufacturers and others to send out men, he sent out numbers of mechanics and others in excess of the orders.

10. Yes.

11. The department has information in regard to additional cases.

12. 58 witnesses, including 38 disappointed artisans who had returned.

13. Yes, a copy of the indictment is on file in the department.

14. Not in so far as the department is aware.

15. Some 16 leading firms were communicated with and 14 answered 'No.' two answered 'Yes.'

16. The department does not take any steps to promote the immigration of mechanics. Its efforts are confined to those intending to engage in agriculture. All immigration agents are instructed along these lines.

17. A reply was received to the effect that with one exception, sufficient evidence could not, at the time be secured to institute criminal proceedings.

AUDIT ACT.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. When will the promised improved Audit Act be introduced ?
2. What progress has been made ?
3. What is the cause of delay ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I do not know what promise my hon. friend refers to, but all matters in relation to the Auditor General's office are still under consideration.

DREDGING AT WHITBY.

Mr. CHRISTIE—by Mr. Walsh—asked :

1. What amount was expended for dredging at Whitby, on Lake Ontario, in the season of navigation of 1904 ?
2. Who was the owner of the dredge so employed ?
3. Who acted on behalf of the Department of Public Works as local inspector ?
4. What remuneration was paid to such inspector ?

Hon. CHARLES HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works) :

1. $13,502.67.
2. Robert Weddell.
3. James M. Willis.
4. Paid at the rate of $3 per day.

DREDGING AT PORT PERRY.

Mr. CHRISTIE—by Mr. Walsh—asked :

1. What was the amount paid for dredging performed at Port Perry, on Lake Scugog, in the year 1904 ?
2. Who was the owner of the dredge so employed ?
3. Who acted as inspector for the government, and what remuneration was paid to him ?

Hon. CHARLES HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works). No dredging was done at Port Perry during season of 1904.

JAMES BAY RAILWAY.

Mr. GRANT asked :

1. Has the James Bay Railway Company filed a route map or plan of the location of the line

from Toronto to Sudbury with the Department of Railways ?

2. If so, does such map show the line to run on the east side of Lake Couchiching, or the west of said lake ?

3. Has the minister finally approved of the route ?

4. Has the company filed plans for a deviation, and has the department considered the same ?

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

1. No. They have filed the route map from Toronto to Parry Sound.

2. To the east of Lake Couchiching.

3. Yes.

4. No.

MAILS TO VICTORIA HARBOUR.

Mr. BENNETT—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Who is the contractor for carrying the mail from the railway station to the post office at Victoria Harbour ?

2. Were tenders asked for such service ? If so, when ?

3. When does such contract expire ?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General):

1. Mark Vasey.

2 and 3. In December 1896 tenders for this service were invited ; only one, that of Mark Vasey was received being at the price of $120.80, and was accepted. The contract was renewed at $128.80 a year in 1901 with the same contractor and was further renewed in 1905 at the same price. It expires on the 31st of December, 1908.

COAL FOR GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

Mr. BARKER—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. In six months ended 31st December, 1904, how many tons of coal were accepted from the Joggins, Strathcona, Kimberley, and Chignecto mines, respectively, for the government railways ?

2. What were the prices for the several mines, and qualities ?

3. What were the respective places of delivery at the prices ?

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

1. Joggins mines, 15,084 tons ; Strathcona mines, 5,160 tons ; Chignecto mines, 14,820 tons ; Kimberly mine, 'nil.'

2. The price paid to each of the several mines was $3.25 a ton of 2,240 pounds, and the quality of coal supplied by each of them was generally satisfactory.

3. The place of delivery at the above price was for all the mines at Maccan station of the Intercolonial Railway.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—SEYMOUR WOODILL.

Mr. BARKER—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Is Seymour Woodill employed on the Intercolonial Railway at Halifax or elsewhere ? If so, in what capacity, and on what terms ?

Mr. GRANT.

2. Was he previously employed in the Post Office Department or any other department ? If so, where, and in what capacity ?

3. Was his employment or service discontinued ? If so, when and why ?

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

1. Yes. As clerk at a salary of $55 per month.

2. So far as can be ascertained he was not previously employed in the Post Office Department or any other department.

3. He is still in the employ of the Intercolonial Railway.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—CARRIAGE OF COAL.

Mr. KEMP asked :

1. To whom in the city of Ottawa was coal transported free in the year 1902-3 over the Intercolonial Railway ?

2. Was it for government use ?

3. If not, for whose use was it ?

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

1. The corporation of the city of Ottawa.

2. No.

3. It is understood it was sold by the corporation to those wishing to purchase it.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I shall make a few remarks with respect to a matter which I have informed my right hon. friend the Prime Minister I would speak upon to-day. My remarks will be very brief. They are in connection with the introduction of the Bills for the establishment of new provinces in the Northwest Territories. I do not of course propose to discuss the merits of these measures—the rules of the House would not permit me to do so, and even if they would, that course is not advisable at the present moment, when, as I understand, certain questions in connection with these Bills are under consideration by the government. However, if I were disposed to enter into a discussion of the merits, I would be unable to do so on account of the very well known rules of the House which do not seem to be thoroughly understood in some quarters throughout the country. The particular matter to which I desire to call attention is : that the Prime Minister introduced this legislation, as a measure concurred in by all the members of the administration, whereas we discovered afterwards that this was not the fact. My right hon. friend has always vaunted himself as a strict follower of constitutional usage—he has sometimes done more than that, because some ten years ago he claimed for himself the attributes of foresight and of courage when a somewhat similar question as that which arises to-day

was to a certain extent agitating the parliament and the people of this country. My right hon. friend then said :

> My courage is not to make hasty promises and then to ignominously break them. My courage is to speak slowly, but once I have spoken I will stand or fall by my words.

I mention that, because my right hon. friend though he may have shown a great deal of courage in his action with regard to this measure, does not at least seem to have combined foresight with strict regard for constitutional usage. It is beyond all doubt that this House is entitled to regard every measure brought down by the Prime Minister, or by any other member of the cabinet, as a government measure, which is the result of the collective wisdom of the cabinet. I need not cite authority for that, to those who are at all familiar with the usage as laid down by recognized constitutional authorities ; let me, however, quote two or three words from volume II of Todd on parliamentary government in England where it is thus laid down :

> Except in the case of an admitted open question, it must be taken for granted that the whole cabinet have assented to the ministerial policy as officially presented or propounded by any minister acting or speaking on their behalf.

Words could not be plainer. We have the absolute right to regard the measure brought down by the Prime Minister on the 21st day of February last, as a measure in respect of which every member of the cabinet had been consulted, and which, whatever differences of opinion might originally have existed with regards to its terms, was in the end concurred in by all the members of the cabinet, and had the support of each of them. Now, it has turned out since the introduction of the measure, that the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), until recently the Minister of the Interior, was not consulted about that measure at all. I do not know how it may be with regard to other members of the cabinet ; we have no information with respect to that. We do not know whether or not the Minister of Finance was consulted with regard to the clauses which did not meet with the approval of the Minister of the Interior, nor do we know to what extent, if any, the Minister of Finance was consulted with regard to the financial terms embodied in this measure. But we have this peculiar circumstance, at least, that the measure was brought down two or three days before the return of the Minister of the Interior. Naturally we would not be led to suppose that a measure of this importance, with the terms of which the Minister of the Interior is so intimately connected, would be brought down within two or three days of his return to Ottawa, without his having had an opportunity to become acquainted with its terms. Nor is it to be supposed, in view of the fact that the Minister of Finance had sailed about a week before from Europe to this country, that legislation of so great importance as the financial clauses of this Bill, would be introduced into this House on the eve of his return, without his having any opportunity to advise with regard to them, or to give his colleagues the benefit of the wisdom and experience which of course he must possess after occupying for some eight or nine years the position which he now holds. Under these circumstances, I think we might well call for an explanation from the right hon. gentleman who leads the House as to why it was he brought down this measure without vouchsafing to the House the explanation that two members of his cabinet had not been consulted at all with regard to its provisions, and that, so far as they were concerned, this was not the act of the government.

But I need not go to Todd or to any other authority on parliamentary government in regard to this matter. This administration has laid down a rule, peculiar, as it is declared, to the form of government which we enjoy in this country. What was the position of affairs ? The Minister of the Interior represented in the cabinet the great west of Canada—represented more than any other member of the cabinet that portion of this country which is now being created into two new provinces. Further than that, owing to his experience of some eight years in the position of Minister of the Interior, he might be supposed to possess a more intimate knowledge of the needs and requirements of that country than any other member of the cabinet. And yet the Minister of the Interior was not consulted with regard to this measure, and that in the face of the most explicit declaration made by this administration no further back than the 14th of June, 1904, that he was the man above all others who should be consulted on this question. When Lord Dundonald was dismissed from his position as General Officer Commanding in this country, the government passed an Order in Council which was laid upon the table of the House, and in which the action of the administration in that regard was justified upon certain grounds; and one of the reasons put forward by the administration for the interference by the Minister of Agriculture in a department with which otherwise he had no concern whatever, indeed, the only justification for that interference, was expressed in that Order in Council in these words :—

> In the case of members of the cabinet, while all have an equal degree of responsibility in a constitutional sense, yet in the practical working out of responsible government, in a country of such vast extent as Canada, it is found necessary to attach special responsibility to

each minister for the public affairs of the province or district with which he has close political connection, and with which his colleagues may not be so well acquainted.

Well, I would submit to my right hon. friend that, taking his own standard of ministerial responsibility thus expressed in this Order in Council, the Minister of the Interior was in this case the minister above all others who should have been consulted in the first instance about those very provisions which at the present time are causing some discussion in the country, and, if we may believe all we hear, some dissension on the other side of the House ; and I would like to know from the right hon. gentleman how it was that after having delayed some two years before taking up the question at all, the minister who, under the constitutional rule laid down by the government itself, was most to be consulted with regard to the terms of the measure, was not consulted at all, although the measure was introduced within three days of his return to Ottawa. My right hon. friend has been a very strict stickler for constitutional usage in some of his dealings with his ministers in days gone by. I will advert to only one case. We remember that the right hon. gentleman felt himself constrained to ask for the portfolio of Public Works at that time held by the Hon. J. I. Tarte, because Mr. Tarte had seen fit, in the words of the Prime Minister, to advocate a policy which had not yet been adopted by the government. Well, if that be a just reason, have not the colleagues of the right hon. gentleman a right to demand his portfolio at the present time, because he has seen fit not only to advocate, but to place before parliament and the country, a measure to which his colleagues have not all agreed. I do not know on what ground the right hon. gentleman can justify himself in this regard, because it seems to me that it is not treating the House of Commons with due respect to bring down a measure of this kind as one which is concurred in by every member of the administration, and afterwards to acquaint the House, as we are now acquainted, with the fact that certain members at least were not consulted.

Have we not the right under the circumstances to inquire respectfully of the First Minister whether there are any other members of his cabinet outside the member for Brandon, lately Minister of the Interior, and the Minister of Finance who were not consulted with regard to the terms of this measure. The right hon. gentleman has adverted to the aid which he obtained from members of the Executive Council of the Northwest Territories. May we not also respectfully inquire whether all the provisions of this measure were considered at the conferences which took place between the members of the cabinet and the members of the Executive Council of the Territories. There is some further desirable information, if the right hon. gentleman will not regard my curiosity as fastidious—because that is the term he usually applies when any question is in the least degree awkward—might I ask whether or not any conculsion has been arrived at with regard to the filling of the position made vacant by the resignation of the Minister of the Interior. I would also respectfully inquire of the right hon. gentleman regarding another matter which I mentioned the other day, namely, whether or not changes in the proposed Bills creating the new provinces are under consideration by the government ? We of course, do not seek to concern ourselves with any differences which may have occurred in the ranks of the hon. gentlemen opposite, but the shape in which these measures shall eventually come before parliament is a matter in which we are legitimately concerned and as to which we have a reasonable right to inquire. It is said over and over again in the organs supposed to have the confidence of the government—for example in the very last issue of that newspaper which is supposed to be the organ of the Minister of Agriculture ; it is stated not only that these matters are being discussed within the cabinet and in the ranks of the hon. gentleman opposite, but that certain conclusions have already been arrived at and will be announced in due course. I suggested to my hon. friend only the other day that as soon as those changes—if any are contemplated—be agreed upon, they should be announced to the House in order that we may have them under consideration before the time arrives for discussing them in parliament. I venture to bring this matter before the government to-day. The right hon. gentleman told us some ten years ago, when matters of this kind were discussed in parliament and the country, that he was not in the battle 'No,' he said : 'The battle is there ; there is the seat of contest ; there is the raging conflict.' I do not want to make any special application of those words to-day ; but I do think that as soon as the differences are amicably adjusted, we should have a statement from the Prime Minister as to the form this measure will eventually take when it comes before parliament.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say that I have very little to tell my hon. friend of which he is not already aware. He is too old a parliamentarian not to know the answer I must give him. My hon. friend knows well, none better, that the deliberations of cabinets are secret, that all the members of a cabinet are sworn to secrecy, and that solidarity exists among them until one of them chooses to express his dissent because he finds he cannot support any longer the policy of the government. When such a thing occurs, it becomes the duty of the government to inform parliament of the

causes of the differences which have arisen between the dissenting member and his colleagues. My hon. friend knows that in every government, it must always be presumed that there will be some differences of opinion among the members composing it. It is not to be supposed that in a cabinet composed of 13 or 14 members, all the ministers are of one mind upon all questions. It must be expected that there will be some differences among them. It is not in human nature that they should agree on all matters, and therefore some latitude must be allowed the individual members, and this latitude is always extended until it becomes impossible for one of the members of the administration to agree with his colleagues. Let me quote Todd :

> Upon the formation of a ministry which embraces men of different shades of political opinion, it necessarily follows that there must be, to a greater or less extent, mutual concessions and compromises. But with the rare exception of certain questions, which by previous consent it is agreed shall be considered as 'open,' it is an admitted principle that all the responsible ministers of the crown are bound to unite in furthering the measures of government through parliament, and in otherwise carrying out the policy which has been agreed upon by the cabinet. This policy is framed in the first instance by the prime minister in accordance with the principle of the party to which he belongs. It then forms the basis of negotiation between himself and those whom he may invite to assist him in carrying on the Queen's government.

All members of the cabinet should agree on questions of policy, but if there should be a disappointment, if, as in the case of the hon. member for Brandon, there should be a difference of opinion, then either a compromise must be reached or the dissenting colleague resigns from the cabinet. In the latter case it is the duty of the First Minister to give the House information of the causes which led to this unhappy result just as an explanation of the policies of the government is due to the House when the government is formed. But does my hon. friend expect the government to give to the House all the different conversations or deliberations which may have taken place in council—everything which passed either in writing or by word of mouth ? If he so expects, his expectation is not borne out by the authorities on the subject.

It will be sufficient for me to quote to him the author from whom he himself has quoted, who is recognized as the standard authority upon these subjects. I quote from Todd, Vol. 2, page 487. After having stated that the House is entitled to have full explanation on the formation of a government, Todd goes on to say :

> But the House has no right to ask for more than a general exposition of the main principles on which a government is formed. It has no right to inquire into all the conditions which may have taken place between the several members of the government. Any arrangements, however, which have been specially referred to in debate by new ministers as the stipulations and conditions upon which they agreed to accept office, may be suitably inquired into by other members.

And this rule that is laid down for the formation of a government is exactly the rule laid down, as I understand the constitutional authorities on the point, in relation to giving information concerning a government that, instead of being formed is, to some extent disrupted. A few days ago, it was my duty—my painful duty—to communicate to the House the reasons which had brought about the rupture between the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) and the government. I do not know that the House in entitled to more information than I gave them. There are the facts, and the matter has been brought before the House. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) has taken exception, and when the time comes to discuss the matter, he will be able to give whatever explanation he thinks it well to give. Until that time, the House must rest content with the explanation given. The hon. gentleman has not stated whether, in this matter, he refers to the Bill in toto, or simply to the educational clauses. It will be open to him to tell the House to what extent he refers to the Bill as a whole or to what extent he refers to in toto. Up to this time, I do not think the House is entitled to more information from us than that which has already been imparted.

My hon. friend asks a second question. He wants to know whether any action is to be taken to fill the vacancy in the portfolio of the Interior caused by the resignation of my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton). He is entitled to a full and categorical answer. No action has been taken, and it is not my intention now to take any action in the way of filling that portfolio.

And my hon. friend asks still another question. He wants to know if any changes are contemplated in the Bill. Really, the hon. gentleman is very inquisitive. I said the other day—and I think my hon. friend will agree with me—that I am not aware of any measure of any great importance, and I am aware of very few measures even of little importance, that have ever gone over that table without having changes made in them ; and I shall be much surprised if this Bill, which is of such great importance runs the gauntlet of this House without fault being found with it—perhaps by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) ; perhaps by my hon. friend who sits next to him (Mr. Foster) ; perhaps by my hon. friend who sits behind him (Mr. Monk), or, perhaps by my hon. friend who sits at his right hand (Mr. Sproule). Perhaps fault will be found on one hand, perhaps on many. Therefore, I cannot see how it is possible to gratify my hon. friend and say anything as to changes being contem-

plated. But I must say that I can understand that my hon. friend is very anxious to know in advance if there are to be any changes made in the Bill. I think, judging from past experience, my hon. friend will think it important to know in advance what is to be the precise character of the Bill when it shall come to the second reading. I presume—and in so presuming, I think I do not state anything that is not in accordance with the truth ; if I do, he will correct me—and I have reason to believe, that he is preparing some batteries to attack this Bill ; and, perhaps it is important for him to know at this time whether he should place his batteries on a certain hill or place them on another hill. I can understand that my hon. friend is anxious to know whether or not the Bill is to be as it is. If there are to be other provisions, as a matter of tactics he would like to be in a position to judge whether his batteries should be placed in one place or in another. But I can hardly give myself the pleasure of coming to the rescue of my hon. friend by giving him to-day information to which, in due time, he will be entitled.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I say one word to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier): Whatever else I do I shall not retire within the lines of Torres Vedras. Might I respectfully suggest to him that he has not at all answered the question which I put to him, namely : Why did he so far violate constitutional usage as to bring down a Bill as the act of the administration when two members, who were on the eve of return, had not been consulted in regard to it. That is the point, the chief point, of my remarks.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has given no explanation as to the questions put to him.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I intend to move the adjournment——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The House is to be moved in supply in a moment, and that will give the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean) an opportunity to speak.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The right hon. gentleman had the opportunity to speak, and so had the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and I claim the same privilege of discussing the matter at the present stage.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. In order to keep myself within the rules of the House, I intend to conclude with a motion. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has made a statement that does not meet the point that has been raised. He has been asked to explain why he introduced legislation in this House dealing with the autonomy of the Northwest without having the approval of his colleagues. And he tells us that he does not intend to appoint another Minister of the Interior at the present stage and to consult that minister in regard to these Bills. We heard the other day about autocracy in this House ; but what about the autocrat of the present occasion ? Not only has he got rid of one minister, but he intends to go on with this question without calling to his cabinet a new Minister of the Interior. Apparently, he does not care to consult the opinion of the west in regard to these things. But surely the west is worth consulting. Surely the new provinces of the west are just as well entitled to be consulted in this matter as are some other provinces. But every stage of the right hon. gentleman's conduct is on unconstitutional lines. I think the Prime Minister is constitutionally bound to tell us whether one of his colleagues had not objections to the financial phase of the Bill that has been brought before the House. We are supposed to have a Minister of the Interior especially charged with the affairs of the west. We have a Minister of Finance who is especially responsible for the financial program of the government. Yet we have this autonomy measure involving grave financial charges, and giving reason to all the other provinces for demanding better terms, and the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) so far as we can gather, has not even been consulted, as the Minister of the Interior was not consulted. Where are we to end, if these things continue ? And let us refer to another minister. I spoke of this matter the other day, but it should be mentioned in this connection also. We have a gentleman acting as Minister of Public Works who is putting through estimates for $10,000,000, and will probably have supplementary estimates for $3,000,000 more. The amount will depend on the political exigencies of hon. gentlemen opposite. Last session this gentleman was in the same unconstitutional position, and then put through estimates of about $10,000,000. And yet this unconstitutional method is to be continued, and when explanations are asked none are forthcoming. There are more governments in trouble than this one. If you read the papers to-day, you see that nearly every government in Europe is in trouble for some reason. But there is a cure ; there is a solvent for these difficulties ; and that is to consult the people. If the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) believes in the principle professed by his party, he will not carry on the negotiations that are now going on in the way of fights and bickerings in his own cabinet, but he will do the constitutional thing and go back to the country and submit this question to the people. He has confessed to-day that he is afraid to open the constituency of London, in Ontario ; he is afraid to open a constituency in Manitoba, and bring in a

Minister of the Interior. On such unconstitutional lines he has carried his course for a good many years. Take for instance, his Grand Trunk Pacific Bill. He did not go to the people with that before he introduced it here? He carried it through two sessions and then went to the country with it. Sir John A. Macdonald, when he introduced the national policy, first went to the people, and got the approval of the people. The right hon. gentleman was afraid to go before the people of this country in the last election on the Autonomy Bill, and he brings it down in the first session in order to escape responsibility for it. Now, if he is in trouble, as he is in trouble, if he has trouble, if the Minister of the Interior——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Do hon. gentlemen opposite mean to say that the Minister of Justice has not thrown all the members from the Northwest into fits? There is trouble. I will tell you why the right hon. gentleman will not appoint a Minister of the Interior; it is because if he gets a Minister of the Interior to consent to these modifications he proposes, he will have another province on his hands, another rebellion to quell; and, being in that position, he cannot resort to the straight constitutional method of solving these questions. He should not have introduced this Bill without having had the consent and advice of the members from the Northwest; and on behalf of the province of Manitoba to-day I ask the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), I ask the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway), I ask all the delegation from the west, whether they approve of this legislation having been introduced without their representatives in the cabinet being consulted, and whether they propose to submit any longer to this legislation being proceeded with without having a minister in the cabinet representing them and representing the west. It is not constitutional. It may be justified, but it will end in disaster, it cannot end in anything else. Now, if the right hon. gentleman fixes up his fences as far as Manitoba is concerned, he will find them down in Nova Scotia, and as soon as he fixes them up in regard to Nova Scotia and the Northwest, he will find them down in the province of Quebec; and, being in that position, he has to resort to all these tricks. He is afraid of trusting the people to-day, he is afraid of the good old principle he laid down years ago of provincial rights. Now, I want to tell him in regard to this education problem, that he can patch it up as much as he likes, he can hold what caucuses he likes, he can fix up his fences in this direction and in that direction; but there is only one thing that will satisfy the provinces of Canada to-day, and that is complete autonomy for the Northwest provinces, the right of the people of the west to settle their own educational affairs. They wish to be free to settle this question; they don't want all these bickerings in the cabinet. They want to be treated as freemen, with the right to settle their own educational questions; and it is because they dared to assert their freedom in this House, because they had a minister in the government who was prepared to assert that right, that that minister has been put out, and they are to-day to be treated as slaves. Again I tell the right hon. gentleman that he must have more respect for the constitution. So far he professes to be upholding the constitution. But everything he does is irregular—his relations with his ministers, these negotiations that are going on to-day, all these things that we hear of, and many other things that don't get into the press, but that we know are going on, with no peace in prospect, continued bickerings are in store for us. Again I say he is on the wrong line, and he must retrace his steps. He has spoken to-day of the retreat of the late Minister of the Interior. There was no retreat on the part of the late Minister of the Interior in standing up for the rights of the new provinces. He was maintaining what I call good doctrine in regard to provincial rights. Yet, because he took that position in this House, the First Minister says he is retreating. Well, the right hon. gentleman may say it is a retreat, but I say, No. Once again, in the name of the people of the great Northwest, I ask the government to keep their hands off these new provinces in regard to education. Let the people up there settle these questions themselves. They are well competent to do it; they know what they want without any advice from any other province, I do not care which. Al lthey ask is that they be permitted to settle their own affairs. I do not care what batteries may be placed in this House, on the one side or the other. There is no service in this House but the one service—the public service. I want to tell the right hon. gentleman this, that it may take much longer than he counts on to put this session through. I do not see why the right hon. gentleman should get one dollar of supplies while he has no minister of the Interior to take the part of Manitoba. I do not see why he should get any legislation through this House until he comes forward with a complete ministry, until he comes forward with a man representing that portion of the country—if the government believe in geographical representation—with a man from that portion of the country prepared to assume the responsibilities of this government in connection with their programme in dealing with the autonomy of the west.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman did not conclude with a motion.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. SPEAKER. In making a motion the hon. gentleman should rise.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (rising). Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. I would like to know who this member is that is moving the adjournment of this House, interfering with the proceedings and delaying the business that ought to be gone on with ?

Motion to adjourn negatived.

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Mr. GERVAIS moved :

That rule 49 of this House regarding the presentation of petitions for Private Bills be suspended, and that he be given leave to present a petition to incorporate the Crown Casualty Insurance Company, Limited, time having expired for presenting petitions, and that the said petition be read and received forthwith ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Gervais) not to make this motion ; let it stand until to-morrow. I would like to have some information about it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) when he will bring down the return which was ordered by the House on the 20th of February with reference to the application of Port Arthur and Fort William for access by their municipal telephone wires to the offices of the Canadian Pacific Railway in those towns. The hon. gentleman must be aware that there are a number of similar applications depending upon this return, and, having regard to what took place when the matter was last under discussion in this House, I think the return should have been brought down before this. I desire to have the return expedited as much as possible, and I trust the minister will agree with me in that.

Mr. EMMERSON. I regret that we have not yet received from the Railway Commission the copies of the papers which are necessary to be included in this return. I shall take occasion again to call their attention to the fact. We have not received the information yet.

STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I would ask the Postmaster General if he is aware that there are over 2,000 mail bags containing mail matter at Sackville and Pictou that have been delayed in transmission to Prince Edward Island. I would like to know what the department is going to do about it. This matter of mail communication has got to be in a most disgraceful condition and when we find that passengers take something like six weeks to get from Pictou to Charlottetown in Prince Edward Island, I think it is about time the government took some measures to remedy this great grievance. We find that about 2,000 bags of mail matter have now accumulated, and I think this is a matter for the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) himself to take in hand.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, I will inquire into the matter and give the hon. gentleman an answer to-morrow.

Mr. EMMERSON. I might say in answer to that question that I have received word that the snow blockade in Prince Edward Island was finally raised to-day. Until now all trains there have been suspended for a considerable time.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. That is not the matter which I wish to bring to the attention of the Postmaster General. I was referring to the mail matter which is on this side, not to conditions on the other side.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I stated to the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. A. McLean) that I will inquire into the matter and give him an answer to-morrow.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Murray Harbour branch and Hillsboro' bridge, $357,400.

Mr. EMMERSON. There was some information that was required but it will take a day or so to get it. We have had to send to Moncton for it and I therefore cannot go on with this item at present.

Item allowed to stand.

Railways and Canals collection of revenue—Intercolonial Railway, $7,000,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is the usual amount asked for in connection with the revenue and expenditure of the Intercolonial Railway with the exception that we have added $500,000 in order to cover the additional wages and increased mileage.

Mr. KEMP. Could the hon. gentleman tell us if he has the information I asked him for in respect to tenders for supplies, the details of which I gave him two days ago ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In a large majority of cases tenders are invited from people all over the country, and I beg to hand now to my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) the general form of tender which is used in the Intercolonial Railway. In some cases the supplies are advertised for. The detailed information he asked for has to be obtained from Moncton where the original tenders and statements are kept, and it was impossible for me to obtain them so soon.

Mr. KEMP. Would the minister have them within a week ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not suppose my hon. friend wishes to have the matter delayed until the information can be obtained. I will have it for the supplementary estimates and my hon. friend can discuss the matter then.

Mr. CROCKET. Before the general discussion on this vote is proceeded with, I want to call attention to what seems to me to be—and what I think will appear also to the unbiased, independent judgment of the House to be a most unwarranted and unjust dismissal by this department. I refer to the dismissal of Mr. Odbur White, station agent of the Intercolonial Railway at Fredericton, that is on the line, which was formerly the Canadian Eastern Railway and is now in operation as part of the Intercolonial system. Mr. White had been in the employ of the Canada Eastern for twenty-two or twenty-three years, indeed ever since the first year of its operation. For fifteen years he had been station agent at Fredericton, from which position he was dismissed on the 24th of January last. Before being appointed at Fredericton he served for five years as station agent at Boiestown, and for two or three years prior to that he had been a brakeman on the road. Mr. White has ever been recognized by all those who know him as a most respectable, intelligent, painstaking and industrious man, a perfectly inoffensive man whose whole thought was engrossed in the performance of his duties and in providing for the comfort and welfare of his family. I believe that Mr. White's politics were known to no one, outside possibly the circle of his own family. When the Canada Eastern was taken over by the government on the first of October last, Mr. White received the same notice as all other employees of the railroad, that he would be after that date continued in the service of the Intercolonial Railway. The Canada Eastern was added to the Moncton—St. Flavie division of the Intercolonial Railway, and Mr. Thomas Hoben, who had served with great satisfaction to the public as superintendent of the Canada Eastern from the first year of its operation, was appointed assistant superintendent of the Moncton-St. Flavie division. All the other employees and officials of the Canada Eastern retained their several positions under the government management in accordance with what I believe was the agreement between the Alexander Gibson Railway and Manufacturing Company, the former proprietors, and the government. Mr. White continuel to perform the duties of station agent at Fredericton after the taking over of the railroad until after the general elections, and down to the 10th day of January, when without any suggestion having been made to him or any intimation of any kind communicated to him from any source that his services were unsatisfactory, he received this letter :

Gibson, N.B., January 10th, 1905.

Mr. Odbur White, agent, Fredericton :

Dear Sir,—I am directed by my superior officer to inform you that your services as station master at Fredericton for the Intercolonial Railway are to be dispensed with. It will take effect 14 days from this date.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) THOMAS HOBEN.

It will be observed that this letter assigned no cause whatever for the dismissal of Mr. White. It will be observed also that his dismissal was to take effect, not at the beginning or end of a quarter, not at the beginning or end of a month even, but on the 24th day of January in midwinter on a two weeks' notice. I think that even had there been any reasonable grounds for dissatisfaction with Mr. White, it was reprehensible and contemptible to the last degree for this department of the government to treat him in this summary way, a man who had given twenty-three years of his life to the service of this railway. I think I will be able to show, however, that this dismissal was absolutely without any justification or excuse, and to serve no purpose, except that of gratifying the spiteful whims of the defeated government candidate in the county of York. As I have said, the letter which I read was the first intimation Mr. White had that there was any dissatisfaction with his services, and on its receipt he went at once to Mr. Hoben, under whom he had served for twenty-three years, and asked him the cause. Mr. Hoben informed him that he knew nothing whatever about it, and that the first intimation he had received of an intention to make any change was the letter of dismissal, with instructions to sign it and to forward it to Mr. White. Mr. White then wrote to Mr. Evan Price, superintendent of the Moncton-St. Flavie division, and also to Mr. J. E. Price, the general superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway, but to neither of these letters did he receive any reply. Then he wrote to the minister himself, asking for the reason of his dismissal, and six days later the minister replied with a letter, which I will refer to later. Mr. White, not having received this letter up to that time or been able to ascertain from any one the course of his dismissal, I asked on the 23rd day of January, the following question of the minister :

1. Has Odbur White, station agent of the Intercolonial Railway at Fredericton, N.B., been notified that his services as such agent are to be dispensed with on the twenty-fourth day of January, inst. ?

2. If so, when was he so notified, and for what reason ?

3. Have any complaints been made against him in reference to the performance or non-performaance of his duties, or otherwise ?

4. If any such complaints have been made, by whom were they made : were they made in writing, and have they been investigated ?

Mr. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals :

1. Yes.

2. January 10, 1905.

3. Yes.

4. Mr. Tiffin, general traffic manager, and Mr. J. E. Price, general superintendent, reported him as not qualified for the position.

Hon. members will observe that I asked specifically if there were complaints, and if those complaints were in writing. The minister's answer was: 'Yes. Mr. Tiffin, general traffic manager, and Mr. J. E. Price, general superintendent, reported him as not qualified for the position. The reasonable inference the only presumable inference from the form of the question and answer, was that these complaints were in writing. Assuming, then, that these officials had in writing reported Mr. White as not qualified for the position, I moved on the 26th of January :

For copies of the letters of Mr. Tiffin, general traffic manager, and J. E. Price, general superintendent, of the Intercolonial Railway, reporting Odbur White, station agent at Fredericton, N.B., as not qualified for the position ; and of all other correspondence in the possession of the government of the Department of Railways and Canals, relating to the dismissal of said Odbur White ?

When that motion was moved the Minister of Railways made this statement:

There is no correspondence. Reports were made to me orally at Moncton in the month of December. I have received a letter from Mr. White, to which I have replied. That correspondence can be furnished if the hon. gentleman is satisfied with that.

Now, it seems to me that it is a most remarkable thing that these complaints, if there were complaints, should originate with the head officials of the road at Moncton, Mr. Tiffin and Mr. Price. It seems to me that those officials could not possibly have had any personal knowledge of the manner in which Mr. White was performing his duties at Fredericton. The only knowledge they would have would be such as would be communicated to them by patrons of the road at Fredericton or by reports from intermediate officials, and, therefore, the statement which the minister made, that these complaints came, not from the ground upon which Mr. White was performing his duties, but from the fountain head of the system, struck me as being rather a singular statement. Imagine two of the chief officials of the government railway system meeting the responsible Minister of Railways at Moncton in the month of December last, as the minister stated, and both importuning him for the dismissal of a station agent who enjoyed a salary of but $65 a month, and that at the Christmas season of the year. This may apepar to be a creditable statement to the members of this House, and of course we are bound to accept it, but at the same time it does seem to me that it is a most remarkable explanation of this dismissal. I have referred to a letter which Mr. White addressed to the Minister of Railways asking the reason of his dismissal. This correspondence I get from the return, which was brought down on the 13th of February in answer to the motion to which I have already alluded. On the 14th of January Mr. White wrote this letter to the Minister of Railways :

Fredericton Station, January 14, 1905.

Dear Sir and Brother,—I am not personally acquainted with you, but I am well known in the city. I have worked on the road since it was first started. I have been dismissed, notice to take effect January 24th, 1905. No cause given whatever.

Now, my friend, I am, and always have been, a supporter of the present government. I defy the face of clay to say anything contrary. I think it pretty hard, a poor man with a family, and to be thrown out of a job just in mid-winter, and if you think well of it you might ask the management to be a little merciful. Will you please look into this matter and kindly let me know.

Yours, in trouble,
O. WHITE, Agent.

To this the minister replied as follows:

Ottawa, January 20, 1905.

Dear Sir,—Yours of the 14th instant is received, having reference to the notice which has been given you by the Intercolonial authorities. On the report of the officials of the road as to your efficiency and the necessity of having a better qualified man at Fredericton, I was constrained to give assent to your being set aside. I had reprimanded the officials for the manner in which the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway at Fredericton were being conducted, and their answer was that they could not be held accountable in view of the want of qualification on the part of some of the officers. I hold them responsible for results. and must give them a free hand in the choice of officers to do their work.

Yours faithfully,
H. R. EMMERSON.

It appears to me that it is pretty difficult to reconcile this letter, addressed by the minister to Mr. White on the 30th of January, with the statement which was made by the minister in this House in answer to the question I asked on the 23rd of January. From the answer which the minister made to these questions, it would appear that this dismissal was the result of complaints which had been made by Mr. Price and Mr. Tiffin. From the letter which the hon. Minister of Railways addressed to Mr. White on the 20th of January, it would appear that the initiative was with the minister himself. In that letter he says he reprimanded the officials for the manner in which the affairs of the Intercolonial Rail-

way at Fredericton were being conducted. It did seem to me somewhat out of the ordinary that the hon. minister should have any knowledge of the manner in which the business at Fredericton was being conducted except through reports made to him by these same officials whom he was reprimanding. When I questioned him the other day regarding the necessity for a new station house at Fredericton, he said he had no knowledge personally of the requirements of the traffic at Fredericton; and it seems rather singular that while he had no knowledge of the requirements of the traffic at Fredericton, he should have personal knowledge regarding the details of the work of a station agent who was receiving a salary of $55 a month. However, that is the statement made, and from this letter it appears that the initiative in connection with this dismissal lay with the Minister of Railways himself. It is rather remarkable, I think, that an officer who had served for fifteen years in charge of that station—the most important station upon the Canada Eastern Railway—and in the employ of the Alexander Gibson Railway and Manufacturing Company, and against whom no complaint had ever been made—that such an official should have been retained by the Intercolonial Railway and continued in this position until shortly after the elections and then, without any previous intimation, be dismissed in mid-winter on a two weeks' notice for the alleged reason that he was not qualified for the position. By the law of this country a domestic servant under a month's hiring is entitled to at least a month's notice if dismissed. In my opinion the treatment meted out to Mr. White does the Railway Department great discredit and will not do the government or its party in the county of York much good. Neither do I think that it will commend itself to the judgment of this committee.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend has the idea that in this matter I was moved by some spirit of political antagonism. I want to say distinctly and unequivocally that the dismissal of Mr. White was in no way due to any act of the gentleman who was Liberal candidate at the last election in the county of York. Nor was it inspired by any political antagonism or due to any political representations or political interference at all either in that county or out of it. Let me state the bare facts. It came to my knowledge during last autumn —I think in December—that the traffic from Fredericton to the west was largely going over the Canadian Pacific Railway. I then had a conference with the general traffic manager here in Ottawa in the first instance. I called his attention to the fact that the traffic was being diverted to the Canadian Pacific Railway, when naturally it should go by the Canada Eastern. I spoke warmly, and he explained that the solicitation for freight was under the direction of Mr. Smiley, the district freight agent at St. John, and that Mr. White, station agent at Fredericton, was charged with the duty of looking after freight matters there, and that he was entirely inefficient. More than that he said that those who shipped freight complained of Mr. White. Mr. Tiffin, the general traffic manager, told me that he had gone to Fredericton himself and had seen that the traffic was being diverted from the government road, and he complained against Mr. White in that connection. I did not know Mr. White from Adam. I did not know there was any such person in charge of the station. I had to ask who he was, and I said to Mr. Tiffin: If Mr. White is not fit for the place, you will have to get somebody else. There was no arrangement between myself and Mr. Gibson or anybody else representing the Canada Eastern Railway that the employees on that railway should be continued. I did say to Mr. Gibson that of course if the men he had been employing were found efficient and satisfactory, we would keep them on. They were therefore continued on probation. The railway was not taken over until last summer late or in the autumn and these men were on probation. It was the duty of Mr. Tiffin to find out how these men were doing their work, and it was on his report that I took the action I considered necessary. Later on, in December, the matter came up at Moncton, when I was there. It was either the 1st December or the 1st January. I cannot remember the exact date.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How long had the Intercolonial taken over this road at that time?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was taken over in October, I think. Then, I saw Mr. Price and Mr. Tiffin. These gentlemen had been discussing the matter, and their view was that Mr. White was not capable of attending to the work there, and it would be necessary to have somebody who was qualified. I gave my consent to that. There was nothing political in the matter—I make that statement here. In addition, Mr. White's letter states that he was a Liberal during his whole life.

Mr. CROCKET. Mr. Gibson did not seem to consider him such.

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Gibson did not approach me in the matter. This seems some little parochial affair that has been taken up by my hon. friend without full appreciation at least of the responsibilities of my position. The hon. gentleman seems to think that Mr. Gibson wanted Mr. White dismissed? I do not know that he did. It was purely a departmental matter, and it was carried out in accordance with the

routine of the department. Even with selecting the man to take Mr. White's place, I had nothing to do. It was part of the routine of the Intercolonial Railway. I am not consulted about appointments of station agents.

Mr. INGRAM. Who took this place ?

Mr. EMMERSON. A man from one of the other stations was promoted. I think his named is Walker. He was entitled to the place in order of promotion. He had been stationed on the northern division at Dalhousie. The notice was the customary notice, and I had nothing to do with it. Of course, I have to assume the responsibility here, and I do not shirk it. I think that, with the knowledge of the facts I have given, my hon. friend must revise his judgment with respect to the matter. I stated in my letter to Mr. White the exact facts.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not sure that I understood what the minister meant by the diversion of freight, and the agency of the station master in that respect.

Mr. EMMERSON. It was western freight.

Mr. FOSTER. Where from ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Originating in Fredericton and vicinity and shipped from Fredericton. A certain quantity or class of that freight, I am informed, always went by the Canada Eastern and Intercolonial. I understand that it transpired that some of that freight was, under the changed conditions, being sent by way of the Canadian Pacific Railway by Fredericton junction. The duty of the station agent at that station, in conjunction with Mr. Smiley, the district freight agent, was to attend to the solicitation of freight and see that it went out in the right direction. This I was told by the traffic manager of the Intercolonial, and it was solely upon his complaint that the action was taken.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the freight been secured under the new agent ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not heard any complaints.

Mr. CROCKET. Did the minister communicate with the assistant superintendent of that district whose headquarters were at Fredericton, with regard to this diversion of freight ? Would not this assistant superintendent be responsible for that diversion rather than the station agent ? And what does the minister mean by his letter in which he speaks of the difficulty arising through want of qualification not on the part of the station agent, but, 'on the part of some of the officers?' If there were others responsible, who were they ? And, were complaints made to Mr. Hoben, who was primarily responsible for the administration of the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway at Fredericton ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Hoben has to do with the management of the trains and the maintenance of the road-bed, as I understand it—he is not a traffic officer any way. My communications are with the head of the department; I do not have communications with track masters along the line or the district superintendents. The communications between the minister or the department and the railway are through the general manager, or, on a matter relating to traffic with the traffic master, or in a matter coming under his department, with the superintendent of motive power.

Mr. CROCKET. Would not Mr. White be immediately responsible to the assistant superintendent, Mr. Hoben ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In regard to his station duties, yes ; but not in regard to his duties in the solicitation of traffic.

Mr. CROCKET. To whom would he be responsible on that point ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The freight agent at Moncton, and the general traffic manager.

Mr. CROCKET. Would the hon. minister explain why he was so anxious about freight being transferred to the Canadian Pacific Railway before the dismissal of this man, and, since the new man has been put in the place, he has made no inquiries ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Complaints were made to me that we were losing freight. I took action on those complaints. I have had no complaints lately. I had not thought it my duty to inquire into these internal affairs, but, when they are brought to my notice by the officers of the railway, I feel it my duty to take action with regard to them. When the complaints reached me I inquired whether these conditions existed and what was the remedy, and, according to the advice of the officer that remedy was applied.

Mr. CROCKET. Am I to understand that Mr. White's dismissal was in consequence of the diversion of traffic to the Canadian Pacific Railway through his fault.

Mr. EMMERSON. I stated the reasons for diversion.

Mr. INGRAM. They were very unsatisfactory.

Mr. EMMERSON. Of course, I know that there is nothing I could say that would be satisfactory.

Mr. INGRAM. This Mr. White, had he been a member of parliament, perhaps would have been listened to with greater attention ; but, being only a poor station agent, his case was held to be not worthy of consideration. Now, the hon. gentleman has made, by inference, a serious charge against Mr. White. You can only infer that Mr. White has violated his instructions. Violated them, how ? If Mr. White was instruct-

ed to collect general freight at Fredericton, and John Brown came along with freight and wanted it routed over the road to a certain point, and if Mr. White, yielding to his request, did not route it over the line that the minister wanted him to route it, then Mr. White is deserving of censure and dismissal. The minister has not given a single instance where he routed freight belonging to any man over the Canadian Pacific Railway, he has not made out a case against Mr. White. In the next place, if Mr. Hoben, who is superintendent of that division, was not consulted as to whether he was carrying out his duties properly, then I hold that Mr. Hoben was not to blame. This is a clear case of dismissing a man in the most heartless manner and without a proper investigation. As I said before, if a member of parliament had done something of this kind his case would have been considered ; but, as he is only a poor railway agent, twelve days' notice is sufficient for him to get out. This man had been an agent for fifteen years on the Canada Eastern Railway, after he had been a brakeman for years previously to being an agent, and still we are told he was not qualified for the position of agent at Fredericton. I say it is disgraceful. The government have had this road only from October to January, and if this is the way they are going to treat their employees on the Canada Eastern Railway, it is high time a change should be made. As to Mr. Tiffin's ability as a railway man, there is no question that he is thoroughly competent and capable. He has had a wide experience, and is doing his duty faithfully and well. I am not finding fault with him, but I am finding fault with the government for dismissing this man in the manner they did. It is unheard of in any other railway service in this country.

Mr. CROCKET. One word with regard to the statement of the minister with reference to Mr. White's politics. As I said before. I do not think Mr. White's politics were known to anybody in the city of Fredericton outside his own family.

Mr. EMMERSON. I only quoted from his letter.

Mr. CROCKET. But I do know that Mr. Alexander Gibson, junior, the Liberal candidate in that election, suspected that Mr. White was not a supporter of his, and simply for the reason that his father and his brother were said to have been supporters of the Conservative candidate. Now, I have every reason to believe the statement which Mr. White made in his letter to the minister, saying that he voted for the Liberal candidate. I believe he did so. At the same time I do know that it is a matter of common knowledge in Fredericton. Mr. Gibson, the Liberal candidate, suspected that Mr. White had voted against him, and that he was marked for dismissal for that reason. Whatever may be said in this House, it will be difficult to convince the people of Fredericton and of the county of York that this dismissal was not made upon political grounds. Now, the minister has stated that politics had nothing whatever to do with this. I would like, in this connection, to draw attention to a declaration which the Minister of Railways made in the city of Fredericton in regard to citizenship in this country. In a speech he made in Fredericton, on Thursday, October 20th, the Minister of Railways declared :

> If there was any man in this city so blind to the best interests of his city, his family and his province as to cast his vote on November 3rd against Sir Wilfrid Laurier's government, he was not worthy of Canadian citizenship.

Mr. EMMERSON. I want to say to my hon. friend that I did not make that statement. It was quoted in the papers, and there was a great ado about it, but I did not say that.

Mr. CROCKET. I am glad to hear the minister make that statement here.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have given it a denial more than once since then. I have not had an opportunity of speaking in Fredericton since then, but if I had I would certainly have denied it.

Mr. FOSTER. It was in the heat of the contest.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, I did not use the words ; I did not speak in a moment of weakness, either. There were no exceptional circumstances, and I did not use the words.

Mr. CROCKET. I am glad to hear the minister make that statement. I did not hear him speak myself ; but I took this quotation from a full report of the speech which appeared in the ' Gleaner,' a Liberal paper published in that constituency.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend will not contend that it is a Liberal paper ; it is edited by his brother, as he knows, and it is a Conservative paper. The report of that speech was manifestly unjust. That alleged quotation from the speech was published all over the country, when, as a matter of fact, I had not used the words at all. I want to give it the most unqualified denial.

Mr. CROCKETT. This is the first time I have heard this. But I had this statement in my mind when the minister said that Mr. White was not qualified for his position, and I was therefore not surprised that a minister of the Crown who entertained the view that no man who would vote against Sir Wilfrid Laurier was worthy of Canadian citizenship, should hold that a station agent suspected of having voted against the government, was not qualified to hold a position under a Liberal government.

Mr. WHITE. If this question is ended, I would like to say one or two words with regard to the Intercolonial Railway expen-

ditures. I frankly confess that I have been somewhat startled by an examination of the public accounts in noting the large amount of money that appears to have been drained out of the treasury year after year in connection with that work. An examination of the report of the Minister of Railways for the last year shows that there was expended upon capital account on the Intercolonial $1,800,000 ; and that, in addition, the deficit between earnings and working expenses was $900,000. There we have upwards of $2,500,000 taken out of the public treasury in connection with that railway, and that at a time when the other great railways in this country have been increasing their net earnings. In addition, we have an expenditure of over $700,000 on capital account on the Prince Edward Island Railway, and a deficit of over $100,000 in connection with the running of that road. Now these figures are somewhat startling, and they indicate to my mind that something must be done in connection with this road to equalize receipts and expenditures. What that remedy is to be I do not propose to suggest. But it seems to me that with a road such as the Intercolonial, with an excellent roadbed of over 1,300 miles, which has cost the country, according to the public accounts, $72,000,000, the results are exceedingly disappointing to the general public. I find upon examination of the estimates that a very large expenditure is contemplated on capital account for the present year we are about to enter upon. If the deficits that have been shown during the last year continue for the next ten years, we will have a road of 1,300 odd miles costing us $100,000,000. I would suggest to the government and to the Minister of Railways that it is an absolute necessity that something should be done to improve the condition of things as they exist. I said I was not going to suggest what remedy should be adopted, but I would like to point out that upon an examination of the report of the Minister of Railways I find that one portion of the government railway in the eastern provinces, the Windsor branch, is the only portion that appears to have made any profit to the government at all ; and, if I am rightly informed, that road is not being operated by the government. I am not going to offer any criticism upon the officers of the road. The general manager, I believe, understands his business thoroughly. I do not believe he would have been retained in the employ of the governments that have employed him for a great number of years if he did not understand his business thoroughly. But I think that some explanation ought to be given to the committee as to why this large deficit has occurred, as to what the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals anticipates in the future, and, if these large deficits are to be continued, what remedy he proposes to get rid of them.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think that my hon. friend (Mr. White), whom I respect very highly, was in the House when I endeavoured to make my statement in respect to the revenue account the other night, and I do not think he has done me the honour of reading that statement. I would hardly expect that he would do so, but, I endeavoured on that occasion to show the reasons why there was such a deficit and I think I gave the true reasons. I have suspected for some time that there was an effort being made to discredit the Intercolonial Railway and that it was made in the interest of large railway corporations in this country. I think that a good many of the facts in respect to the Intercolonial Railway have been distorted. We have been increasing the wages and the cost of everything has increased, but our rates could not be changed. They remain the same. We hear a great deal of complaint about the Intercolonial Railway and its deficits. Now, the Intercolonial Railway was built for a certain purpose. It is practically the highway between what were known as the older provinces of Canada and the provinces by the sea. It was built in very much the same way as the canal system was—for the benefit of the whole country, for the benefit of transportation and for the purpose of inducing and stimulating trade between the provinces. We hear no complaint about the million dollars, or nearly a million dollars, that are expended annually in order to support and maintain the canals aside from the question of capital expenditure. We are putting millions year after year in the canals in the way of capital account and we are spending every year, or have been during the past few years, some $800,000 or $1,000,000 in maintaining these canals. We hear no complaints about these expenditures or about increasing the capital expenditure on the canal system. We hear no maritime member on the other side getting up and complaining that the Intercolonial Railway is being unfairly dealt with in this respect although we hear hon. gentlemen opposite who are from other sections of Canada than the maritime provinces, condemning the capital expenditure and all other expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. EMMERSON. Pardon me, it is done year in and year out, and it has been going on for years by these hon. gentlemen who do not in any way complain of adding to the capital account of Canada in respect to the canal system. I think this is a matter that should be treated fairly.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why are you dragging in the canals ? It is because you cannot get yourself out of the hole you are in.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) remembers that he wants a canal down near Brighton. I was waiting to hear what he had to say about canals. My

only object in bringing in canals was to hear what he had to say about them.

Mr. COCHRANE. It was not any such thing.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am sure my hon. friend will not interrupt me. I am sure he will not say that he does not want to have the Trent Valley canal go down through his constituency.

Mr. COCHRANE. That's parish politics. You had better stick to your subject.

Mr. WHITE. I am sorry that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals should suppose for one moment that I am desirous of treating this question from a sectional standpoint. I am not proposing to treat it from a sectional standpoint, but the defence that the hon. minister has set up is really no defence at all. He states that the great railway corporations are endeavouring to decry the Intercolonial Railway. In what way ; pray ? Does not the report of the Hon. Minister of Railways justify every word I have said to-night in regard to the deficits and capital expenditure ? Now, my hon. friend alludes to the canals. He says that a large amount of money is expended on the canals, but I have been endeavouring to draw a comparison between the results of the Intercolonial Railway upon which there is a franchise and other great railways, and my hon. friend will remember that there are no franchises on the canals, that the canals are open to everybody who has a boat to put into them. I have been endeavouring to show that whilst the other great railways throughout the country have been increasing their net earnings the Intercolonial Railway has been going behind and notably the last year. If that is the case surely it cannot be called sectionalism on the part of myself because I happen to come from the province of Ontario if I complain that this great drain is being made on the public treasury. I am not complaining in regard to the management of the road because I do not know how it is managed, but I venture to affirm that if the Intercolonial Railway were put upon a different basis, if the manager of the Intercolonial Railway were entirely free from political complications, from the political complications that beset the Minister of Railways, if the railway itself were put into the hands of a competent manager—as I presume Mr. Pottinger to be—and if he were allowed to use his own discretion and judgment in regard to the working of the railway, we would have fewer deficits and fewer complaints from any portion of the country in regard to these deficits. I have endeavoured fairly, I think, Mr. Chairman, to discuss this subject. I have pointed out what appears in the public accounts. I have shown that the public accounts indicate that if the deficits and expenditure go on for the next ten years as they have during the last year, and as it is proposed that they shall go on during the present year we will have really a capital account of $100,000,000. Is that a condition of things that is to continue ? I ask the hon. Minister of Railways if he thinks it is a question of sectionalism. It is not a sectional question at all, I am not debating it as a sectional question but I am debating it, as I consider it, from the national standpoint, and I say that when a railway constructed as the Intercolonial Railway has been constructed, having the best roadbed in Canada, being well equipped in every essential and with a large portion of the expenditure which upon other great railways comes out of the working expenses, being charged to capital account—I say that when a railway under these conditions, managed through the department of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, shows the results which the Intercolonial Railway has shown during the past year there ought to be some remedy applied and that remedy should be applied at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. COCHRANE. I was going to say in connection with this matter that my position in this House has been very clearly defined. I am not here to represent any section of the country. I am here, as I understand it, to use my best judgment and to see that the people's money is properly expended in all parts of Canada from the boisterous Atlantic to the placid Pacific. I take it that I am here to see that the money is expended in the best interests of the Dominion of Canada as a whole. But I do not want the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to introduce low parish politics as he has done by appealing to me to know whether I want a canal constructed through the village of Brighton.

I am here representing a constituency in which Brighton is situated ; Brighton is a thriving and populous village and when the Minister of Railways and Canals was perambulating his surveyors around Cobourg and Port Hope, the inhabitants of Brighton asked him to have their route surveyed. Why does the minister want to refer to the canal system which was inaugurated before he and I were born, and why does he attempt to raise sectional prejudices in connection therewith. A minister of the Crown should be above that. The fact stands out that other railroads in the Dominion are paying well, while year after year there are huge deficits on the Intercolonial Railway in addition to there being large sums charged to capital account which ought to be charged to running expenses. We should call a halt. We, on this side of the House desire that the money of the people of Canada should not be frittered away as it is, and if that railway is to be conducted on business principles they had better adopt the plan under which other rail-

ways are made to pay. We are not criticising the expenditure of the Intercolonial Railway from a sectional point of view. I do not care where the money is spent if it is properly spent in the best interests of the Dominion, and when we point to these things as representing our constituents the minister has no right to draw a red herring across the trail by talking about the money spent on the canals. The canals are for the benefit of Canada or they would not be built if it were not for the benefit of Canada, and the canals have nothing to do with the question of wasting money on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman from Renfrew (Mr. White) made a very reasonable demand when he asked what the Minister of Railways was going to do to prevent these large recurring deficits on the Intercolonial Railway. In the statement which he made the other night the Minister of Railways gave no suggestion of a remedy for the prevention of these deficits.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, I did.

Mr. INGRAM. I listened attentively to the speech made by the minister and I challenge him to point to any effective suggestion which he made for doing away with deficits on the government railways. The Minister of Railways finds fault with the members from Ontario discussing this matter, and he says that the members from the maritime provinces do not discuss the Intercolonial Railway estimates. The minister may be correct to that extent, but I can tell him that the members from Ontario are not objecting to a reasonable expendiure on government railways. What we are objecting to is extravagant and wasteful expenditure. What we are objecting to is the method of expenditure, and we have good reason to make a protest. I have stated often in this House that I am a believer in government ownership of railways, but I am entirely opposed to the present method of government management of these railways. I am not saying one word against the manager of the government railways. I have often said, and I repeat it that if he were allowed to do what he thought best; if he were allowed to proceed without political interference, then, instead of having a deficit from year to year it is possible that the railroad might pay its way. It is because of the political management and adminstration of the railway that the minister is compelled to come to parliament year after year announcing ever increasing deficits. That is what we complain of, and we will continue to complain until the grievance is removed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The observations of the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) were very much in point, and especially so in view of the declaration of the Prime Minister during the last campaign, who in discussing the question whether it would be advisable for the government to own and possibly to operate a transcontinental railway, said he objected to do so because the system under which government railways are operated in Canada at present is a vicious system. That expression was used by him in Toronto. We must assume that he expressed the view of the administration and therefore something ought to be done by him and his government to abolish this vicious system. The results show that something is wrong. We have a deficit of $900,000 on the Intercolonial Railway, a deficit of $100,000 on the Prince Edward Island and capital expenditures amounting to upwards of $2,000,000, a considerable portion of which would not be classed as capital expenditure by the great railroads of this country.

If I am not interrupting the discussion on this point, I wish to mention another matter. In the papers laid on the table of the House in connection with the arbitration proceedings between the Intercolonial and the Grand Trunk Railway, there are a great many allegations made on behalf of the government as to the violation of the agreement with the Grand Trunk in respect to diversion of traffic. At page 29 of this document the government declares:

> That the Grand Trunk Railway Company has endeavoured to divert, has diverted and is now diverting traffic which should go to the maritime provinces under the agreement between them; that it is endeavouring to divert that traffic to points in the United States, and that in consequence the Intercolonial Railway suffered a great deal of damage.

On page 21, the amended statement of the government declares:

> The government is claiming damages for the diversion by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of traffic originating throughout the company's system or connections west of Montreal and offered for shipment to points on the Intercolonial Railway or reached by its connections; and for the diversion of traffic originating in the city of Montreal or on the Montreal joint section destined to points on the Intercolonial Railway and routed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company via United States ports instead of via Montreal and the Intercolonial Railway.

I find that same allegation emphasized by a charge made on page 36 of this case, namely:

> That the Grand Trunk Railway Company, in reference to traffic originating throughout the company's system or connections west of Montreal, for export via Montreal and the Intercolonial Railway and via the ports of St. John, N.B., and Halifax, N.S., has been and is diverting the same by charging for the carrying of the said traffic a higher rate than that charged by it to shippers for the carriage of similar traffic to Portland; the whole to the great loss and damage of the Intercolonial Railway.

I find further a charge as follows:

That in order to carry out its object of so diverting the said traffic in breach of its said agreement, the Grand Trunk Railway Company has in the first instance instructed its agents by circular and otherwise to refuse, where shipments for export via St. John, N.B., or Halifax, N.S., to European or other ports are offered, to give to the shipper a through bill of lading from the point of origin of the said freight to the point of destination, although bound by its contract to do so; and further, in the second instance, has endeavoured to carry out, and has carried out, its object of so diverting the said traffic in breach of its agreement, by issuing circulars and instructions to its agents, and by authorizing the latter to accept the said traffic for export, when the same is consigned via Portland at a lower rate and on more favourable conditions than when carried for export via the said ports of St. John, N.B., or Halifax, N.S.

I find charges also on pages 46 and 47 of the case, where it is alleged that the Grand Trunk Railway Company has removed from its station houses in Montreal and elsewhere advertisements of the Intercolonial Railway placed there under the terms of the contract already referred to. Now, this is a very important question. The minister will remember, at least most of us remember, that when an arrangement was made between the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway Company for the user to the extent of one-half by the Intercolonial Railway of terminal facilities at Montreal, it was claimed by the gentlemen who then spoke for the government that it was a wise action on behalf of the government to pay an enormous rental for one-half the user of those terminals, because under the contract then made with the Grand Trunk Railway Company we would secure for the ports of Halifax and St. John a very large amount of traffic. Apparently, according to the allegations of the government made in the arbitration proceedings which are now pending, that contract has not been observed at all by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and the results which have been submitted to the committee by the Minister of Railways and Canals indicate in a very emphatic way the truth of that statement. I would like to ask the minister to what extent the expectations of the government in that regard have been disappointed—whether or not it is true that the Grand Trunk Railway Company is still refusing to carry out the terms of that agreement, with the result that we are paying for terminal facilities in the city of Montreal an enormous rental without any corresponding benefit to the Intercolonial Railway or the county as a whole?

Mr. EMMERSON. Referring to the last question of my hon. friend, as to any corresponding benefit for the rental paid to the Grand Trunk, I may state that the Intercolonial Railway does complain and has complained to the Grand Trunk Railway Company that they have not carried out an agreement which if carried out would be very greatly to the interest of the Intercolonial Railway. Now, the matter is pending, and the Intercolonial authorities are determined to carry it through, and to exercise all the power they can exercise in order to have that contract carried out. But it is perhaps not fitting that we should discuss it while it is the subject matter of arbitration. It may be that the result of the arbitration will teach the Grand Trunk Railway Company a lesson. If not, I shall hope that there may be some way whereby they may be taught that it is not to their interest to violate conditions which they solemnly entered into with the Intercolonial Railway in regard to the railway terminals.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. STOCKTON. The statement was made by the hon. minister this afternoon that there was a diversion of freight from Fredericton over the Canadian Pacific Railway, which otherwise would have gone over the Intercolonial Railway. I would like to ask the minister what was the objective point of the freight and the kind of freight so diverted.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not the details. My information was general to the effect that traffic which had hitherto gone by way of the Canada Eastern over the Intercolonial Railway, was going by the Canadian Pacific Railway. I spoke to the general traffic manager and he admitted that some freight was being diverted.

Mr. STOCKTON. Was that freight going to the United States or Western Canada?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think to Western Canada.

Mr. STOCKTON. Then the minister had no information as to the kind of freight that was being diverted or the objective point to which it was being sent.

Mr. EMMERSON. I had not the details.

Mr. STOCKTON. Then for all the minister knew, that freight might have been going to the United States.

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not assume it was, but it might.

Mr. STOCKTON. The hon. minister knows that the Canadian Pacific Railway has a station in Fredericton, and so has the Intercolonial Railway since it acquired the Canada Eastern. They are separated stations. Did the minister think that the agent of the Intercolonial Railway, when a customer came to his station, to ship freight, would divert that freight from the Canada

Eastern and the Intercolonial Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway? Is that the charge against Mr. White or the information received by the hon. minister from his official ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The freight that would go by the Canadian Pacific Railway would not go to the Intercolonial Railway station at Fredericton at all, and the way-bills would not be brought under the notice of our agent there. But I understood from the general traffic manager that it was the duty of this man at Fredericton, under the supervision of Mr. Smiley, district freight agent at St. John, to solicit for freight by way of the Intercolonial, and that there was a falling off in that respect as compared with the period when the Canada Eastern was not under control of the Intercolonial Railway. At that time the Intercolonial Railway got that traffic in connection with the Canada Eastern, but the Canadian Pacific Railway had been too active and had got ahead of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. STOCKTON. The Canada Eastern was taken over in October and the minister was given the information he speaks of some seven or eight weeks after that. Then without any evidence as to how the falling of occurred or why there was a diversion of freight, if there was any, the minister dismissed Mr. White.

Mr. CROCKET. Did the hon. minister call the attention of Mr. White to this matter ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Personally, I did not.

Mr. CROCKET. Did the general superintendent, Mr. Price or Mr. Tiffin, or any of the officials, have any communication whatever with Mr. White regarding this alleged diversion of freight ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Not that I am aware of. I left the matter in the hands of Mr. Tiffin, and told him that if there was any official who was not qualified to cope with the Canadian Pacific Railway in the securing of freight, he should take the proper action.

Mr. STOCKTON. I quite agree that if any officials are inefficient, they should be supplanted by men who are efficient. But what I am trying to find out now is what justification there was for the dismissal of Mr. White. So far as the minister has told us, it seems that after an experience of only seven or eight weeks, he found there was a falling off in the freight from the Canada Eastern to the Intercolonial Railway, and without taking sufficient time to get general results, he jumped to the conclusion that this station master was responsible and was guilty of dereliction of duty in diverting freight to a rival railway.

Mr. STOCKTON.

Mr. EMMERSON. I must be guided by my general manager, Mr. Tiffin. When I ask the cause, and he assigns a certain cause, I must be guided by his conclusion. I left the matter in his hands. I told him I would hold the traffic department responsible because freight which had heretofore gone by the Canada Eastern should continue to go that way. Mr. Tiffin mentioned that he had seen some of the Fredericton shippers and had personally inquired into the matter.

Mr. STOCKTON. But in the light of subsequent events, does not the minister now think he should have made inquiries and that he had not sufficient information on which to fasten a charge of this character against a man who had been in the employ of the Canada Eastern for thirty years and against whom he had no direct evidence. All the minister had to go upon was a falling off of freight, and because there was a falling off, he assumed that it had been diverted, at the instance of this official, to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman seems to fail to catch the point. There was a direct charge by the traffic manager that this man was not securing that freight and that it was because of his inefficiency that we were losing it.

Mr. STOCKTON. There was a falling off in freight, and so it was assumed that there was a diversion.

Mr. EMMERSON. No. This was at Fredericton. Freight originating there was not going by the Canada Eastern but by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it was alleged that it was because this man was not looking after his duties and that he was not qualified for them.

Mr. STOCKTON. The minister told us but a moment ago that he did not know the objective point of that freight, whether to the west or to the United States. If to the United States it would not go by the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. If it had gone by way of Chaudière to the Quebec Central before that, why should it not continue ?

Mr. STOCKTON. Did it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I understand that this freight was going west. I did not inquire whether it was going to a United States point or to a Canadian point.

Mr. STOCKTON. That is just why I find fault with the minister. When these general statements were made, he should not have allowed his officials to deal so harshly with this station agent. There was no evidence, so far as I can see, that he was guilty in connection with the falling off of freight for the Canada Eastern or Inter-

colonial Railway, or that there was a diversion to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman has referred to the fact that this man was employed by the Canada Eastern for twenty-three years. I care not whether he was employed fifty years. I, as head of the department would not be justified in keeping him if he was pronounced inefficient by our officials. There cannot be any great claim of sympathy for this gentleman. Ordinarily speaking, when the transfer of the Canada Eastern to the Intercolonial Railway was made, that would end his services. He was there only on probation after that, as all of them were. The conditions prevailing on the Canada Eastern since the transfer, it will be admitted are not the same as those previous to the transfer. These men were retained simply on sufferance and on probation. We were not under obligation to keep them. Those who were satisfactory were continued, and those who prove satisfactory no doubt, will be continued.

Mr. STOCKTON. I do not think the minister does himself justice in making the statement he has just made, that he did not care whether this man was there twenty-three years or fifty. I say that a man who has been in the employ of a company for twenty years or fifty years is entiled at least to justice; and, before he is dismissed he is entitled to know why. And there should be sufficient evidence in the possession of the officials, and brought to the notice of the minister, to justify that dismissal.

Mr. DANIEL. We have heard a good deal to-night about the diversion of freight from Fredericton to the Canadian Pacific Railway instead of the Intercolonial Railway, and it was assumed to be caused by the want of attention or of ability on the part of this station agent. Possibly, there were other reasons for that diversion from the Intercolonial Railway to the Canadian Pacific Railway. We are called upon to-night to vote about $7,000,000 for the running expenses for the ensuing year for the Intercolonial Railway. We have heard a good deal of the very large deficit on the operations for the last year, the largest deficit, by a very large amount, ever recorded against the people's railway. As an explanation of that deficit, it has usually been pleaded in this House that it was occasioned largely by the increase in the wages of the employees. But, if that is the reason of the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway why do not the other railways of Canada show a deficit. Is the Intercolonial Railway the only railway that raised the wages of its employees? I think I am within the mark when I say that the Intercolonial Railway has not increased the wages of its employees in any greater ratio or any greater degree than the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk, or any other railway in Canada. We find, in the report of the Department of Railways and Canals, the statement that the Intercolonial Railway actually carried less freight last year than it did the year before. Then, it must have earned less money. And that, I take it, is the reason of this large deficit. And, I might point out that this deficit is caused at a time when every gentleman in this House has been congratulating the country on being in such a remarkably high state of development, with every thing booming and business in the best shape. The Intercolonial Railway, I believe, is the only railway that, with an increase of mileage, shows a decrease of freight hauled. If that is the case under the present circumstances, what are we to expect when business is less prosperous, when hard times come? It seems to me the case is a very serious one. The minister spoke of the criticisms of the opposition on the expenditure of the Intercolonial, and intimated that the members, especially from the province of Ontario, were sectional in their criticism. I was very sorry to hear him bring up so frequently as he has during this session reference to the expenditure on the canals in Quebec and Ontario, and intimation that if the canals, which have cost a great deal of money, are being largely made free, no one can criticise any expenditure on the Intercolonial. Now, no one on this side, whether from Ontario or any where else, has the slightest desire to curtail proper expenditure on the people's railway. What we do object to is reckless and unnecessary expenditure, and the making of the railway management a partisan political machine. That, I am sorry to say is what the management at the present time very largely is. If the minister will do justice to government ownership, and, by proper government management will do for the railway what ordinary business management does for other railways, there will be no two opinions in this country as to the benefit of government ownership. We believe in government ownership—certainly for my part I believe in it very earnestly. I do not believe in the management which the Intercolonial is getting at the present time. Now it is possible that there may be some other reason than the laxity of a station agent why freight is diverted from the Intercolonial. With regard to that matter, I would like to read a statement that appeared in the hon. gentleman's own organ in Moncton not long since.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have no organ.

Mr. DANIEL. Well, for the benefit of those gentlemen who have not seen it, I will read some extracts from it.

Mr. EMMERSON. No one ever claimed that any paper printed in Moncton is my organ.

Mr. DANIEL. Well, then, we will call it the government organ. It is difficult to tell just now whether a paper is really the organ of a minister, or whether the organ of a member is a government organ or not. There are difficulties abroad just now.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would not bank too much on those difficulties if I were you.

Mr. DANIEL. I will read it, then the hon. gentleman can claim it or not, as he wishes :

The traffic situation on the Intercolonial, particularly with regard to freight, is rapidly reaching a climax. Indeed, in the minds of many it has already reached a crisis and sharp action is absolutely necessary, and that at once. Shippers from all over the country are crying out against the management with respect to the manner in which their shipments are handled, and will not believe the excuses made by the official staff. Many thousands of dollars have been spent in making improvements and placing the road in a position to handle a situation far more difficult than that which confronts the operating department to-day. A representative of the Allan Line of steamers passed through the city recently and complained bitterly of the manner in which cargoes from their steamers were handled between Halifax and Montreal. He stated that his firm had protested that if their shipments were not given better attention and hauled over the road with better despatch and fewer delays, they would be compelled to divert this traffic to a competitive point.

That is the point.

With this in view, and many similar complaints from shippers with business just as large as the Allans', how can it be reasonably expected that all important shipments will be made over the Intercolonial and not be diverted to the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific roads?

Surely, Mr. Chairman, I think there is one reason why traffic becomes diverted occasionally, and perhaps frequently, from the Intercolonial. During the last week or two I have had occasion to have a little correspondence with the Intercolonial through Mr. Pottinger ; and I may say in that connection that Mr. Pottinger certainly facilitated the business I had to do in every way he could. But as a wind-up to that correspondence, I give a letter from a gentleman to-day in which he states that :

He has come to the conclusion that his freight is of no benefit to the Intercolonial and has decided to bring his freight via the Canadian Pacific Railway. . . . Should this state of affairs continue I will have to go out of business.

I may say that in addition to the correspondence I have previously read, and which Mr. Pottinger will remember, this gentleman says :

At present my mill is idle for want of corn, and two cars within a few yards of my mill. I have used every means available to get a shunt, but of no use. Even put my men out and had my siding cleared, yet the sectionmen can clear the siding directly in front of my place for Peter's tannery, and get both coal and tan bark, while I have to stand by with my hands folded and cancel carload after carload of meal. I have come to the conclusion that my freight is of no benefit to the Intercolonial, therefore have decided to bring my freight via Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. Who makes that complaint ?

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. C. W. Stewart, who went there and invested his capital in a corn meal mill, which he built up right alongside the Intercolonial, intending to use the Intercolonial for all his business, and he has been using it for all his business. But he has not met, as he tells us at all events, with that treatment which he has a right to expect. As I said just now, I have brought this matter to the attention of the officials of the road. I did not say anything to the minister, because I presumed that the proper thing to do in a case of that kind was to act through the officials of the road, and Mr. Pottinger communicated with Mr. Tiffin. Now I would appeal to the minister if he thinks that is the way to increase the business of the Intercolonial. Here is a case in point. The report shows that the traffic business of the Intercolonial is decreasing, and here is one of the reasons, I take it, why the traffic is decreasing. As a matter of fact, the minister will see in his own report that there was really less through freight on the Intercolonial last year than there was drawn over it seventeen years ago. That is not a condition of things that ought to exist. I would be very glad if the minister would see, now that his attention has been called to it, that this gentleman is properly treated. I do not know what his business amounts to, but he brings everything he uses for that mill over the Intercolonial. I know the position of these two places, Peter's tannery and the corn meal mill are almost alongside one another. One man gets everything done for him, the other man cannot even get his stock in trade, that is only a few yards off, brought up to his warehouse.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why can one man get the favour and the other cannot ?

Mr. DANIEL. Because the Intercolonial does not see fit to do it. He wants a little shunting of a few yards, and it cannot be done—that is his statement.

Mr. EMMERSON. Does my hon. friend say that the matter of shunting was brought to the notice of Mr. Pottinger ?

Mr. DANIEL. I do not know—his letter is all I know about it.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend says he has had considerable correspondence with Mr. Pottinger, and that it culminated in the letter he had received to-day. Now did my hon. friend call Mr. Pottinger's attention to the matter of shunting ?

Mr. DANIEL. This letter only came to me to-day. This gentleman says he is done now, he has reached the climax, he is going to cease operating with the Intercolonial and will bring his business via the Canadian Pacific Railway. If he had asked me to interest myself in getting his wants attended to, I should have been glad to do so. But as a matter of fact, he says he cannot stand the racket any longer and that he must go somewhere else.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend has mentioned something that has not been brought to my attention. I would remind him, however, that this complaint against the management of the Intercolonial has nothing to do with politics. It is simply a complaint against the officials and their management or control of the details and the routine. I have never heard of it until this moment, but sitting here, I have gathered already some information with which the hon. gentleman must be familiar. He has had before him the letters of the general traffic manager. It appears that there is a complaint upon the part of Mr. Stewart who owns a corn grinding mill at St. John that the Intercolonial Railway is charging him a higher rate than the Canadian Pacific Railway is charging somebody else for the same class of goods. That, as I understand it, is the core and kernel of the whole complaint. My hon. friend must know what the answer of the general traffic manager and of the general manager of the road was in that regard. He has had their answer before him and I think it would have been fair for him to have given that information to the committee, namely, that the management state that there could be no such thing, that the Canadian Pacific Railway, under the traffic arrangements, could not charge less than the Intercolonial Railway is charging for the same amount of transportation ; that is that the rates that apply to one railway must apply to the other. Everybody knows that in so far as through freight is concerned there are certain traffic arrangements between railways, there is a certain schedule of rates and unless there is a breach of faith on the part of some one they are all bound by that agreement and that schedule, and if there is any rebate it is in fraud of the agreement and certainly is against good faith. Mr. Pottinger has informed me that in so far as any question of shunting is concerned this is the first he has ever heard of it, and I am sure that the officials would not discriminate in favour of one as against the other. It is purely a matter of the internal management of the Intercolonial Railway, and my hon. friend will see that the complaint that is made that this railway is a politically managed road has no foundation. These things are under the control of the manager, the general traffic manager and their officials and they are all regulated by them. These matters do not come under my supervision. Sometimes appeals are made to me in respect to these matters and I am sometimes called upon to adjust them. In doing so, I do it in conference with the officials. I have not the technical knowledge, I am not supposed to have it, and I must necessarily be guided by their reports and their advices in such matters.

Mr. DANIEL. I have no statement to make in regard to the rates of freight as charged on the Intercolonial Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway. As a matter of fact my correspondent has certainly expressed his dissatisfaction with the rates that are charged on the Intercolonial, and he says that he was charged one cent more per hundred pounds, or per barrel, whatever it was—per hundred pounds, I think—than the rate that was guaranteed to him, by the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I might make the whole thing clear by reading this corespondence, but I do not think it is worth while to do that. I will merely state that my corespondent says in his letter :

> In reply I would say that Mr. Wallace, general freight agent's information with regard to lake port corn is correct, but my claim is on corn all rail to Chicago.

That is what he says in regard to the rebate. I do not know that it is necessary for me to read this letter. I do not want to detain and weary the committee with a large correspondence on this one single thing, but I just bring the result to the notice of the hon. minister, and I am quite sure that a man who has invested his money in a mill, placed right alongside the Intercolonial Railway in order to be near it and to do his business in connection with it, would not write such a letter as this or state that the condition of affairs between the Intercolonial Railway and himself has about come to a climax, that he is coming to a conclusion that his business is no good to the Intercolonial Railway and that he will have to do business elsewhere unless there were some grounds for so doing. I desire to draw the attention of the hon. minister to this state of affairs. If it is not the fault of the railway why, of course, the railway cannot be blamed for it. But I do not think that a gentleman such as Mr. Stewart is, would make statements of that kind unless he had some real cause to do it.

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, I think my hon. friend is manifestly unfair to the officials of the Intercolonial Railway. This is not a charge against me, it is not a charge

against the department, but it is a charge against the efficient management of the Intercolonial and he has brought to the attention of the committee what I would say, and I do not say it in any offensive sense, is a garbled statement of some complaint which the hon. gentleman says exists.

Mr. DANIEL. I take issue with that statement and I would like to know whether the hon. minister is in order or not.

Mr. EMMERSON. I say that I do not say it in an offensive sense.

Mr. DANIEL. I do not care in what sense the hon. minister says it, it is not a true statement.

Mr. EMMERSON. The facts will speak for themselves. It is a one-sided statement. The hon. gentleman has all the letters there, he has letters that were addressed to the officers of the Intercolonial Railway and he has their replies and their explanations. The great charge of the colleagues of my hon. friend on the opposite side of the House has been ever since I have been a member of this House that we have been carrying freight for nothing, that our freight rates are entirely too low—this has been the universal complaint against the Intercolonial Railway—and now the hon. gentleman stands up and says that the Intercolonial Railway is charging too much, that it is charging more than the Canadian Pacific Railway. In so far as their rates are concerned, they are supposed to charge the same rate per hundred pounds or per barrel. That is recognized, and if any one of the parties to a traffic arrangement violates it he is not acting in good faith towards the others. Surely this matter having been imported into this discussion, not for my sake but for the sake of the management, it is only fair, that the whole matter should be made known. I regret that it will take up time, and I regret that it will take up space in 'Hansard' but there must be some answer. I have not a very clear knowledge of it, it has not been brought to my notice, I never heard of it until I heard it from the lips of my hon. friend a few moments ago. But there is one statement he made in respect to the earning of the Intercolonial Railway which I think should be corrected. I know it does not tell in favour of the position which I have taken, but it is truth and should be recognized as such. The earnings of the Intercolonial Railway last year, as compared with the previous year, have been increased, and yet despite that fact the expenditures on the Intercolonial Railway were increased. But the gross earnings were increased and therefore it should not go down as a matter of record that the gross earnings of last year were not as great as the preceding year.

Mr. DANIEL. I wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that I made no such statement as he has attributed to me. I did not mention the words 'gross earnings' at all. I said that the amount of freight he had carried over the road during last year was less than that carried during the year before. That is the statement I made and that is the statement I make now. Let me read to the minister his own report which is as follows :

> The freight traffic amounted to $4,041,122.48, or 63.25 per cent of the gross earnings, a decrease of $87,132.52.

There is the statement from his own report, and that is the report I was reading from. I made no reference at all to the gross earnings; I am quite aware there was a slight increase of gross earnings last year over the year before, but my reference was to the traffic, and the idea I had in bringing the matter up was that such occurrences as this might be some reason why a smaller amount of freight was carried. If there is good care taken of the patrons of the Intercolonial Railway, I do not see why the business should not increase. I can understand that if a man goes to Mr. Stewart and tells him that he is getting better treatment from the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that such can be shown to be the case, it is reasonable to suppose that he would transfer his business.

Mr. EMMERSON. I admit that if Mr. Stewart was getting his freight hauled over the Canadian Pacific Railway from Chicago to St. John for one cent per hundred pounds less than the Intercolonial Railway rate, he would be justified in sending his freight by the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have stated, however, that it is the contention of the traffic manager of the Intercolonial Railway that the freight between Chicago and St. John must, under the traffic agreement, pay the same rate whether carried by the Intercolonial Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. DANIEL. I understand that.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think it is fair that this country should understand it, too, and if it is true that the Canadian Pacific Railway are cutting rates in violation of the agreement it should be known.

Mr. DANIEL. I have made no reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway cutting rates, and I do not know that the minister has any right to make such an insinuation. There are other things which count in the treatment of patrons of a railway besides the question of rates. My correspondent is evidently complaining of the treatment he gets by the railway, but as to whether any one gets better rates on the Canadian Pacific Railway for the same class of business than on the Intercolonial Railway I am not prepared to say; the rates are supposed to be and they probably are the same.

Mr. EMMERSON. There are through long haul rates.

Mr. DANIEL. Then the rates being the same there must be a difference in the accommodation afforded by the two roads or my correspondent would not make such a complaint. I shall be very glad to pass this letter over to Mr. Pottinger. This gentleman makes the statement here that when a couple of loaded cars were within a few yards of the mill, although he cleared the tracks with his own men, he could not get the cars shunted.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. After listening to the wishy-washy arguments of the Minister of Railways—

Some hon. MEMBER. Oh.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Hon. gentlemen opposite say 'Oh.' but if they had listened to these arguments for the last few days, they would come to the same conclusion as I have.

Mr. EMMERSON. You are entitled to a great deal of sympathy.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not ask for any. Here we have the minister trying to shunt the responsibility on to the men who are with him in managing the Intercolonial Railway. I do not believe that is fair to these men.

Mr. EMMERSON. Will my hon. friend pardon me. I take the full responsibility in connection with the management of the Intercolonial Railway, and in the discussion of these estimates I have not in any way attempted to place any of that responsibility on the shoulders of the officials of the road. But my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel) clearly stated that this was purely a question between certain officials and a gentleman named Stewart. It is a matter which has not been brought to my notice in any way, and according to my hon. friend's own statement, it is a matter for the officials of the railroad to deal with. Therefore, out of respect to these gentlemen, I ask that he should give their letter and place it on 'Hansard' side by side with the charge that is made by Mr. Stewart. If my hon. friend does not do that I shall certainly do it, because I think it would be unfair treatment to the officials of the Intercolonial Railway if that letter is withheld from the knowledge of the committee.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. This afternoon we had the minister giving considerable attention to a poor station agent who was dismissed, and naturally it would be supposed that a matter of this kind mentioned by my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel) would come under his notice to. There cannot be too much said in condemnation of the present management of the Intercolonial Railway, with its huge deficits from year to year. The hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) made a splendid suggestion when he said the Intercolonial should be taken out of politics, and if that were done I believe it would be one of the best things that has ever happened this country. Why should not the Intercolonial Railway be a paying institution? Look at the Australian government railway system with its different gauges and the expense of transhipping freight and there you will find a government railway a paying concern.

Some hon. MEMBER. Oh.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Do the hon. gentlemen say 'Oh?'

Some hon MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Then they do not know what is going on in Australia. Last year the Australian railways paid the government three per cent on the investment and here in Canada we have a government railway which should be the most up to date in the country running behind year after year when other railways are earning large dividends and increasing their traffic. And yet in view of this the minister tells us that we are making garbled statements and that your humble servant here was having information pumped into him. Let us look back at what has occurred in this House for the last few days, and we will see that if it had not been for his deputy pumping information into the Minister of Railways the minister would be in a sorry plight. I do not wish to prolong the argument to-night, but too much cannot be said in condemnation of the way in which the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway and its branches are managed by this government, and were the Prime Minister in his place I would urge upon him the necessity of creating an independent commission and taking the Intercolonial and all its branches out of politics, so that we should have a paying investment instead of one that is running behind and showing deficits year after year.

Mr. INGRAM. The Minister of Railways has taken occasion to stand up for the officials of the government railways in view of a remark of the hon. member for St. John. That is a good thing to do, and I commend my hon. friend for it. We are to-day voting some $7,000,000, part of which is to be devoted to increasing the salaries of the men on the Intercolonial Railway. What I rose specially to say was this. When the government bought the Canada Eastern Railway, I presume they intended to carry out the usual practice of railway companies of retaining in their employ the employees whom they found on the railway when they took it over. One of these employees was Mr. White, the station agent at Fredericton. After twenty-three years of service, Mr. White was paid the magnificent salary of $65 a month on which to keep himself and his family; but, because the minister heard

a few complaints about Mr. White not getting sufficient freight at Fredericton, he discharged him on fourteen days' notice. I was sorry to hear the minister say it did not matter to him whether a man was ten years or twenty-five years in the service of the company. If the minister wants to encourage the employees on the government railway to do their duty, he must not exhibit that spirit towards them, but be prepared to appreciate long and faithful service and reward it properly. He supplanted Mr. White by employing Mr. Walker and paying him $85 a month for what he expected Mr. White to do for $65 a month. That is a poor way to treat Mr. White after his long service. On ordinary railways the officials would say to Mr. White: We find that you are not competent to perform the duties of station agent at this important station; therefore, we will supplant you with a man qualified to fulfil the requirements of this station, but we will move you to another station where the duties will be such as you can perform. That would be humane treatment, and would encourage the employees on the railway to give efficient service; and unless you give the employees humane treatment, you cannot expect them to work efficiently. I have a statement of the minister to the effect that the strong competition of the Canadian Pacific Railway with the Intercolonial Railway must naturally lead the officers of the Intercolonial to greater exertion. I again urge upon the minister, on behalf of this man, who appears to be a deserving man, to find some station where he can be of service. There is no person to stand up for him except the hon. gentleman representing his constituency. He has not been discharged by reason of any political interference. I appeal again to my hon. friend not to be harsh towards this unfortunate man, but to do his duty as the head of the government system of railways and give him employment at some other station. By that means he will encourage all good, steady, honest employees to do their duty.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have had it in my heart to express to the minister the same sentiments that have been so ably expressed by the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram). I do not know the details of this case, but from the statement of the minister himself, there is no evidence to show that Mr. White was unfit for the position he occupied for so many years. At any rate, the rule of the government departments is to allow a gratuity amounting, I think, to a month's salary for every year of public service to men who are dismissed; and I understand that when any road is taken over, the officers on that road are treated the same as if they had been in the government service. Even if the worst the minister says of Mr. White is true, that he is unfit for the Fredericton job, there are many other places along the line that he could fill. I submit to the minister that a man who has given the best part of his life to the service of a railway, when that railway is absorbed by the government, is entitled to consideration, and I trust that the minister will endeavour, at an early date, to find a station where this officer can be put in charge. Any man who gives twenty-three years of his life to the service of a company or the country is entitled to consideration.

Mr. EMMERSON. He did not give his service to the country, but to the company.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That company has been absorbed by the government, and I understand that its officers for the time being are recognized as placed on the same footing as if they had been in the service of the government.

Mr. DANIEL. I notice some little improvement in the conduct of the minister in the fact that Mr. White got ten days' or two weeks' notice, whereas the two dismissals which took place shortly after the by-election in February, a year ago, were instantaneous. No time was given for contemplation, or even for regret, but the dismissals were sudden, short and sharp. I am in hopes that in another year's time when a dismissal takes place the minister will investigate the case in the way in which almost any other employer would do, so as to make sure that he is doing no injustice. I would like to ask the hon. minister if this amount of seven million dollars includes the amounts which are paid the advertising staff of the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, all expenditures.

Mr. DANIEL. How many are employed in that service and at what rates?

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Creighton is head of the advertising staff. Mr. Lindsay, Mr. Allward, Mr. Hickson and Mr. A. E. Barten are on the staff. Mr. Barten is with the advertising car now at the sportsmen's show in New York.

Mr. DANIEL. Are they employed all the year round?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. I am not speaking from personal knowledge, but it has been intimated to me that that department is rather over-manned.

Mr. EMMERSON. All last spring and winter we had men going through Ontario and the New England states with an advertising car, showing pictures of the different points.

Mr. DANIEL. In the winter?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, they were here during the session. They had a store on Sparks street where they showed views of the most prominent points in New Brunswick,

Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, Cape Breton and Quebec. Mr. Lindsay had charge of the Intercolonial Railway exhibit at the St. Louis fair. Mr. Creighton is chief of the staff, assisted by Mr. Allward. Mr. Creighton travels over the Intercolonial Railway system, going to the different points. Mr. Allward remains in the office at Moncton. There are only four altogether and the department is certainly not overmanned. They do very successful work. Any one who saw their exhibits here and at St. Louis will bear testimony to the good quality of their work. We got a gold medal at St. Louis for the Intercolonial Railway exhibit, and I am sure that that was quite a triumph for a Canadian railway.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister give us some information on the question of freight rates? What would the difference be on the Intercolonial Railway in freight rates say for 100 miles into Montreal as against 100 miles going to Toronto on the Grand Trunk or Canadian Pacific Railway carrying farm products ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is dependent very largely upon water competition. Generally speaking the rates on the Intercolonial Railway are much lower than those on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. BLAIN. About how much?

Mr. EMMERSON. It varies according to the different classes of goods. My hon. friend will perhaps remember the statement that a former Minister of Railways made in 1902, when he said that after studying out the matter he had found that in some instances the rates were 80 per cent lower on the Intercolonial Railway. I think however that that was only an isolated case. In some instances, they are 50 per cent and in others 25 per cent lower. Generally speaking the rates on the Intercolonial Railway are very much lower than on the other Canadian railways. I am referring to local rates. We all know that the through-rates have to be uniform by reason of the traffic agreement. Then the rates are affected on the Intercolonial Railway very materially by water competition. For instance the rates between Montreal and Sydney are very materially governed by steamship competition during the summer months. In order to secure traffic the year round from any industry at Sydney, we have to make special arrangements. Of course we could charge what we pleased during the winter but during the summer they could snap their fingers at us. Of course we would not wish to be excessive and they would naturally get the best freight rates they could.

Mr. BLAIN. Why does the minister enter into an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway to make the Intercolonial Railway rates on the long hauls exactly the same as those of the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway but a traffic agreement in which a great many roads have to be considered. Coming from Chicago there is the Grand Trunk Railway and from other points beyond Chicago there may be other railroads. The traffic agents of the different railways meet during the year and make up a schedule as to the mileage. It is not an agreement in the sense of forming a monopoly or combine, but an agreement as respects the mileage. The Intercolonial Railway is governed in that connection by the shorter mileage because it cannot charge for its actual mileage. For instance we have to meet the short line rates between Montreal and St. John though we go much further around.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman refers to local rates. Do we understand him to mean that between points on the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial purely local, the Intercolonial rates are lower than those of the Canadian Pacific Railway ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. On all other lines in Canada the Railway Commission has the right to interfere to prevent discrimination, but it has no control over government railways. Now the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway, for instance, at competing points make the same rates, and any violation would be interfered with by the traffic association. It seems to me the minister must surely have the same system as between the Intercolonial and the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. I understand that the object of the Railway Commission is to protect the patrons of the railways and prevent charges beyond a certain maximum. If one of the railways charges less than the maximum, I do not understand that the Railway Commission will interfere.

Mr. INGRAM. Evidently, I have not made myself plain. There is a tariff arrangement between the railway companies. They meet once a year and arrange the rates.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is for through rates.

Mr. INGRAM. And for local rates at competing points.

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. minister will allow me to inform him that that is so. If one railway company violates the tariff arrangement by discrimination, that railway is punished.

Mr. EMMERSON. As between themselves ?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes.

Mr. EMMERSON. But the Railway Commission will not interfere.

Mr. INGRAM. Except in cases of discrimination, where one man is charged more for the same service than another man.

Mr. EMMERSON. I thought the hon. gentleman was speaking about separate routes. He mentioned the Canadian Pacific Railway and its relationship to some other road. But, as to one road, the Railway Commission would not interfere except in case of discrimination in favour of one customer as against another.

Mr. INGRAM. But, referring to what I spoke of previously, surely the Intercolonial has an arrangement for local rates at competing points with other roads. But I understand him to say that this is not the case.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman will bear in mind that there are not competing roads, except so far as the points of Montreal and St. John are concerned. The Intercolonial was at St. John before the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Intercolonial had its rates fixed years ago, and these—I will not take time to explain why—have been continued. They are practically the same yesterday, to-day, and, apparently, for ever. And, I fancy, the Canadian Pacific Railway has adjusted its St. John rates to meet the Intercolonial. I hope these freight rates will have some modification in the future, so that we may be able to expunge the words 'for ever' as respects rates.

Mr. INGRAM. The Canadian Pacific Railway runs from Montreal to St. John, as the Intercolonial does. Do I understand the minister to say that the rates are much less on the Intercolonial ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood him to say so.

Mr. EMMERSON. I understood my hon. friend to speak of local rates. From Montreal to St. John is a through rate, as my hon. friend knows. But I do not think there is any arrangement even as to that, because that was established by the Intercolonial years ago.

Mr. INGRAM. The association for the railways throughout the country meets every year and arranges rates——

Mr. EMMERSON. Through rates.

Mr. INGRAM. I am speaking of through rates. That traffic arrangement is carried out by all the railways operating in the district. And I understand the Intercolonial is a party to that arrangement.

Mr. INGRAM.

Mr. TAYLOR. Combine.

Mr. EMMERSON. It belongs to that association, and, so far as through rates are concerned, it is governed by it.

Mr. INGRAM. There are the through rates. In addition to that the other railway companies have their arrangement for competing points. These are local rates. If a shipper chooses one route rather than another, it must be on account of cars or something of that kind, for the rates are the same. I do not understand that the Intercolonial has different local rates——

Mr. EMMERSON. Let me explain. The Intercolonial does not submit its local rates to this association, and in no way depends upon any action of the association. And, if I am correctly informed, the rate from Montreal to St. John is considered a local rate in the sense that it was established by the Intercolonial and is not a subject of agreement. A through rate is always in connection with connecting railways, where there is a division of the traffic and an apportionment to connecting lines. But where the freight goes from a station on the Intercolonial to another station on the Intercolonial, that is a local rate, controlled entirely by ourselves, without regard to other railways or the traffic association.

Mr. INGRAM. Take an instance. Suppose that two men are shippers over the Intercolonial. One is charged a certain rate, while the other is charged a higher rate—that is, there is discrimination as between the two shippers. Does the minister say that nothing of that kind has occurred ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I explained that it was a uniform rate, and that was the boast of a government railway. But the hon. gentleman complains that there has not been sufficient elasticity, that shippers have complained that where they had furnished hundreds of carloads of traffic to the railway, they were shown no more consideration than the man who had only three carloads. My information is that if there are special rates in connection with any product, either natural or manufactured, that special rate is given to all engaged in the business, and it is not given to one man in a town and refused to another. It is obvious that the railway, being a government road, cannot discriminate.

Mr. INGRAM. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman make that statement. I do not know whether the Intercolonial has ever discriminated between shippers.

Mr. EMMERSON. In that respect there is certainly no politics. A Conservative can get the same rate as a Liberal, and vice versa. The rates are made regardless entirely of politics, creed, nationality or any other difference.

Mr. INGRAM. I want to get back to what my hon. friend stated a short time ago. I put the case of shippers over any other line of railway being discriminated against, and the minister says that the commission could step in when more than the maximum rate was charged ; that they never interfered unless more than the maximum rate is charged. The hon. gentleman is not quite correct in that statement as regards other railways.

Mr. EMMERSON. On the same railway ?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes.

Mr. EMMERSON. Then I withdraw my statement that the commission does not interfere with respect to the maximum rate. I thought it was a question as between two railways. I understood my hon. friend to put his question in that way ; but he afterwards amended it, and said it was with respect to the same railway, and I then said in that case the commission would interfere if there was discrimination.

Mr. INGRAM. I want to mention to the hon. gentleman that the Standard Oil Company got certain privileges from railways in this country that the railways would not grant to other interests that were engaged in the oil business, and that the matter was brought before the Committee of the Privy Council and was settled here in Ottawa. I say it is the duty of the Railway Commission to handle such cases as that. It seemed to me remarkable, when the Railway Bill went through, that government railways were not included in the scope of the commission. I think it would be a step in the right direction to give the commission control over government railways as well as others. I would go further, and say that the time has about arrived when we should have an independent commission to manage all the government railways in this country. When we bring about that change, I am satisfied we will not have $1,000,000 deficit every year.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to ask the minister if he remembers making some reference last session of parliament to a superannuation scheme for the employees of the Intercolonial ? I understood that he intended to introduce that scheme last session. I do not know whether any reference was made to it during the last election. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us what cost such a scheme would involve to the country, or whether any part of the cost is included in the item before us. Does he intend to bring down such a scheme this year or at any time ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I did bring the matter before the House last year. I am familiar with what has transpired with respect to the pension scheme on the Intercolonial. It was first referred to by the Hon. Mr. Blair, when he was Minister of Railways, I think, in 1902. He again referred to it in 1903, and when I assumed office in 1904 it was a live question. The officials and the employees all along the line were consulted in regard to it, and they drew up certain resolutions to form the basis of a scheme. These were submitted to me, and are now under consideration. I hoped to introduce the Bill last session, but it was found impossible to go on with it on account of the overwhelming importance of the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill. I am still in hopes that I will be able to consider this matter, if not at the present session of parliament, certainly at the next session.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to ask the minister a practical question regarding a matter that comes under my observation every day. Suppose I am a shipper at Brockville, where we have the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway. If I want to ship goods to St. John, to Moncton and to Halifax, can I get a better rate if I bill those goods by the Grand Trunk to Montreal, thence via the Intercolonial to St. John and Moncton or Halifax, than if I billed them by the Canadian Pacific Railway to either of these points ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not able to answer my hon. friend as to the rates between these points by the Intercolonial as compared with the rates over the Canadian Pacific Railway. But I think that is what is called the long haul, and that is a matter that is regulated by this traffic agreement over the railway.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who makes this traffic agreement for the Intercolonial ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The traffic manager.

Mr. TAYLOR. The traffic manager enters into a combine with the other railways that rates shall be the same from Montreal by the Intercolonial Railway to any point where the Canadian Pacific touches.

Mr. EMMERSON. The Canadian Pacific Railway does not go beyond St. John. The very moment the Canadian Pacific Railway gets that freight to St. John it pays tribute to the Intercolonial Railway and gets mileage. There is no combine. The Intercolonial Railway has a certain mileage down to that point. The Grand Trunk Railway has a certain mileage down to Montreal and that is regulated by the through haul. It is not a combine ; it is only an apportionment according to mileage to the different railways.

Mr. TAYLOR. When you are quoted the same rates by the Grand Trunk Railway to the point to which it goes and thence by the Intercolonial Railway, the freight being handed over at St. John for points east and the rates being all the same, what is the good of competition in railways ? As long as the government can allow their traffic manager to enter into a combine with other railways and to agree that the rates shall

be the same there is no competition, and yet the hon. gentleman gets up and tells us that the rates on the Intercolonial are lower than on any other road. I am shipping goods every day and my hon. friend from Centre York (Mr. Campbell) knows as a matter of fact that he as a shipper cannot get a cent of difference in the rate charged by the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway from Toronto to Montreal or St. John, or Halifax.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Of course not.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend (Mr. Campbell) says 'of course not.' He knows as every practical business man knows that the government railway is in a combine with the other railways.

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly.

Mr. EMMERSON. The mileage of the Intercolonial Railway is very much greater than the mileage of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Intercolonial Railway carries that freight at a much lower rate per mile than any other railway, and thus keeps the rate down.

Mr. TAYLOR. What difference does it make to me as a shipper from the west whether my goods are carried a thousand miles or five hundred miles? It is the rate that I am after as a practical business man. My hon. friend says that the rate is lower because we have a longer road to haul the freight over. We do not care about that. We want our freight delivered at the cheapest rate. Yet the hon. minister tells his traffic manager to enter into a combine with these other roads in order to regulate freight rates.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The rates to Halifax and St. John and other points down there are not in competition with the railways, but they are based upon the competition between the rail and water routes. The time was a few years ago when nearly all the flour that was consumed in Prince Edward Island and along the southern shore of Nova Scotia was sent by Boston, and our own railways did not get a pound of the haul. In the last few years the rate has been lowered so that to-day I do not think there is a single barrel of flour going to Prince Edward Island or the southern shore, of Nova Scotia via Boston, or if there is it is in very small quantity.

Mr. TAYLOR. That does not affect my statement.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The rate from Toronto and points in Ontario to Halifax and St. John is necessarily very low. The rate on flour is exceedingly low from Toronto to Halifax. It is only 14½ cents per 100 pounds for carrying that flour over the Intercolonial Railway, I suppose about 1,200 or 1,300 miles, and that rate is divided between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Intercolonial Railway. The rate is the same by the other roads, but the roads have to make that rate in connection with water shipments and they have to make it lower if they want to get the traffic. That is the reason that shippers in Ontario regard the rates to these points in the maritime provinces as being exceedingly low and satisfactory.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then what benefit is it to shippers in Ontario and in the western provinces to have the Intercolonial Railway operated as a government railway if it does not give us any competitive rates? I am in favour of government railways, but not run by such a government as we have running and managing this one. I notice in the Auditor General's Report that $81,000 was paid for printing and advertising for the Intercolonial Railway and that of this $39,000 was paid to three or four newspapers in St. John—the 'Gazette,' the 'Globe,' the 'Telegraph' and another.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the reptile press.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway manage their business in this way or throw away $81,000 for printing and advertising?

Mr. EMMERSON. They pay a great deal more.

Mr. TAYLOR. I know how they do it. Look what the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway pay in St. John under these heads. Can you find an expenditure of $39,000 a year divided amongst three or four newspapers? I am in favour of government owned railways, but if we own that railway, we ought to control the rates instead of authorizing our traffic manager to make an arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, so that if people in the west want to send goods down east it is immaterial which way they bill them. I am in favour of a government owned railway that would bid for the freight, that would not go into a combine but that would put its rates at such an amount as would bring business our way. Such a railway would not have half a dozen elevators built at St. John and along the line standing three or four years idle and never having a bushel of wheat in them.

Mr. EMMERSON. Who started that business?

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend knows all about it. If we had control of them we would have them filled and emptied every week with grain and we would offer such competition in rates as would bring the grain there. But there is competition now. My hon. friend goes and forms a combine with other railways and then he fritters money away paying newspapers in St.

John and Halifax $81,000 without receiving any benefit in return. The railway under his management has run the country millions of dollars in debt every year in place of showing a surplus and paying a dividend to the stockholders as other railways are. My hon. friend gets up and says that the road is no good, that it is never going to be any good and that the people might as well make up their minds to this while it is under the management of the present government. They are asking for hundreds of thousands of dollars every year to keep the road running. That is practically the statement which my hon. friend made in introducing his estimates in regard to the Intercolonial Railway the other night. I think that is a humiliating position for the people to be in. Although the people own this railway the government say they cannot manage it without running it several millions of dollars in debt. They have made an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway by which they cannot take freight at a lower rate than the Canadian Pacific Railway take it. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel) pointed out a while ago, that a shipper was charged a cent more on the Intercolonial Railway than on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and if that is so what is the value of the agreement that they have entered into ? I am in favour of a government owned railway run as a business concern and not as a political machine as my hon. friend has been running the Intercolonial Railway since he came into power.

Mr. EMMERSON. I never suspected that my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) was humorous, but he seems to be qualifying for the distinction when he speaks of what would be done with the elevator at Halifax if his party had control of it. The hon. gentleman wants to make it appear that the Intercolonial Railway enters into a combine as a result of which the rates are too high. Does the hon. gentleman complain that the rates to Halifax and St. John and these points are too high? Will he answer that question.

Mr. TAYLOR. I know they are very much higher now than were two years ago.

Mr. EMMERSON. Than they were two years ago ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Two or three years ago.

Mr. EMMERSON. The rates were originally fixed on the Intercolonial Railway as against the water competition by shipment to Portland and Boston, and by vessels crossing the Bay of Fundy to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick ports. These rates were in consequence made very low. Then the Canadian Pacific Railway came into being, and their rates were under the control of the Railway Commission ; and are now under the control of the Railway Commission from Ontario points to points in the maritime provinces. By reason of the contract entered into between the government of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway in 1881, so far as western Canada is concerned the Canadian Pacific Railway is above and beyond all government and all Railway Commissions, and can charge what rates it likes. The Intercolonial Railway is obliged to carry any traffic it gets at Montreal for St. John, a very much further mileage than the Canadian Pacific Railway, the latter road being shorter ; and yet the Intercolonial Railway cannot charge higher freight rates than the Canadian Pacific Railway, or else the Intercolonial Railway would not get any business. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel) gave a good illustration when he said that the Canadian Pacific Railway are charging one cent per hundred pounds lower than the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. TAYLOR. In violation of your agreement.

Mr. EMMERSON. In violation of the through-freight agreement, because this freight comes from the western states and there may be half a dozen railroads participating in the rate. That through-rate must be a uniform rate established according to mileage and in accordance with a certain schedule. It seems to me that the Intercolonial Railway is a corrective, but the Intercolonial Railway suffers, because its road being 100 miles longer than the Canadian Pacific Railway it must carry over the greater mileage at the same rate as the shorter routes. We heard the complaint the other day about our carrying grain and corn to St. John and Halifax at a very low rate, and hon. gentlemen opposite condemned the transaction notwithstanding that I was able to show that in consequence of our accepting that low rate we were able to get over the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal a very profitable inland return freight from the steamers at Halifax.

Mr. FOSTER. The mass of details in the Auditor General's Report is so great that it is very difficult to make an analysis, and so there are a few questions I want to ask. How does the minister arrange for the supply of oil? We find oil bought from different parties under various prices. I suppose the Intercolonial Railway should know, almost to a barrel, the amount of oil it would require for a given year. Is it bought from Tom and Dick and Harry, or are tenders called for the whole supply to be delivered at certain points in an endeavour to get it at the lowest price ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is lubricating oil, illuminating oil, and linseed and paint oil. They are all purchased by tender and contract. The lubricating is purchased un-

der contract, and the cost is limited to a guarantee of so much per mile of the Intercolonial Railway for locomotives, for passenger cars, and for freight cars. That is to say, the cost of the lubricating oil is guaranteed not to exceed a certain sum per mile. Then, the illuminating oils and the paint oils——

Mr. FOSTER. Are they bought at so much a mile too ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No; they are purchased by tender per gallon.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the term of the contract?

Mr. EMMERSON. The present lubricating oil contract is for two years.

Mr. FOSTER. Who has the contract?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Galena Oil Company.

Mr. FOSTER. The Canadian Oil Company?

Mr. EMMERSON. No; the Galena Oil Company, an American concern.

Mr. FOSTER. How does the minister get at the rate ? Is there competition for the amount of oil used per mile ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, it is computed. The contract is for so much per gallon, but the price cannot exceed a certain limit for the whole mileage ; and if the amount at the price per gallon exceeds the amount according to the mileage, then a reduction is made to keep it within the limit of cost per mile. This is the system that prevails in connection with the lubricating of all railways in America.

Mr. FOSTER. Who applies the oil ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The company. It is under their control, and it is in their interest to avoid waste. They have inspectors to follow the engines and the cars. This is the system that prevails on the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway and on all the great American systems, and it has saved to the Intercolonial tens of thousands of dollars in comparison with the system that formerly prevailed, of purchasing the oil at so much per gallon. This system was introduced, I think, in 1897.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister know how the cost per mile on the Intercolonial compares with the cost per mile on the Grand Trunk or Canadian Pacific Railway ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not in a position to state that, but I think the contract entered into is in effect that the rate charged to the Intercolonial is guaranteed to be not one cent higher than the rate charged to any other railway in Canada. Under the contract referred to by my hon. friend, the cost per thousand miles for locomotives is $2.72, for passenger cars 20 cents and for freight cars 12 cents.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that these figures are similar to those of the contracts made with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes. The contract guarantees them to be no higher than the rates charged to any other system in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. When the contract expires will new tenders be called for ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Who has the contract for illuminating oil ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think the Imperial Company.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that yearly ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes ; we ask for tenders yearly.

Mr. INGRAM. Does this same contract apply to paint oils ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No ; they are purchased under the stores' contract.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it not a fact that the government railways have car oilers who are paid by the government, and that the company employs inspectors to see that the oils are not unduly wasted ? Do I understand that the government pays so much per gallon for each class of oils, and that in no case is the cost to exceed a certain price per mile ?

Mr. EMMERSON. With respect to locomotives, when in transit, the engineers and firemen apply the oil. With respect to cars, the duty of oiling them is attended to by certain men, who are paid by the government, at the terminal or divisional points where the trains stop. The company furnish the inspectors paid by themselves, and they go along the line and supervise the application of the oil.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there a contract for the supply of all paint oils over the whole system ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I find numerous places in which you will find different charges made by different parties.

Mr. EMMERSON. The purchase of stores for the Prince Edward Island Railway is separate from the contract on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. The contract is one contract for all paint oils required for the Intercolonial Railway outside Prince Edward Island ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Who has the contract for the paint oils on the Intercolonial Railway ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I will give my hon. friend the page in the Auditor General's Report. On W—159 he will find purchased from A. M. Bell & Co., Halifax, boiled oil at 53 cents and raw oil at 50 cents. And on page W—109, he will find purchased for the Prince Edward Island Railway from Finlay & Chandler, raw oil at 72 cents and boiled oil at 75 cents—being a difference of 23 cents a gallon over the Halifax prices. Evidently there is a nigger on the fence somewhere.

Mr. EMMERSON. Findlay & Chandler are a firm in Charlottetown and they were the lowest tenders. No one will charge them with being in any way connected with any dark individual upon any fence.

Mr. LENNOX. They would take all they could get.

Mr. EMMERSON. No doubt, but their tender was the lowest.

Mr. TAYLOR. If my hon. friend tenders for the same supplies for the Intercolonial Railway at Halifax at 53 cents a gallon, would he not see that a tender of 75 cents at Charlottetown was altogether too high ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I notice that the prices rule higher on the Island than elsewhere.

Mr. FOSTER. There should not be that difference.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is all done by tender and contract.

Mr. FOSTER. Are the tenders for the Prince Edward Island supplies confined to the Island or do you advertise for general tenders ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think they have always been confined to the Island. The people of Prince Edward Island claim that they are isolated, and to use a well known phrase of my hon. friend it is a case of splendid isolation for them when they are furnishing supplies for the Prince Edward Island Railway. I do not think that these gentlemen are affiliated with the party to which I belong.

Mr. FOSTER. We are not asking about the party.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, but my hon. friend made an insinuation.

Mr. LENNOX. In saying I supposed the contractors would take all they can, I did so because the hon. minister frequently has told us that he would hardly assume certain gentlemen would take more than was right. Well, we all know that any contractor will get as high a price as he can, and it is for the government to see that they only pay a reasonable price.

Mr. FOSTER. There are charges here for suit cases. Is the department in the suit case business ?

Mr. EMMERSON. These are square boxes used by the general manager and the officials to carry their papers when they go out over the line. They must have all their papers. Practically they carry their office with them. They take all their papers affecting contracts, culverts, stations and so on, and these are leather boxes called suit cases.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister himself any personal interest in these rail benders that bear his name ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, I did not know there were any.

Mr. FOSTER. I find an item if $120 for Emmerson rail benders.

Mr. EMMERSON. There are Emmersons and Emmersons.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not your patent ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. FOSTER. In the city of St. John there is an immense amount of iron supplies of all kinds purchased from the McAvitys. How are the prices fixed ?

Mr. EMMERSON. A notice is sent to dealers in the trade. It is the same practice which has been followed for years on the Intercolonial Railway. In addition purchases are made from time to time from McAvity when the goods are needed urgently. My hon. friend knows that in the city of St. John there are two leading hardware establishments, one of which is W. H. Thorne & Co. I believe that previous to 1896 they got a great deal of the patronage on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. BLAIN. Did they not tender ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not sure, but McAvity & Sons have the contract now.

Mr. FOSTER. Are the specifications publicly advertised ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They are sent to dealers in the trade.

Mr. FOSTER. Generally.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, but not to all. They are sent to dealers in Toronto, Hamilton, Guelph, Montreal, Quebec—in fact all over Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, because in all these cities there are gentlemen who belong to the political party opposite. Will my hon. friend not be frank and say that he sends those circulars very carefully to supporters only of the party in power ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a certain list prepared. I think my hon. friend is familiar with the system. In his day he had

a list. I do not think that exactly the same list that was used by him is used to-day. There have been changes. I am free to confess that the names usually favour the party that is in power to-day. I know that some on the list do not favour the present government.

Mr. FOSTER. It might be possible to find them with a microscope.

Mr. EMMERSON. They are plainly to be seen. My eye strikes them in going over the list.

Mr. KEMP. Referring to the charges of $31,449.13, of Messrs. McAvity, I do not think that any other hardware firm in St. John appears in the Auditor General's Report for this same class of supplies. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that such a firm as W. H. Thorne & Co., would not have an opportunity to tender ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think their name is not on the list. But there are other reputable firms, the Burpee firm, McIntyre, Kerr and Robertson, James Robertson & Co., and others.

Mr. KEMP. In the case of such a large amount of supplies—thirty or forty thousand dollars—would it not be well for the minister to set politics aside and call for tenders more widely, and so save money for the country? Would he not be able to save thousands of dollars?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think so.

Mr. KEMP. I am satisfied he could.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am satisfied that it would not. I say unhesitatingly that the purchases made by the Intercolonial are made at very low prices and that competition is widespread. It is not confined to St. John or Halifax, but extends to Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton and throughout eastern Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. Opinions differ, but if I were asked to give my opinion I would say quite the opposite. I would say that in these matters to which reference has been made there is absolutely no competition. In the case of Messrs. McAvity & Sons, for instances, they charge their own prices. The minister takes good care that there shall not be competition, and, I suppose, for the best of reasons. Now, in the advertising business, what is the rule? I find in the Auditor General's Report three or four pages devoted to accounts for advertising in papers. Occasionally, but not often, I catch the name of a Conservative paper.

Mr. EMMERSON. The same rule is applied as used to be applied.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the minister says that Conservative papers do not circulate, and he must use papers that reach the public. But he considers this advertising is economical. Take for instance, a charge here for the back page of the Quebec 'Telegram,' $323.50.

Mr. EMMERSON. The prices in these matters are regulated by the King's Printer.

Mr. FOSTER. This was an advertisement in the Christmas number. What was the minister advertising that really did any good to his railway to justify the payment of $323 in this case ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is very difficult to calculate exactly the returns you get from any kind of circulation. But it all brings to the notice of the public the advantages of the Intercolonial. This was a special number, and, I assume, circulated very widely.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose that the way it came about is that this paper was issued as a Christmas number and got the Intercolonial as one of its advertisers, not as a matter of business but as a matter of favour.

Mr. EMMERSON. I find that in cases of that kind submitted to me, the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway take a certain space, and the Intercolonial Railway is compelled to do the same. We must not hide our light under a bushel. We want to be known and read of by all men, and so we advertise as much as our means will permit.

Mr. FOSTER. On the same principle, I suppose, the Toronto 'Globe' had a Christmas card inserted by the hon. gentleman for which he paid $400.

Mr. EMMERSON. Not a Christmas card.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, in the Toronto 'Globe.'

Mr. EMMERSON. I suppose a Christmas greeting.

Mr. FOSTER. I see items here for couplers and knucklers last year amounting to $49,590.87. These are bought almost entirely from the United States. I suppose they are patents, or they have specialties there. How are these bought ?

Mr. EMMERSON. By tender.

Mr. FOSTER. Are tenders publicly called for in the United States?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think that, as a rule, the United States concerns dealing in these things have agencies in Canada, and the agents receive notice and put in tenders in the name of their principals, and the purchases are made in that way.

Mr. FOSTER. How does it come that these purchases are nearly all from United States firms ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Because they are cheaper.

Mr. FOSTER. Are there no manufacturers of these things in Canada ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Intercolonial found it necessary to use steel couplers and, until quite recently there was no manufacturer of these things in Canada. There is now the Montreal Steel Works, but I believe that it is recently established, so that until recently purchases had to be made from American manufacturers. Formerly they were all of cast iron, that is the information I have.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose these are a superior coupler to the cast-iron ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes ; all the railways have recently adopted steel couplers.

Mr. FOSTER. Links and pins seem to go in the same way to the United States manufacturing concerns, page W—185.

Mr. EMMERSON. The bulk of those are furnished in New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, by W. P. McNeill & Company. Of the Gould Nickle pins, we bought $280 worth in New York from the Gould Coupler Company. They were not purchasable elsewhere. We also had to purchase the 12-inch pins.

Mr. FOSTER. On page W—186 I notice a payment to Joseph A. Lightly, St. John, for wood ; is that under contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is for southern pine, which Mr. Lightly imports. That is all by tender.

Mr. FOSTER. There seems to be a large expense in the King Edward hotel at Toronto and the Toronto city office. There are two rentals—one in the King Edward hotel and the other in the Provident Investment Company—one for $900 and the other for $733. Then $2,110 was spent by the Intercolonial on the hotel office. Do you rent in part and then fit up the office besides ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We rent offices in the King Edward hotel, and had to fit them up at a considerable expense. We paid two rentals for a time because, in going from one office to the other, we had necessarily to take the King Edward at a certain time or else not get it at all, while we were at the same time paying rental in the old office.

Mr. FOSTER. You put over $2,000 in permanent improvements in the office ; who gets that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is provided for in the lease.

Mr. FOSTER. There must be some consideration surely ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I apprehend that is done by the departmental management here.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is a good place for an office, probably the best place ; but it seems to me that is a pretty large expense for fitting up.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will get a memorandum of that.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister give me the name of the president and manager of the Galena Oil Company ? I see he purchased from them last year $33,182.66 worth of oils of different kinds. It is represented that the Galena Oil Company have a station in Toronto.

Mr. EMMERSON. The Galena Oil Company is an American concern. I think the president is a Mr. Miller, away down in Pennsylvania.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The Auditor General's Report shows a purchase from the Galena Oil Company of $33,182.66, out of the total of $65,000 worth of oil purchased.

Mr. EMMERSON. Toronto is their Canadian headquarters, where they have a warehouse.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I want to draw attention to the fact that we have only two refineries in Canada to-day, one the Independent Refinery and the other the Imperial Oil Refinery, and I notice that in all these contracts the Independent Refinery have not received one dollar's worth. Can the minister say whether they were asked to tender for all these contracts ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They were not for lubricating oils.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The Independent certainly make all kinds of lubricating oils, and the very best quality. That is a Canadian oil refinery.

Mr. EMMERSON. I know tenders were asked for in respect to lubricating oils. I am quite certain they had an opportunity to tender. I am speaking for the contract for this year. I cannot speak with respect to the contract of 1904.

Mr. CLARE. Who has the contract this year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Imperial Company, I think.

Mr. FOSTER. With respect to parlour, dining and sleeping cars—are those owned by the Intercolonial ?

Mr. EMMERSON. All owned by the Intercolonial.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the minister give us an idea as to the net profits coming from these cars ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think that on the dining car service over the whole system we lose each year about $5,000. Although there is a direct loss from that service, it is necessary in order to secure passenger traffic that we should supply these conveniences.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not finding fault with the convenience ; I wanted as a matter of fact to know how they panned out.

Mr. EMMERSON. I want that explanation to go down, because, while my hon. friend might recognize that, perhaps it would not suggest itself to the minds of others.

Mr. FOSTER. When you say that you lose about $5,000 on the dining cars that does not take into account interest on cost of the car itself ? That is for the furnishing, the food and the running of it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. How does it run in reference to the parlour cars ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is no loss on the parlour cars.

Mr. FOSTER. And of course on sleeping cars there is a large profit.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know that it is very large. I think the parlour and sleeping car services pay.

Mr. FOSTER. How long has the sleeping car service been a distinctly Intercolonial Railway service ?

Mr. EMMERSON. For a long number of years.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman states that there has been a loss on the dining cars ? Have you many refreshment rooms that would interfere with the dining car service ?

Mr. EMMERSON. As far as possible the refreshment rooms have been abolished although we find it necessary to have refreshment rooms at certain points, for instance Truro and Moncton. We have lunch counters at these places so that people are not compelled to go into a dining car and pay 75 cents for a meal. When they want to get a little lunch the train stops for five minutes at Truro and at Moncton and they can run out and get a sandwich and a cup of tea. Of course that interferes with our dining car service, but the rights of the public in that regard must be respected.

Mr. INGRAM. That would interfere with the profits of the dining car service, but there can be no complaint as to that because there are certain classes of the public who would prefer to patronize the lunch counters rather than pay for the more expensive meal in the dining car.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Are these dining rooms regulated. Who regulates the prices that are charged at Truro, for instance ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We rent the privilege.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I understand that there were complaints about the charges made at Truro.

Mr. EMMERSON. When this dining room was established at Truro they were in the habit of giving a full meal. The price was regulated at 50 cents and it is still fifty cents. The same is true of St. John. But the major portion of their business is the furnishing of lunches and there have been no regulations as to those. I think from my personal knowledge the prices asked are very reasonable. There have not been any complaints and the matter has never been the subject of inquiry by the management as to what they should charge for a sandwich and a cup of tea.

Mr. FOSTER. But you have a supervision over them ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, we rent these privileges subject to certain supervision on the part of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. INGRAM. I suppose at terminal points where you have a large number of employees there is a certain rate for the employees and that it is required to be lower than the rate for the travelling public ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, that is regulated.

Mr. FOSTER. How does the hon. minister buy his stationery ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is bought through the Stationery Department here at Ottawa.

Mr. FOSTER. Not all ; there is a certain amount bought outside—not a very large amount. I suppose these are special things that probably they did not have in the stationery office here, but it is the rule of the department to buy its stationery through the Stationery Department here ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, it is a matter of very serious complaint, but it is the rule. The Auditor General will not, I think, as a rule, audit bills outside of his department.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice at page W—200 that there are $40,741 spent for travelling expenses of officials. That seems a very large amount. What officials ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The general manager, the traffic manager, the chief superintendent, chief engineer and others. The items are all given. These are officials in the department who are compelled to go out over the line. They are paid their actual expenses. They are required to furnish vouchers and the matter is regulated in that way and the accounts are audited from that standpoint.

Mr. FOSTER. Some of the amounts are very high. I notice that our old friend A. E. Killam has travelling expenses running way up to over $1,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Killam is out on the road travelling practically all the time examining bridges from Ste. Rosalie to Halifax, from Sydney to Truro and Pictou,

over the short line and in fact over the whole system. He is necessarily travelling from place to place and is obliged to foot it in many instances.

Mr. FOSTER. Are all these officials of the road ?

Mr. EMMERSON. These are all officials. There are none outside of officials. Of course, there are the travelling passenger agents, the solicitors for freight and passengers and the travelling auditors.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you pay them a mileage allowance or do you pay them just what they pay out and do they have to give vouchers for everything ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Their actual expenses only and they have to furnish vouchers.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course there are no fare expenses ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No fares.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the meaning of 'travelling picture display ?'

Mr. EMMERSON. The Intercolonial Railway in connection with its advertising department started out a car containing exhibits, paintings, and engravings and that car travelled all over Ontario visiting the large cities and through the New England states. It is now at the Sportsmen's Show at New York.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How much has been expended on it during the year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. $1,039,76.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That would not cover it all ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This was the expense outside of the salaries of those in charge of it. There is Mr. Barton and Mr. Lindsay.

Mr. INGRAM. Who is Mr. Barton ?

Mr. EMMERSON. He is now connected with the advertising department of the Intercolonial. He was a clerk in the general manager's office and was transferred from that position to the one he now holds.

Mr. FOSTER. Where did they operate chiefly ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In the New England states, at Boston and at the principal points wherever they thought they could best attract the attention of tourists with the idea of encouraging summer travel.

Mr. KEMP. Is that car taken over other railroads free ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is some arrangement under which they charge a very reduced rate, it is a matter of courtesy between the railroads.

Mr. KEMP. I understand there is a tremendous number of applications for free transportation over the Intercolonial Railway, and that passes are given to those who are not entitled to them. Have any new rules been laid down ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There have been no new rules. I think we rigidly adhere to the regulations. The number of passes issued by the department is proportionately very small as compared with those issued by private corporations. We have to be governed by certain principles and to depart from these would make the life of the minister a burden.

Mr. FOSTER. What are these ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a regulation that the wives of members coming to Ottawa get a special trip pass. The members of the press get trip passes. The annual passes are confined to exchange and to members of parliament.

Mr. KEMP. There are lots of 'specials.'

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think it.

Mr. KEMP. Not so far as your knowledge is concerned.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have got used to saying 'no,' and it is very unpleasant at times.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you always say no.

Mr. EMMERSON. I hardly ever say yes, outside of a certain rule.

Mr. FOSTER. There ought to be rules and they ought to be strictly adhered to. This railroad is paid for by the country and one man has as good a right as another to travel free as a matter of grace. If there are official and legal reasons it is all very well, but outside of that they ought not to get passes. How many private cars are there.

Mr. EMMERSON. I gave that yast year.

Mr. FOSTER. We do not know what changes may take place in a year.

Mr. EMMERSON. There have been none.

Mr. FOSTER. I was not here last year and I have to get it once more.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is car '109' assigned to the Minister of Railways and usually used by him ; car '75' used by the general manager ; car 'Ottawa' assigned for a number of years in connection with the Deputy Minister ; car No. '28' a spare car not assigned to any one in particular ; there is the car used by the general traffic manager.

Mr. FOSTER. That makes how many ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Five.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that all the private cars on the system?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is the Governor General's car.

Mr. FOSTER. That is used exclusively for the Governor General's use.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes. There is the Railway Commissioners car ; but of course that is not controlled by the department.

Mr. FOSTER. Has that other Railway Commission a car ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. KEMP. Has it applied for one ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have had no application.

Mr. INGRAM. Are the Intercolonial Railway sleeping and parlour cars run on other railways?

Mr. EMMERSON. They are all used on the Intercolonial Railway, except that to facilitate the tourist traffic between New England and points in the maritime provinces there is a special train known as the Boston train which takes the sleeping car on the Canadian Pacific Railway as far as Vanceboro' so that the passengers may not have to get up too early.

Mr. INGRAM. I notice that the price of uniforms varies from $18 to $23.50 per suit. Will the minister state the reason for the difference, and whether the employees pay any portion of the cost of the uniforms ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The employees pay no portion. I think the prices are uniform. The goods are generally submitted to the consideration of the different brotherhoods, in order to give them the class and style of goods they want.

Mr. INGRAM. Are tenders asked for in the matter of price ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No ; tenders have not been asked for.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the minister be good enough to state the total number of employees on the whole system ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Between 8,000 and 9,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the minister be good enough to tell us the exact number at the next sitting ?

Mr. FOSTER. Before the item passes I think I ought, in justice to my hon. friend from York, N.B. (Mr. Crocket), to read the report given by the minister's speech at Fredericton by the out-and-out Liberal sheet, the 'Herald.' The idea seemed to be left with the committee that the report in the other paper was a wrong report, because it was not favourable to the minister. That paper has been favourable to the Liberal cause for years. The hon. gentleman may not have known it.

Mr. EMMERSON. No ; I have never had any evidence of it.

Mr. FOSTER. But it is the fact, without a doubt. The Liberal paper thus reports him, speaking of the Grand Trunk Pacific:

> This new road is bound to mean the development of our industrial life and the exploiting of the natural resources of the country. If there was any man so blind to his own interests as to cast a vote against the Laurier government on this question, he is not worthy of citizenship in Canada.

So that my hon. friend's own party supporter must have been under the same hallucination as the 'Gleaner.'

Mr. EMMERSON. What I said was that no man would be a good citizen who would oppose the construction of another transcontinental line of railway across this continent.

Mr. FOSTER. And the minister still adheres to that, does he ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do. While there might be differences as to the way it might be built, I said that a man who opposed the construction of another transcontinental line across the continent was not a good citizen, and I will stick to that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister did not endorse the present policy of building. Does he stick to the old policy which he was in favour of at first ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I stick to the policy I have always stuck to.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FITZPATRICK moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the business for to-morrow ?

Mr. FISHER. We will go on with supply, taking up the estimates of the Minister of Railways and afterwards those of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 10, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE—PETITIONS FROM EAST ASSINIBOIA.

Mr. JOHN G. TURRIFF (East Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, I have here two petitions purporting to come from my district of East Assiniboia. But they are all in the same handwriting, and seem to have been sent to me by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule).

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TURRIFF. I am speaking to a question of privilege. These petitions may be from my district, but the names are all in the same handwriting. The petitions are marked East Assiniboia, but posted in the city of Ottawa. I present them, but I do not know whether they are from my constituency or not.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Since my name has been mentioned, may I be permitted to say that these petitions were sent to me by a personal friend, with the request that I should send them to my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). To carry out this request, I put the petitions in an envelope and handed them in at the post office, which, I think, was the proper way to do.

STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). Yesterday the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. A. A. McLean) called my attention to the quantity of mail matter said to be detained at Sackville, intended for the island. I told him I would ascertain the position of the matter and inform him to-day. I have done so, and wish to state that my officers state that the mail matter detained at Sackville and other points on the mainland consists of merchandise, books and other heavy mail matter, not letters or daily papers; and is detained simply because there are no means whereby it can be transported to the island at the present moment, unless the vessels, the 'Minto' and 'Stanley,' which have for a time been detained in the ice, are now liberated. Up to this morning we have no notice that those steamers have been liberated, although the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) has been momentarily expecting to hear of their liberation. All letters and daily newspapers have been sent forward by the iceboats, but it has not been possible yet to send the other matter.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I may state for the information of the Postmaster General that I received a letter yesterday saying that daily papers posted in Montreal on the 4th day of February were only received in Charlettown on the 6th of March.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY. The fact that these boats were locked up and there was no possiblity of getting them out, shows that the department has been remiss in its duty, because they have only had four boats at the beginning of the season crossing from either side of the straits, and latterly five boats, and at most these can only carry about fifty bags of mail. Upwards of ten boats belonging to private parties are crossing daily, and only four or five government boats have been crossing daily. The block in mail matters has resulted largely from the inactivity of the department. I know that letters I mailed here weeks ago have not yet been received by the parties to whom they were sent, while letters mailed at a later date have been received. Now it seems there are a lot of letters and newspapers held over at Sackville.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I have only to say, on the information of my officers, who I think are aware of the facts, that no letters have been detained. I am also assured by them that the daily papers have gone forward. My officers are the only source of information I have, and I have the most implicit confidence in the accuracy of my information.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to know when we may expect to have the Auditor General's Report for distribution. I have several applications for it, and I have only been able to get the first volume. True, there were three volumes issued for the use of members, but the first volume of the regular issue is only out now. I would like to know when we may expect to get the remaining volumes ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I am informed by the officers of the department that the usual distribution has been made.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Only to-day I was in the distribution office making inquiries for it. As I say, the first three volumes have been issued for the use of members, but the first volume of the regular issue was only out to-day—so I am informed by the gentleman in charge.

Mr. FIELDING. I will make inquiry.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to renew my request for returns from the Railway Department and especially from the Interior Department. From the Railway Department with reference to the hay business, and from the Interior Department with reference to the sale of lands. This delay is becoming monotonous, but I am afraid I shall have to keep on the same note until these are brought down.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I do not think there is any cause for the hon. gentleman becoming monotonous with regard to the reports to which he alludes, because they were brought down yesterday.

Mr. FOSTER. Are you sure ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I want to draw the attention of the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) to the fact that a re-

turn carried some time ago concerning Port Arthur and Fort William harbours, has not, to my knowledge, been laid on the table yet.

Mr. HYMAN. When the motion for the return reached the department, I gave instructions to the officers to facilitate its preparation in every way. I will make special inquiry again.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) to the fact that out of some twenty returns ordered from his department—two of them having been ordered very recently and the others on different dates between the 25th of January and the 27th of February—only seven have been brought down, leaving eleven that I think ought to have been brought down ere this. It is desirable that we should have them before the hon. gentleman's estimates are more fully discussed.

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). So many of these returns were asked from the department that my officers, although they have been working at them diligently, have not yet been able to prepare them all ; but I will bring them down as fast as I can get them prepared.

SUPPLY—PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES.

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

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair, I take the opportunity of pressing once more upon the attention of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) the matters which I took occasion to mention yesterday. What he said in reply to my inquiry at that time was very excellent in its way. He cited constitutional authorities as to the course which should be adopted upon the formation of a government and he read certain quotations from a great authority on that question, but none of his remarks touched at all or were even relevant to the real question which I asked. It seems to me that in a matter of this kind the inquiry is one worthy of some attention by the right hon. Prime Minister when it is made in a respectful and serious way, as my inquiry was intended to be. The circumstances are very unusual. A measure of the greatest possible importance not only to the Territories of the Northwest which are now being constituted into provinces, but to the country as a whole, is brought to the attention of parliament and the right hon. Prime Minister introduces that measure. When he places that measure before the House he says to the House as emphatically as if he had declared it in express words that the measure had been submitted to, had been considered by and had met with the approval of every one of his colleagues. That is the situation as I understand it. I have yet to be corrected in that apprehension of my right hon. friend's conduct in introducing this Bill. Well, afterwards it transpires that at least one member of the administration had not considered, and more than that, had not even seen the measure which was brought down by the Prime Minister, and it is an open secret that another member of the administration, then on his way from Europe and expected to arrive in Ottawa within a few days, was not made acquainted with the provisions of the measure as far as we are aware. In making that statement, I am, of course, not making it of my own personal knowledge, and if I am wrong in my conjecture in that regard I shall be glad to be corrected. But the importance of the situation is this, that the two hon. gentlemen to whom I have referred were gentleman who had allied themselves with the right hon. gentleman in 1895 and 1896 in regard to a very similar question. The hon. ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), in 1895 and in 1896, used language in regard to one of the questions embraced in this measure, language which I have under my hand, but which I shall not read to the House to-day because the views of the hon. gentleman are pretty well known. His language was not only of a pronounced, but, in some respects, even of a violent character and it would do no good to place it before the House to-day. There is no dispute and there never has been any dispute as to the attitude of the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior in that regard. Yet, he is one of the hon. gentlemen who was not made acquainted with the intentions of the government in bringing down this measure. But, there is another hon. gentleman, the hon. Minister of Finance, to whom I have already referred, and in so far as we can gauge the circumstances and in so far as we can learn from the silence of the administration after the statement has been made across the floor of the House, he was also absolutely ignorant of the provisions of the Bill which the right hon. Prime Minister introduced within two or three days of the date when that hon. gentleman expected to return. Now, I have referred to the opinions of the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior. I would like to add also that the opinions of the hon. Minister of Finance, acting as an ally, as the chief of my right hon. friend in the campaign made in Nova Scotia in 1896, although not expressed perhaps in so violent a way as those to which I have just referred of the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior, nevertheless, are of a very pronounced character. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance conducted a very able campaign in support of my right hon. friend in 1896 in the province of Nova Scotia. He was regarded as the leader of the Liberal ranks in that province

at that time and the exertions which he then put forth met with their fitting reward in the tender to him of the position which he now holds. This hon. gentleman was acting as the ally and, I suppose, under the direction of the right hon. gentleman in the east as was the hon. member for Brandon in the west of Canada. He pronounced himself in no equivocal terms upon this question. It was thought by his friends in Nova Scotia that the speech which he delivered at Windsor in the county of Hants on the 6th of March, I think it was, 1896, was the ablest deliverance made in that province in support of the policy of the Liberal party at that time, and was perhaps the best exposition of their policy that had been made by any man in Canada up to that time. I will quote a few words not for the purpose of criticising them, not for the purpose of assenting to them, but simply to support my position that my hon. friend had very pronounced views to the knowledge of the Prime Minister on this question which makes it all the more strange that the provisions of this Bill should have been withheld from him, if, as a matter of fact, they were so withheld. Said the hon. gentleman on that occasion to which I have referred :

> Why should we not believe that Manitoba will be reasonable in this matter ? The Manitobans are not African savages.
>
> I will venture the statement that the true interests of the Roman Catholic citizens of Manitoba will be better advanced by the policy of conciliation than by the policy of coercion. This Remedial Bill which the government are trying to enforce upon an unwilling parliament, even if it should pass, cannot settle the question. It would be an attack on provincial rights. . . . If Roman Catholics are ever to obtain a solution of this question which is worth having they must obtain it through the good will of the majority of the people of the province to which they belong.

Further on in the same speech he said :

> I ask the people of Hants county and the people of Nova Scotia to stand by the principle of free schools in the case of Manitoba just as they would stand by it in their own province. . . . We in Nova Scotia know the value of a system of free public schools. We have shown in the past that while we may differ on many questions we are practically a unit in support of that system. . . . If the Dominion authorities should attempt to interfere with our school system, if they should attempt to impose upon this province a system which they are trying to force upon Manitoba, we would expect to have the sympathy of the friends of free schools elsewhere, and we would expect the people of the western provinces to give us their sympathy and support in such a condition. Let us to-day give them our hearty sympathy and support in the struggle until we find that they are not amenable to reason.

Further on after giving credit to Sir Charles Tupper for establishing public schools in Nova Scotia, he continues :

> What can we say of the position of that gentleman to-day who instead of standing up as the champion of a free school system and resisting those who attack it scrambles into parliament through the unfair influence of the Roman Catholic pupils of the county of Cape Breton, and is now devoting the evening of his life to the work of destroying the free school system of Manitoba and forcing upon that province a system which he would not dare to attempt to force upon the province of Nova Scotia.

Further on in a letter to the 'Casket' newspaper published in Antigonish he said :

> The uproar is upon us, already the blaze of religious strife has been kindled and is being vigorously fanned every day by the efforts to coerce the province of Manitoba.

In the speech at Windsor to which I have just now referred he used this further language :

> For twenty years the Roman Catholic minority thus had the privilege of a separate school system. The result of that system proved exceedingly unsatisfactory to the people of Manitoba. . . . Ample evidence has been adduced to prove that the separate schools were not efficient schools.

Then, one more passage from his speech which is of some importance at the present juncture as embodying his views :

> I believe that the people of Manitoba if let alone will settle this question for themselves. Why should we not believe this ? We know from our own experience in the maritime provinces that it has been found possible to maintain a free school system and to administer it so as to make it acceptable to the people of every class and creed. We hear no complaint of the Nova Scotia School Law. The Manitoba school system is substantially the same as Nova Scotia.

My object in quoting this language of the Minister of Finance is not to criticise or to discuss it ; it is simply to show that when the right hon. gentleman accepted the aid and support of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) and when he invited him to enter his cabinet, he knew that the hon. gentleman had used that language, and had made these speeches in Nova Scotia. Thus, the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had full knowledge of the views which the Minister of Finance entertained in regard to certain provisions similar to those in the Bill now before parliament.

I wish to once more call the attention of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to the fact that upon the eve of the return to Ottawa of the ex-Minister of the Interior (Hon. Clifford Sifton) and of the Minister of Finance (Hon. W. S. Fielding) he has seen fit to introduce to parliament a Bill in such manner that parliament had every reason to believe, was bound to believe, and indeed every one of us did believe, that the provisions of that Bill had received the assent of every member of the administration. Under the circumstances, that was undoubtedly a grave departure from constitutional usage. I do not

know of any modern precedent for conduct of that kind with regard to a measure of any importance, and I think it my duty to once more inquire of the right hon. gentleman what was the overmastering reason which led him under these circumstances to introduce that Bill to this parliament without giving to the people of this country, and especially to this House of Commons, the information that two members of the cabinet, members who above all others, it seems to me, should have been consulted with regard to the provisions of this measure, had not even had it submitted to them, were not even consulted with regard to it, had not even seen it or read it. There must be some explanation for so extraordinary an act. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has not vouchsafed any. I do not want to make explanations for him, I do not want to suggest any explanations. Explanations are being suggested throughout the country, and I would think that it is not only due to this House and to the country, but due to the right hon. gentleman himself that he should, without any further delay, without any further attempt to avoid the issue, inform the House as to the real circumstances under which he took this step in defiance of all unconstitutional usage.

There is one more question which I would again like to ask the right hon. gentleman, and I think that in doing so I am not transgressing my duty. I ask it in the same respectful way and for the purpose of information ; it is this : The right hon. gentleman in his speech introducing this Bill referred to the aid in its preparation which the government had received from the members of the Executive Council of the Northwest Territories. What I would like to know is whether or not the educational clauses of this Bill were submitted to, were fully discussed with, and met with the appropriation of members of the Executive Council of the Northwest Territories. In the last place, I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman a question which I have not already asked but which seems to me to be very pertinent in view of his reply of yesterday.. How long does he propose to carry on the affairs of the country without filling the vacant portfolio of the Minister of the Interior ? One would suppose that when a measure of the importance of that which has been proposed to parliament, a measure especially affecting the Northwest Territories of Canada, has been introduced and is about to be discussed in parliament, that we should have the advantage of the experience and knowledge of some gentleman of the Northwest Territories, occupying a position in the administration, or, at all events that we should have the benefit of the advice and experience and knowledge of some gentleman filling the portfolio of the Department of the Interior, appointed to that portfolio for the very reason that he is well qualified to fill it. These three questions I venture to again bring to the attention of my right hon. friend, and I trust that he will be pleased to give to the House, at my request, that full and sufficient information on the subject to which I think the House is entitled.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) has to-day asked one question which he has not previously put and as to which I am quite ready to give all the information I have at present. My hon. friend desires to know how long the vacancy in the portfolio of the Minister of the Interior will be left unfilled. I have only to submit to my hon. friend and to the House that there has been no undue delay in filling it. The vacancy occurred only ten days ago, and I do not think it could be expected that in so short a time as that the government could come to a conclusion as to whom they should call to fill such an important office. I hope before long I shall be able to give to my hon. friend the opportunity to give his assent to the appointment we shall make. I do not know whether he will respond to the invitation, but at all events we shall certainly afford it to him.

With regard to the other two questions I do not think that I am warranted in giving more information to my hon. friend than I have already given.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is none.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is not much ; but I would submit that strictly speaking my hon. friend is entitled to none at all. The conferences which took place between the government and the representatives of the Northwest Territorial government were carried on confidentially, and I do not know whether I have any authority to give any information about them to the House; no record has been kept of this information ; the conferences have been absolutely confidential.

With regard to the other question, which my hon. friend has now put for the third time, I am sorry to say my mind has not changed. I think, with all due respect to my hon. friend and to the position he occupies, and to this House, that I have given all the information the House was entitled to. I can see plainly that my hon. friend is shaping his course carefully; he is going ahead bit by bit, he is taking no plunge, but every day we can see a little more where we are finally to be led. Yesterday we could not see where he was to place his batteries, but to-day we can see where they are to be placed. He endeavoured to show that there is a difference between the position occupied by two mem-

bers of the Liberal party and by the Liberal party itself to-day and the position occupied by that party in 1896. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) did my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. W. S. Fielding) the honour of quoting him. I am not at all jealous of that honour which he has paid to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. I compliment the minister upon it; but he might have quoted some of my speeches on the same question. I took some part in that discussion. I intend to take some part in the present discussion. My hon. friend is re-echoing the attempts that have been made in the press to show that there has been a great change from the position taken by the Liberal party in 1896 in the position taken by them in 1905. Now we shall have an opportunity by and by of discussing that question; when we come to the second reading of the Bill I will endeavour to discuss the question with my hon. friend, and we shall discuss it on both sides of the House. I do not admit that there has been any departure at all in the conduct of the Liberal party between 1896 and 1905; but I am sorry to say that hon. gentlemen on the opposite side are always in the wrong. They never can interpret the constitution as it is. In 1896, the position which we took and maintained before the country was that it was not right for the federal parliament to try to impose on the province of Manitoba a system of schools which the province of Manitoba had rejected, acting within the plenary exercise of its powers. If there had been a system of schools in the province of Manitoba in 1870, when it was admitted to confederation, then, Sir, the minority would have been entitled to those schools by the judgment of the courts; but the courts decided that there had been no such system of schools, and therefore the powers of the province of Manitoba were not in any way curtailed. There is a difference, therefore, in the position of Manitoba in 1870, as exposed in 1896, and the position which we are confronted with at the present time. But I will not discuss this question with my hon. friend to-day—I do not think the time is opportune.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not discuss it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In my estimation my hon. friend came very near discussing it. He was very guarded, but introduced it in a gentle way, just to create the impression that there was a great difference between the position taken by the Liberal party in 1896 and its position in 1905. My hon. friend understands his business too well to have introduced it so bluntly as to state it in that way, but he led to a conclusion which was inevitable. I do not think the present is the time to discuss that question, but I assure my hon. friend that we shall take the opportunity of doing so at the proper time and on the proper occasion.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, it was a candid admission of my right hon. friend when he confessed that he had not given much information to the hon. leader of the opposition in response to his question of yesterday and of to-day. It was a charming bit of persiflage that the right hon. gentleman made an exhibition of in those few words—airy, light, well-chosen, skimming all around, but avoiding carefully any expression which would go to shed light upon the grave and serious questions which my hon. friend beside me had raised. Now, I do not intend to be led away by this little diversion into a discussion of matters which are not at present before the House. I want to reiterate, in the first place, the position taken by the hon. leader of the opposition. He quoted from statements that had been made by the Minister of Finance, and could have quoted from statements which had been made by the late Minister of the Interior, to show to the right hon. the premier that he knew thoroughly well, when these hon. gentlemen were in his cabinet, and when just lately he introduced his Bill for discussion in his cabinet, that these hon. gentlemen had well-known and pronounced views with reference to the question of education as it would develop in these new provinces. That is the only purpose my hon. friend had in view. The quotations which he made drove that fact fairly well home, so that the right hon. gentleman could not say that he did not know, in the absence of these two gentlemen, that their opinions had been firmly formed and plainly expressed. The startling thing about it was this—and it was not explained away by all the charming discursiveness of my hon. friend yesterday. The question is: what is the constitutional practice when a Bill, having been discussed in the cabinet and agreed to or supposed to be agreed to there, is launched upon the House as the utterance of the government as a whole? That is the question, and the startling thing about it is that the premier introduced a Bill for discussion in his cabinet, knowing the views of these two gentlemen in their absence, and with a haste that has not yet been explained. Engaged as it were, in a race for a goal with the Minister of Finance and the Minister of the Interior, he beat them by about two days and twelve hours—he got in ahead, and he launched his Bill. Now, the country and this House had no warrant for believing anything else than that that Bill in its entirety had been assented to and had the cordial agreement of every member of the cabinet. That is the point the country heeds, and that is the point my hon. friend the leader of the opposition makes. What has happened in this case is, I believe, unprecedented in the history of this parliament, and it is a

matter not of curiosity, but of right, that both this House and the country should know why this was and what it meant. Now, let me say a word or two with reference to the changed methods of my right hon. friend. Take, for instance, the British North America Act. The clauses in it with reference to education were framed to do what? To give legal effect to an agreement between thoroughly constituted bodies who under that agreement went into the pact of confederation. Each had a House with elected representatives from the people enjoying all the powers of a representative assembly. Those provinces came together as independent constituents, and they did not attempt legislation until they had made their agreement and asked that it be embodied in an enactment. Come to the case of the Manitoba Act. In Manitoba there was no representative body such as an assembly ; but how carefully the men of that time were minded to consult the constituent elements of that northwest country. Delegates were sent; the men were assembled ; their views were got ; the views were sent here ; the views were communicated to the British government, and it was upon that tacit agreement or real agreement as to the wants and wishes of the constituent elements of Manitoba that the legislation was based which became fixed in law. How different has been the action of the right hon. gentleman in this matter. Whom has he consulted? Why, I think it is stated in his own speech that there were some reasons why he should not have granted autonomy two years ago or one year ago, and what are the reasons he gave?

> That as we were on the eve of a general election, the time and occasion would be more propitious and more fitting after the general election when the Territories would have the benefit on this floor of a larger representation. These views were generally accepted. The elections have taken place and immediately after the elections, or as soon as was practicable thereafter, we invited the executive of the Northwest Territories to send delegates here to confer with us upon the measure which was to be introduced so as to admit them into the confederation. We have had the benefit of the presence of Mr. Haultain, the premier of the Northwest Territories, and Mr. Bulyea, one of his colleagues, and we have had the advantage of several conferences with them. We have had the advantage also of the presence and advice of several of the members from the Territories.

Now, in profession, what does this mean? It means that before this Bill was agreed upon and given to the House, the right hon. gentleman wanted to have all the representative opinion he could possibly get from the west. Did he consult it? There are 500,000 people living in those two provinces, according to the statement of my right hon. friend. Is it on record that he consulted those people before introducing this Bill? There were a certain number of old and new representatives from the Northwest present in this House. Did the right hon. gentleman consult them with reference to this clause? If he did, did they approve of this clause? If they did approve of it, why all this bother since? Why has the right hon. gentleman been held up? The right hon. gentleman also had an accredited representative of that Northwest country in the person of the Minister of the Interior, a gentleman who had travelled the west, who knew the west, who, before and from his first entry into this parliament had taken a very deep interest in this very subject. Did my right hon. friend consult him? If so, how comes it that in a race for time, after he had beaten his Minister of the Interior by a few hours, that minister rose in his place in parliament and said to his chief : I never saw that clause until I read it after I came here? Yet if there was any note in the right hon. gentleman's voice in 1895 and 1896, it was this. He will find it embalmed in 'Hansard,' in the pages of his press, in the hearts of his admirers, in quotations everywhere. What was it? Translated into a few English words, it was this and nothing more : I want my people in Manitoba to have separate schools, but I want them to have those schools by the voice of Manitoba itself. I desire to see these privileges retained for them, but I desire still more not to violate provincial rights. That was his note. There was none more dominant. How has he changed? To-day he is an autocrat. To-day he rushes the Bill. To-day he rushes the members of his cabinet, the representatives from the Northwest, and the representative council from the Northwest for he has not been able to state that he did confer with that council—a representative body if there ever was any—and that it ever gave its assent to this clause. In all these cases the old spirit has departed, the old method has been laid aside, and to-day we have in their stead the work of the autocrat, caring nothing for his Minister of the Interior, caring nothing for his Minister of Finance, caring nothing for the representatives from the west, caring nothing and consulting in no way the 500,000 people for whom we are legislating. That is a change to which I call the attention of this House.

There is another peculiar circumstance in this connection. On the introduction of a Bill, the usual method followed is simply to explain it, but when my right hon. friend was taxed with going beyond an explanation, he defended himself by saying that he did give and only intended to give what was a full explanation of the Bill. What is the purpose of having a Bill explained, especially an important Bill of this kind, on its introduction? It is that the House and the country may become seized with its sa-

lient points so that before they are called upon to make up their minds to it, they may have the information necessary. I submit that it was not a lucid explanation of the Bill which my right hon. friend gave but an impassioned argument in its behalf. On the one hand he professed the greatest concern that no old cries should be renewed, that no old issues should be called up, that the demon of discord, which had been laid in 1896, should not be roused again at this time, but I submit that the argument he used when he came to that clause was one he should not have made had he desired to live up to his profession. On what ground did the right hon. gentleman advocate his Bill? It was not explanation but an argument which he gave? He advocated it on the ground that separate schools were superior to public free schools or secular schools. He raised an issue which there was no need of raising at all, an issue which, in the earlier part of his speech, my right hon. friend declared he did not intend to raise. But he forgot that intention and he raised the question of the respective merits of public free schools and separate schools, and gave the horrible example of the United States as an argument against public schools. There you have his argument and his illustration. He tortured the British North American Act of 1867 and the British North America Act of 1871 in order to get a legal ground—what for? For an explanation of his Bill? No, but to make strong his argument for the passage of his Bill. He tortured the shades of George Brown of illustrious memory, until I could almost hear the squeaking ghost of that eminent statesman fitting through the passages here, tortured and injured by the violent wrenching and twisting which the right hon. gentleman gave it. And in all these ways, instead of making a lucid explanation of the main feature of his Bill, he entered into an impassioned argument in order that his Bill might gain the assent of this House and the country. Well, the right hon. gentleman has had to eat the fruits of his mistake. Just then, under the glamour of his speech, under his successful avoidance of certain points, under his equally successful exclusion of certain other points in that Bill, every man behind him applauded to the echo; and if a vote had been called for then, every man would have risen to his feet—perhaps with one exception—and have voted for the Bill. He rushed the House for the time being, but he failed to rush it permanently; and the disorganization and confusion of these ten days is abundant proof that the right hon. gentleman went further than prudence and good statesmanship justified. He taunted my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Borden) with deftly shaping his course. Well, I hope his course is more deftly shaped than that of my right hon. friend. He lightly told my hon. friend that he was seeking for hills of vantage and strategical points, forsooth. There are hills of vantage but there are also valleys of humiliation. And it would be interesting to know who will head the procession through the valley of humiliation. Will it be the sturdy young Napoleon of the west with downcast eyes and drooping colours? Or will it be my right hon. friend who in 1895 boasted that he possessed the courage which did not promise until he had made up his mind, but once his promise was made stood immovable as a rock.

Now, all these are questions which we cannot but be interested in—questions raised in this House and in the country. There is one other thing. Shall I speak of it? Not content with rushing his Bill, not content with throwing aside his colleagues to rush his Bill, not content with proceeding without taking care to ascertain the sentiment of the west, not content with making his speech on the merits of the Bill and confounding it with a lucid explanation of the measure, the right hon. gentleman tried to rush the country as well. One of his colleagues in another place prepared a pamphlet, a remarkable pamphlet in some ways. It purported to be a 'brief history, from official sources, of the legislation respecting the separate schools since the year 1863 in the united province of Canada, and in the Dominion since confederation.' Now, as I said before, I have no fault to find, nor has any one in this House with the publication by the government of official information that will shed light upon this question. But this pamphlet is a partisan pamphlet. It does give the facts taken from 'Hansard,' but it does also colour them, and it does also argue the points involved. How does it colour them? I do not suppose, for instance, that Edward Blake or George Brown, or any of these old worthies, some of whom have passed away, others of whom are still with us, in making their speeches, italicized certain parts of them, or altered them in double-leaded columns, to make the arguments impressive. But in the quotations from the speeches of these gentlemen every sentence that favours the contention of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is italicized or given emphasis which points the argument. It is not necessary for me to go into details. But when it comes to George Brown's momentous sentence, the maker of this pamphlet is not satisfied with italicizing it, but he puts it in bolder type, italicizes it and double-spaces it, in order that it may catch the eye and make the impression the compiler intended to make. And, when that is all done, here is the argument with which it ends—not a quotation from Blake or Brown, not an abstract from 'Hansard,' but an argument from the pen of the maker of this pamphlet:

> Under the Territorial legislation, the rights of the minority have in the past been recognized. It would be a breach of faith and a violation of the British North America Act to dis-

turb now the rights and privileges granted by the parliament of Canada thirty years ago and enjoyed by the minority up to this time.

Now, I say that this is not a very important matter, but it is significant. I say that no government has a right—and it is poor politics, I think, for any government to assume that it has the right and act upon that assumption—in giving what purports to be official information from the records, to endeavour, by the means I have explained, to point out the argument and lead to a partisan conclusion with regard to a measure that has been introduced.

Now, I have no more to say on this occasion. These are just some thoughts which occur to us. We wish them to sink into the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite. We have no wish to dictate their policy; but we would fain give them something for reflection, for calm and, if possible, fruitful meditation. This is our contribution, made with the best of intention and in the best of spirit, and in the hope that it will contribute to the benefit of the hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). In my judgment, we are face to face with a most extraordinary state of affairs in this parliament to-day. We propose to put through an important measure affecting the destinies of practically half a continent under the leadership of a government that has not a representative of that half continent among its members. Under constitutional government, as we understand it, and as it has been carried out, the cabinet is composed of heads who have received the endorsation of the people before they enter upon their work in that cabinet. And these cabinet ministers are chosen from the provinces according to the population or importance of those provinces. For instance, Ontario in the past has nearly always had five members in the cabinet, Quebec four, the maritime provinces at least three, one of whom was allowed for New Brunswick, another for Nova Scotia and, until recent years, one for Prince Edward Island. Thus every part of the Dominion was represented in the cabinet; and when important questions came up in which any portion of the country was particularly interested, its representatives in the cabinet were supposed to have influence in swaying the government in regard to that matter. That has hitherto been the case with regard to Ontario and Quebec, and either of those provinces would rebel to-day if an important measure affecting its interests were before parliament and it were deprived of its due proportion of representation in the cabinet. But to-day we have practically half a continent without representation in the cabinet, notwithstanding that an important measure is going through that vitally affects the interests of that half continent, and that will seal its fate for the future. The only representative in the cabinet of that part of the country has become so dissatisfied with the measure that he has publicly declared that it cannot receive his support, and, rather than remain in the cabinet and assume any responsibility for the measure, he has resigned. The government have not dared to put themselves in touch with that great section of the country by appointing another member in his place. Is it because of the unpopularity of the measure or because no one can be found who will take the responsibility of it, as an in-coming member of the cabinet would necessarily do? Or is it because of the dearth of public men from that country and the impossibility of finding any one in the ranks of the government supporters sufficiently intelligent to be a cabinet minister? It cannot be the latter, because the government has many supporters from the Northwest, some of whom would be a credit to a cabinet. We are driven, therefore, to conclude that it is because of the unpopularity of the measure, and because the government dare not ask the Governor General to appoint a new minister and, by an electoral contest, allow the people of the Northwest to express their opinion upon the measure.

If they did so, in that election which must take place, this measure would undoubtedly be discussed, every phase of it would be discussed before the people, and the people themselves would have an opportunity to express an opinion on it. The government are in the humiliating position to-day—I am justified in saying so in view of what has transpired—that they dare not risk their reputation by appointing a new Minister of the Interior and sending him back for re-election before this measure goes through. So that great country is not represented in this cabinet, that great country is without a representative to voice their views with regard to this important measure. Is that not constitutional government run mad? Is that according to the principles of the British constitution that we have heretofore carried out in the Dominion of Canada? I say it is the very reverse. The government are to-day in the humiliating position that they dare not put a minister into the cabinet and ask him to go to his constituents and get their endorsation of his appointment and of the measure that is before the House to-day. Now in view of this condition of affiairs what ought the government to do? In my judgment they ought either at once to fill that position, and give the people an opportunity of endorsing the appointment, and let this measure be discussed by the people themselves, or they ought to withdraw the unpopular part of their measure; because, if I know anything about the sentiment of this country, especially of that part of the country which this measure will affect more than any other, it is I might say almost unanimous against the Bill, or at least the school clauses contained in this Bill that the right hon. gentleman has submitted to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I presume the hon. gentleman does not propose to discuss the Bill at this present time.

Mr. SPROULE. If you will first allow me to commence the discussion of the Bill, I shall then be happy to be called to order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I judged that the hon. gentleman was coming very close to a discussion of the Bill in the latter remarks he made.

Mr. SPROULE. I mentioned the Bill as several speakers before me have done, and I assume I have a perfect right to do so, without discussing the principles of the Bill. I am merely referring to the Bill as a reason why the government do not fill the vacant portfolio, and I am asking them to fill it so that the people may have a chance to express their opinion of it. When that is done we will say that the government are acting according to the principles of constitutional government. I need not say anything with regard to another portfolio that has been practically vacant for a long time; while we are voting large sums of money for that department to spend we are not carrying out the principles of constitutional government both during this session and last session. Until the government bring themselves in accord with the principles of constitutional government as carried out in Great Britain, we are justified in drawing their attention from time to time to their failure to do so, and in asking them to put themselves in accord with these principles which they have always declared they are desirous of upholding.

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

National Transcontinental Railway—surveys, construction and other expenses, $1,328,500.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). I am asking for this money to meet the necessary expenses in connection with the work of the National Transcontinental Railway Commission. The details of that sum are as follows: For salaries of commissioners and headquarters staff, $100,000; for headquarters rental, $13,500; head office, stationery, furniture, light, telephone, telegrams, travelling, incidental and unforeseen expenses, $25,000; for wages of men in connection with the different survey parties, $600,000; head office, district and divisional engineers' salaries, $100,000; supplies and commissariat, $425,000; outfit and instruments, $20,000; freight and travelling expenses of engineers and transport of men, $45,000. These sums make up the total.

Mr. FOSTER. Now suppose we raise the question, first, a very important one, before any of this money is voted, as to what information this House is going to get. We have tried on several occasions to get it, but have not been able to. The thing has been thrown backwards and forwards like a rubber ball. We have incurred a large expense, and we are now to face a million and a third, and we have not a scintilla of information as to what this commission has done, or the results of its labours, if it has done anything. If it has not done anything it has not justified its existence because the expense heretofore has been very great. If it has done anything we want a complete statement placed before the House as to what it is that it has done. We have debated the question casually time and again and it has been called to the attention of the right hon. Prime Minister and also the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals as to the fact that information does get out, but it does not get out to the members of the House of Commons and the country, because there is no medium of communication between that commission and this House. We would like to have this matter settled first before we vote any money.

Mr. EMMERSON. The commission is constituted under the Act of this parliament and it has certain work to do. It is to be presumed that it is attending to its duties. Now, until it has accomplished certain work, until the work is completed, there can be nothing to report. For instance, the presumption is that in the first instance it will have to look after the surveys. It is to have a road surveyed over the whole route. It will be taken for granted that that will take a certain time, and it will be taken for granted that there are certain preliminary surveys to be made. Now, until there is something to report, until it has the work completed which will enable it to lay before the Governor in Council a statement of the result, we could not naturally expect that the information would be placed before the members of this House. We must not anticipate too much. My hon. friend, I think, shows too much anxiety for this information. The information cannot be in existence. It is true that the general statement may be published in the press that the surveyors are meeting with success in finding a route, but until the finished work of the survey is placed before the Governor in Council it would not naturally be placed on the table of the House. My hon. friend, I think, has become somewhat involved as to the question of the means of communication between the commission and this House. There is no question as to the medium of communication. There was a question however as to the medium of communication between the Railway Commission, another and an entirely different commission, and this House. The question was as to whether the Department of Railways and Canals had any connection with that commission or any control over it. On this the terms of the Act seem to be silent. There is an implication in certain of the sections as

to the position of the Department of Railways and Canals in its relationship with the commission, but there is no direct statement or declaration as to the medium of communication between that Railway Commission and the House. But, Sir, in so far as the Transcontinental Railway Commisison is concerned, it is an entirely different body, and it is recognized by the Act that as soon as it reaches certain conclusions it must submit to the Governor in Council the results. Until it has done that I do not think any question can arise as to either its shortcomings or as to its not fulfilling the duties imposed upon it. I think my hon. friend has mixed up the two commissions as respects the medium of communication. The work started out and the commission has gone on with that work. It is only a few months since that commission was constituted. The results of the first year's operations and the results of the survey could not be given because they have not yet been completed. They would only be preliminary any way and these preliminary surveys are not yet finished.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know that the hon. minister has thrown much light upon it. We made an appropriation for the work and purposes of the commission last year. The greater part of it has been expended. Something must have been done with it, but in so far as we are concerned we do not know whether it was thrown into the Bay of Biscay or where it went. We do not have any too profound a confidence in the commission that these hon. gentlemen have created. Neither has the country. I do not think any commission ever was created with such important interests entrusted to them which commanded so little respect or confidence in the country at large. There is not a man on it who can claim to be an expert in any way or sense. There is not a man I know of who has had any peculiar or especial training or experience to enable him to undertake such a business as that. I am quite sure that no great railway corporation in this country would have picked any one of these men. I make that assertion and I let it go to this House and to the country and the good sense of the country and the House can say whether it is true or not. None of them had any special training. None of them had any of that large business knowledge, none of them had any of the technical and special knowledge, which, I think, are necessary to the men to whom will be entrusted the expenditure of nearly $100,000,000 of the people's money. Another thing which is almost equally important is that to them will be entrusted largely the construction of the road in its grades, curves, and location, because, I suppose, the government have confidence in them, having appointed them, and the government will take their recommendations. The government are not experts. They have not time to attend to it. This commission is specially charged with that work. The government have confidence in them, the government will take their recommendations so that there is not only the expenditure of $100,000,000 placed in their hands, but there is the location and building of a road which for all time will be one of the channels or media of communication in this country. As to its location, as to its grades, as to its curves, as to everything of that kind this commission have something to do, and I do not think as I said before that we have so much confidence in the commission that we can allow an expenditure of money to go to the year's end if we are to have no knowledge at all as to what has been done with the money we have given. The hon. minister says that you cannot ask for information until the work is completed. That is right in part and only in part. We do not want to ask for anything which cannot be had but we do want to know whether we are for ever and for all time to be bandied to and fro between an unwilling minister and an unresponsive commission so that between the two we get no information at all. That is the way the question strikes me. Now, how does it strike the hon. minister ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I will tell my hon. friend how it strikes me. If my hon. friend can claim to have the sympathy not only of this committee but the sympathy of the whole House, I venture this assertion : ' That there is not a man in Canada who will stand up and make the same statements in regard to the commission as those which were made by my hon. friend. In the first place he has assumed that these men must necessarily be experts in the matter of construction and in the matter of engineering skill. I gather from his words——

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot help what you gather. I am only responsible for what I said.

Mr. EMMERSON. I give the ordinary meaning of the English language. In the first place, let us take the chairman of the commission. I venture to say—and I challenge successful contradiction—that there is not an abler man in this House than that gentleman. He is not only an able lawyer but he has had large business experience and has had the management of a railway. He has had wide experience in railway transactions, he has had large experience in the business of the country, and I am sure that Mr. Wade as chairman of that commission has the confidence of not only those who know but the confidence of parliament. The others are all able business men ; they are men who have made their mark in their different sections, who enjoy the confidence of the people who know them, and I repeat that as a board you can rake Canada over and I do not

think you could select an equal number of men who would stand higher in every way in point of integrity, ability and attention to their duties, than the men who constitute that commission. It would not be parliamentary for me to say that my hon. friend was not sincere in giving utterance to the sentiments which he did, and therefore I do not say that, but I am sure that a little reflection will lead him to conclude that in his desire to find something to say against the item, he has perhaps gone beyond what was justified by the facts. There was a vote of $500,000 last year ; I can give a statement of what was expended month by month since the appointment of the commission. I can give not only the expenditures but the liabilities incurred in each particular month.

Mr. FOSTER. If the minister wishes to make a financial statement on this matter let us have it made all at once, so that it will be assembled in 'Hansard.' Will he give the names of the commissioners, their salaries and travelling expenses ; the names of the staff, their salaries and travelling expenses ; the rental of their quarters, and the provisions he has made in the way of private car conveniences for their transportation, because I suppose that some provision of this kind must be made. Then if he will give us the surveyors or surveys that have been sent out, their components and the sections of country that they have taken, we will be able to form some idea, with all this information, of where their activities are being employed and what ground they are covering. As to my own statement I listened with a great deal of interest to my friend's characterization of it; I do not retract a word of what I have said.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would not expect you to ; you are too hardened a sinner.

Mr. OSLER. I undertood the minister to say that this House can get no information in connection with these surveys until they are completed. I suppose the surveys will not be completed within three years from now at the earliest. Are we to vote money year after year for these surveys, amounting in the aggregate to $10,000,000 at least and not receive any information as to the progress that is being made or any information that is of interest to the country until the whole surveys are completed, and in the hands of the government because that is in effect what the minister said ? We want to understand this, because it is a most serious state of affairs if we are to understand the minister in that way.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Osler) has put a strange construction on what I said. My statement did not involve that we should wait until the whole line was surveyed. A gentleman like my hon. friend (Mr. Osler) must realize that these survey parties have certain areas to cover and each district engineer would have a certain territory under his jurisdiction, and when he has completed his work his report would come in and it would be the subject matter for submission to the government of a report to this House. That does not say that the report shall be delayed until the whole line is surveyed, and until somebody else in the wilds of the north should have completed his survey.

Mr. OSLER. I think that is what will be understood from the minister's remarks.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend connected as he is with the board of directors of a railway company and knowing something about the reports on construction that come in, must know that they come in from different engineers, and that one engineer does not cover the whole territory ; that it is in divisions and districts, and naturally it would not be necessary to wait for the whole survey to be completed but until something in a concrete form could be reached by district engineers, or by a divisional engineer. There would not be anything for them to report to the commission and therefore nothing for the commission to impart to the government and to parliament.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the minister if he can tell us when the surveys began, where they have been carried on, how many miles have been gone over in attempting to obtain a route, for example through New Brunswick, and so on, covering the ground in that way. We can hardly believe that this work has gone on to the extent of many hundreds of thousands of dollars and that the minister has allowed himself to remain absolutely ignorant in regard to this. I do not suppose the minister expects us to believe that ; I do not suppose that position is consistent with the proper discharge of his duty as Minister of Railways, and all we are asking is that even although the surveys have not been completed the minister should be good enough to put us in possession of that information which the minister himself has in regard to these matters. We, of course, know that all the work is not being done by one engineer, the minister says it is being done by several engineers, but let us know what work is being carried on, even although it is not completed, and if any results, even tentative results, if I might so express myself, have been reached let us know something about them. There are reports in the press with regard to these results ; are they authorized or unauthorized ? If authorized, it seems to me that parliament should be put in possession of the facts as early as the press, especially if parliament is in session.

Mr. HAGGART. There has been an expenditure of $500,000. The minister comes down and asks for a further vote of $1,-

368,000. Surely the House is entitled to a report from the committee as to the manner in which they have expended the $500,000 voted last year, and the manner in which they intend to expend this $1,328,000. If, as the papers state, a first-class line has been found between Quebec and Moncton, the House is entitled to know it. If that is not so, the House is entitled to know that; or if there is any partial information on the subject, the House has a right to have it. We do not expect anything in a concrete form. What we expect, if the surveys are not completed, is information as to the direction in which they are being made, and how near they are expected to approach the gradients, curves and locations which were promised. It is perfectly monstrous to tell this House, as the minister virtually does, that we are not to have the information until after the surveys are complete. That is treating the House with perfect coolness and indifference.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I bring to the attention of the minister also the fact that section 30 of the National Transcontinental Railway Act, chapter 71, of the statutes of 1903 is in the following terms :

> The commissioners shall make to the Governor in Council through the Minister of Railways and Canals an annual report for the information of parliament, setting forth the receipts and expenditures of the year, and such other matters as appear to them to be of public interest in relation to the said railway, or as the Governor in Council directs. Every such annual report shall be submitted to each House of parliament within fifteen days after the making thereof, or within fifteen days after the commencement of the next session of parliament, whichever first happens.

I remember that we had a long discussion in the session of 1903 as to the terms of this section, which seems to have been absolutely disregarded both by the commission and by the government as well as by the minster himself.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. How has it been disregarded?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Have we any annual report ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The commission has not been a year in existence.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not see anything in the terms of this statute to the effect that the first report shall not be made until the commission has been in existence a year. I would take it to be the fair meaning of the statute that at the first session of parliament, after the commissioners had done any substantial work, a report of that work would be placed before parliament.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I call the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that this commission, if I remember rightly, was appointed in the month of September last, so that hardly six months have elapsed since it has been in operation. The commission may have reports from engineers who have been in the field. Whether it is so or not I do not know. They may have received interim reports from the surveyors from time to time, but I question very much if when parliament opened in the month of January they had the material for a report. We must have a report at least once a year; it may be advisable, indeed, to have a report oftener ; but I do not think the commission can be accused of negligence because they have not yet sent a report.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If parliament meets again in January or February or March next, and a report is submitted then, it will cover more than one year, and it will not be an annual report in the sense in which the statute demands it. The terms of the statute I think require the commission to give a report of what they have done up to the present time. The fact that there may be no finality to their work is not a reason why they should not report what they have done. We are not asking for a report which contains absolute conclusions as to the line ; but inasmuch as they have had $500,000 placed at their disposal, and it appears that they have spent a considerable portion of that, and inasmuch as the administration ask for nearly $1,500,000 more for the coming year, we are justified in asking what they have been doing with the money placed at their disposal at the last session of parliament. That seems to me to be very reasonable, and I should have thought it would have engaged the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals before this.

Mr. EMMERSON. The chief cause of complaint with reference to myself seems to be that I have not obtained a report with reference to plans and surveys. I may say to the House that the chairman of the commission told me that they had in course of preparation a report down to the first of January of this year, but that that report could not contain any information as to the surveys, beyond the fact that they were not complete.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If they have not completed any surveys, can they not at least tell us where they have been making surveys and what they have been doing with the money?

Mr. EMMERSON. I can get that information myself.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you a report from them at all ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No. I have a statement of expenditure.

Mr. OSLER. It is surely an easy matter for the commission to report what they have done up to the 1st of January. That is called for by the Act. I think the House is entitled to it, and I think this item should stand until we have that report.

Mr. FOSTER. Judging from the remark of the hon. minister, he thinks it would fill the bill if he gave us certain information. That will never do at all. What we want is an explicit report of the commission. What has this commission been doing during the six or four months it has been at work? Here you have a very expensive staff, upon what kind of work has this staff been employed during this time? Why should there be any trouble about giving the information? There is nothing secret about it. The directors of railway companies get reports from their engineers. This House is in the position of directors, and we want to know what our servants have been doing. Here is an important section of the Act which the Minister of Railways did not seem to have any knowledge of until this moment.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is not the case.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, he did not see that it was carried out. It is on a par with the extraordinary lapse with regard to the Railway Commission. There was a law put through establishing that commission, and no provision made for a report by it. That is an omission which my right hon. friend says will be made right by legislation. I think the Minister of Railways should let this item stand until he has a report of the commission, and he ought to have that in a very few days. Has this commission taken over any of the reports made by the Grand Trunk Pacific and adopted them as their own and paid for them.

Mr. EMMERSON. That matter is now the subject of negotiations between the commissioners and the Grand Trunk Pacific. The chairman of the commission assured me only this morning that the report was in preparation and that his view of that section was quite in keeping with my own. I have the information as to the expenditure each month and the liabilities incurred month by month, and also as to the salaries. The only report, practically speaking, which the commission could make now, in addition to the information already in possession of the House, would be a general statement covering the points of survey. if hon. gentlemen opposite think we should wait for that, I have no desire to press this item through.

Mr. OSLER. Another reason why it is important this discussion should stand is this. When this report of the commission comes down, we will see under what headings they made it, and a discussion of this item will be most useful in directing how the report should be drafted. It will be very important to have the schedules and the different lines of information defined which the House will expect from these commissioners every year.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Are the surveys proceeding from Quebec to Moncton?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister must have noticed in the newspapers the reports that the engineers have found a location between Lévis and Moncton which fully justifies the expectation expressed by the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) when he made his statement concerning the road. Is there any report in the department of the survey of that portion of the road?

Mr. EMMERSON. None whatever.

Mr. HAGGART. Has the minister had a verbal report from the commissioners?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Where was the report published to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) refers?

Mr. HAGGART. In many of the newspapers.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have seen the report that was so widely published, but it gave no authority for the statements made. Of course, I hope they are true, but it appeared to be a mere newspaper statement and not a quotation from anybody who might be supposed to know the facts.

Mr. HAGGART. It was only a general statement that the surveys had resulted in the finding of a route that fully justified the statements of the Prime Minister.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have seen in the newspapers, and have heard in private conversation, that between the Quebec bridge and Edmundston, not only was there a fine country, from an agricultural and lumbering point of view, but that it afforded a good location for the railway. But, although I have read and heard this statement, I am not aware that the government had any official information on the subject.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The report I saw in the press purported, directly or impliedly to come from the commissioners. And they went to the length of saying that there was an equally good line from Edmundston to Moncton, and that the people of New Brunswick had really not known the interior of their province, but that it had remained for the engineers appointed by this commission to discover this route through that portion of the country. Of course, these reports may not have emanated from the commission, but the impression one received from reading them was that I have mentioned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have heard the same with regard to the interior of New Brunswick, but, I am sorry to say, that I could not connect it with any authority in which I could have confidence. Of course, I should be only too glad to believe it. With regard to the other section between the Quebec bridge and Edmundston, that is stated to be a magnificent country.

Mr. OSLER. Has there been a report on the other section ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not aware that there is any report yet made by the engineers in charge of that survey, but, in casual conversation I have heard the hope expressed——

Mr. OSLER. But not from the surveying party ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Are we to understand from the minister (Mr. Emmerson) that the reports coming from the commission will be laid before the House before going to the newspapers ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I presume they will come to the government first through the medium of the Department of Railways and Canals, and then they will be submitted to the House. But the gentlemen of the press are eagle-eyed and always on the alert. I do not know what they may gather from this report in its flight. They are certainly not likely to get anything until it reaches the government at least.

In the matter of the first item, we have asked $100,000, to meet the salaries of the commissioners and the headquarters staff. I have been asked for information as to the commissioners and their salary, and it will be opportune for me to give it in connection with this item. Mr. F. B. Wade is chairman and his salary is $8,000 a year. Mr. Robert Reid is commissioner and he receives $7,000 a year. Mr. A. Brunet, commissioner, get $7,000 a year. Mr. C. A. Younge, commissioner, gets $7,000 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is he from ?

Mr. EMMERSON. From Manitoba. Mr. Brunet is from the city of Montreal.

Mr. BERGERON. How many commissioners are there ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Four.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There were three at first, but the number was increased.

Mr. EMMERSON. Four under the Act as passed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Under the Act as eventually passed.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the minister state in what capacity these gentlemen had previously served their country, or, if they had not served their country, in what capacity they acted before their appointment ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Wade was a distinguished King's Counsel and a member of this House.

Mr. FOSTER. And that reminds me that he rose in his place here, I believe, and declared that there was no inducement that called him to desert his people whom he represented in this House and who were so loyal to him, and accept a salary as one of the commissioners. He thought the suggestion that he was to be one of the commissioners was a slander and indignantly denied it. I wish the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) were here.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am sure the country is to be congratulated upon the fact that Mr. Wade was induced to accept the position. I have very great respect for the ability of some of the hon. gentlemen on the other side, but I certainly will not place Mr. Wade second to any of them, or second to any one in the country, so far as distinguished ability as a lawyer is concerned, while I think that his knowledge of men and affairs and his grasp of the conditions of this country qualify him in a most eminent degree for the position.

Mr. FOSTER. We will see how far that certificate will carry.

Mr. EMMERSON. Of course, that is only my opinion, and hon. gentlemen opposite may not agree with me.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, it must be understood that if my opinion of these members as railway commissioners is not high, I say nothing at all but what is respectful of them as men. We must keep the personal element separated from their quality as commissioners.

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Wade had experience in connection with railway matters.

Mr. FOSTER. What railway ?

Mr. EMMERSON. A railway in Nova Scotia.

Mr. FOSTER. Which one ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not recall the name of it.

Mr. FOSTER. That is strange.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not strange that I do not know the name of the railway, nor is it strange that Mr. Wade had experience in railway matters. I believe he managed that road for seven or eight years.

Mr. FOSTER. What road ?

Mr. LAURENCE. The Nova Scotia Central.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that a trunk line ?

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) of course, has not been in Nova Scotia and knows nothing about that province. The Nova Scotia Central is a road of considerable importance. I am informed that Mr. Wade has managed the affairs of that railway. But I think it will be conceded by hon. gentlemen opposite that Mr. Wade is a very excellent chairman, and fills the position with credit to himself and with great advantage to the country.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the length of that line ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I could not say. I only know that he was connected with such a railway. Mr. Reid was a business man of prominence, I understand. Mr. Brunet, I think, was a banker.

Mr. INGRAM. What is Mr. Reid's line of business ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know his line of business. If he has business qualifications, it makes little difference what business he is engaged in.

Mr. INGRAM. He surely must have had some special qualifications.

Mr. EMMERSON. He has business ability, executive ability, judgment and tact. Many hon. gentlemen opposite who have ability in certain lines may not have tact and judgment.

Mr. INGRAM. He is accused of advising others to tamper with a ballot box.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not heard of that. I think perhaps that is within the imagination of my hon. friend.

Mr. INGRAM. There is no imagination about it, it is a fact, and a sworn fact.

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Brunet is a Montreal gentleman, he was a banker there, and enjoys a very high position in the business circles of that city, and enjoys as well the confidence of the citizens for his integrity. Mr. Young is from the west, a well known business man, and for many years a member of the Manitoba legislature. Mr. Ryan, the secretary of the commission, was formerly employed on the Temiscaming Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. What is Mr. Brunet's age?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know whether he goes beyond the Osler limit or not.

Mr. FOSTER. I have understood he was about 62.

Mr. EMMERSON. I hope my hon. friend has no idea of asking that he be Oslerized. I do not know what his age is.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would ask if Mr. Cowan is solicitor for the commission, and if so, when his services commenced.

Mr. EMMERSON. We are not dealing with the Grand Trunk Pacific, but with the Transcontinental Railway Commission.

Mr. CLARE. What salary does Mr. Ryan get ?

Mr. EMMERSON. $2,500. Mr. H. A. Collins is the secretary.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister must not give Mr. Young the go-by. He has given an elaborate eulogy of the other three.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have already said that Mr. Young was a member of the Manitoba legislature for a number of years. Previous to his appointment, he had been down to this parliament several times on public delegations. I think he was largely interested in the grain business. I cannot state specifically the occupations of each member of the commission previously, but only in a general way. If it is the desire of the committee that I should read over the names of all the officials—Mr. Collins, secretary to the chairman gets, $1,020.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister follow his plan of making his comments on each one as to their abilities ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think the committee can rely upon the good judgment of the commissioners in selecting their clerks. They select their own clerical staff. Mr. Collins is secretary to the chairman, and gets $1,020.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the chairman has a secretary to himself ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Have there been any strikes on that commission so far ? We had a very sensational story about the other Railway Commission, that one of its eminent members felt aggrieved because he had not a typewriter all to himself, and it is said that he struck when the Council refused to give him a typewriter. There was rather an ominous cloud hovering over the commission and over a part of Ottawa for a time, sulphurous at periods. I believe ; but in due course of time as the recalcitrant hung on, the typewriter was delivered up, the cabinet came to terms and footed the Bill. Has nothing like that happened in this instance ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am afraid that the scandal monger and the gossip have too much the ear of my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend better not commence the scandal mongering business. Let him remember about people who live in glass houses.

Mr. EMMERSON. Now my hon. friend need not make any threats. I do not want any difficulty with my hon. friend, but I want him to understand that I do not run away from him—he might as well understand that first as last. I think my hon. friend, in reflecting in this way on these gentlemen, and asking a question like that as to whether there are any strikes, does

not come up to the high ideals about which he lectures us on occasion. Surely to ask me a question like that is, while it may be humorous——

Mr. FOSTER. I took it as current history, I heard it everywhere.

Mr. EMMERSON. I know nothing about that. Mr. John Neighorn is secretary to the commissioners Mr. Reid and Mr. Young. He gets $900 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the other commissioner a secretary ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Have patience. I do not want to go too fast. Mr. Paul Larocque is secretary to commissioner Brunet. He gets $800.

Mr. FOSTER. Does he speak French ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I should judge by the name that he does. I do not think he was born in Dublin.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it not very unfair that you should divide one poor mortal between two of these commissioners and give one other commisisoner one to himself ? Why not one each ?

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend forgets that this commission is an independent body and that the commissioners have the right to appoint their own officials. When my hon. friend complains of their action—referring to the government, I assume—he is forgetful of the fact that this is not a question for the government. It is a question for the commission.

Mr. OSLER. It must be a question for the country.

Mr. EMMERSON. It may be a question for the country as to what the commissioners do, but it is not a question for which the government is responsible particularly.

Mr. OSLER. It is necessary for this House to have all the information.

Mr. EMMERSON. Certainly ; you are getting it. But, the question was asked : Should we have the right to divide one man up between two and give one secretary to Mr. Brunet ? I may point out that that is a question that has been determined by the commissioners themselves.

Mr. FOSTER. But, there must be a limit. If these commissioners were to go on and make absolutely extravagant and uncalled for appointments there must come a time when some one will have something to say about it. This government in the end has to sanction these appointments, has it not ? They do come before the government in the end ? They must or else there would be no responsibility at all.

Mr. EMMERSON. I want to say that Mr. Larocque does all the French work and all the translation for the whole commisison in addition to the services he performs as secretary to Mr. Brunet. Naturally Mr. Brunet writes his letters in French. Mr. Heidman is secretary to and assists Mr. Ryan, the secretary of the commission. This man does stenographic and clerical work for Mr. Ryan and he gets a salary of $960. Mr. Ronan is a filing clerk and gets $840 a year. The total salaries of the commissioners, clerks and officials whom I have named, amount to $36,060 per year. Then there is Mr. A. L. Ogilvie, general purchasing agent, who receives $1,800 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. What does he do ?

Mr. EMMERSON. He purchases the supplies in connection with the commissariat.

Mr. OSLER. Where was Mr. Ogilvie before he became connected with the commission ? I do not know Mr. Ogilvie and do not for a moment suggest that he is not a proper man for the place, but this is the most important appointment of the whole commission. This is an appointment that ought to have a man above reproach. It is an appointment that ought to be paid four times that money. I think that the appointment of a purchasing agent at $1,800 a year is entirely wrong. The head purchasing agent is the key to the whole expenditure of that money and he should be a man who is well known, a man who has had experience in that business and he should be very well paid.

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Ogilvie was employed in the Department of Public Works here for a great many years and was taken from that department because of his fitness and qualifications.

Mr. OSLER. He should have a much larger salary than that.

Mr. EMMERSON. I quite agree with my hon. friend that a man holding that position should certainly be paid the highest possible salary because it is a very responsible position. Mr. White is the assistant general purchasing agent at $1,200 a year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Where is he located?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think these purchasing agents are connected with the Ottawa office and that they go out from the headquarters here. Mr. R. L. Landry is a stenographer at $840 a year, Mr. Geo. O'Reilly clerk at $700 a year and Miss Alice Seed, clerk at $300. The salaries of those whom I have last named in connection with the purchasing agent's department amount to $4,860.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In the return I have before me there are four purchasing agents mentioned as follows : Mr. A. L. Ogilvie, general purchasing agent, $150 a month ; Mr. F. W. White, $100 a month ; Mr. F. S. West, $125 a month and Mr. Alton $100 a month. Would the hon. minister be good enough to explain why it is that in the

initial stages of this work so many purchasing agents are required ? What do they do ? What is it that they purchase ? How much do they purchase ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The list which I have before me is for the estimate of the salaries of the commissioners and the headquarters staff for the fiscal year 1905, which commences on the 1st of July next. The list which the hon. gentleman has before him is a list of the officials who have been employed during the current year. As I understand the modus operandi in connection with the purchases of this commission, they have certain purchasing agents at different points. There is one in connection with the New Brunswick division. The headquarters of that man is in Fredericton, and he makes the purchases for the different survey parties. These survey parties are located between Moncton and Connors, or the boundary line between Quebec and New Brunswick. Then, in the Quebec division between Connors and the New Brunswick boundary line, at Chaudière Junction they have a man who looks after the parties along that portion of the route. Of course, these men have to make the purchases at different places and give personal attention to them. I think they ask for tenders. They make these purchases and inspect the goods that are offered, and then they have to see to their distribution at the different points where they get into the hands of those in charge of the commissariat departments of the different divisions.

Mr. OSLER. Are these four men independent purchasing agents or are they under the head of the general purchasing agent ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Ogilvie has general supervision.

Mr. OSLER. He has control over all of them ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. OSLER. Because there is no more difficult position to fill than that of purchasing agent. There is no place where temptation is forced upon a man so much as in the position of purchasing agent under these conditions and it is absolutely necessary to have all the agents under the entire control of one head man. He must supervise all others or else you will get into terrible trouble.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would gather that the condition is as the minister suggests. Mr. Ogilvie is the general purchasing agent at Ottawa. Mr. F. W. White, is the assistant and then there are two local purchasing agents, one at Fredericton and one at Winnipeg, Mr. Alton, who was appointed December 22, according to this return.

Mr. EMMERSON. Before I get through the list I will probably be in a position to recall the name. The next official is Mr. A. T. Gow, accountant, at a salary of $1,800; Mr. R. M. J. McGill, assistant accountant at $1,500 ; Joseph Clement, paymaster, at $1,200 ; W. R. Saults, bookkeeper at $900 ; A. Beaudry, stenographer, $840; Rod. Lagimodière, clerk, $720 ; R. H. Lang, clerk, $720. This makes a total of the salaries of these seven of $7,680.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is one other on my list, H. Charlotte, at $840, appointed March 7.

Mr. EMMERSON. The commissioners have furnished this as their estimate of what will be required for the next fiscal year. Then there is John O'Malley, messenger at $600, and E. Lefebvre, messenger, at $240, a sort of office boy. The commissioners ask also for additional clerical help estimated at $10,560, which makes a total of $60,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know anything about the necessity of all this clerical assistance. I suppose we are bound to assume it is necessary, but it certainly appears to be very abundant.

Mr. EMMERSON. The work is very great, and from my observation I do not think they have an extravagant staff at all. I am speaking now from personal observation.

We have now the head office staff in connection with the engineers. Mr. Hugh D. Lumsden is chief engineer at a salary of $6,000 ; M. J. Butler is assistant chief engineer at a salary of $4,500; R. Fitzgerald Uniacke, chief draughtsman, at a salary of $1,800. That is an historic name.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And a very good officer. I know Mr. Uniacke.

Mr. EMMERSON. A. M. H. Stimpson, is assistant chief draughtsman at $1,500 ; J H. Roy, draughtsman, $1,200 ; Owen P. Schreiber, $720 ; P. E. Wright, blue print clerk, $360 ; C. J. Jones, secretary to the chief engineer, $960 ; Fred. Dillon, chief engineer's accountant, $960, and Fred. McCourt, stenographer, $840.

There are certain district engineers. There is Mr. Guy C. Dunn, district engineer, $4,000. He has the district between Moncton and the boundary line between Quebec and New Brunswick. W. P. Collins, accountant, $840 ; J. A. McDougall, draughtsman, $840 ; D. Harnett, stenographer, $720 ; C. G. Hobart, draughtsman, $720. That is district 'A.'

The next is Mr. Doucet's district, district 'B' in the province of Quebec. Mr. Doucet, the district engineer, gets $4,000. S. R. Poulin, assistant district engineer, $3,000 ; A. E. Courchesne, draughtsman, $840 ; G. A. S. Campbell, clerk, $600 ; T. C. Bradley, stenographer, $600 ; C. F. Ross, commissary officer, $1,200 ; Jos. Martel, commissary offi-

cer, $1,200; Owen Morency, storekeeper, $720. That makes $38,120 for the salaries of the engineers and officials named on that section.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why is this district so much more heavily officered than the preceding?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a longer district.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is a commissary officer?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is a man who has to do with the portaging of supplies into the woods for the men. There is a district down there south of the St. Lawrence which is remote from settlement, and there is also the northern district on the north side of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I observe that there is no commissary officer whatever in the staff for district 'A.'

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think it has been found necessary; that district is not far removed from the base of supplies. At the Quebec bridge, E. A. Hoare is the engineer in charge at $2,400; H. B. Tourigny, a transit man, at $1,320; E. H. Blockley, a leveller, at $960, and there are five men at $480 each per annum.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not understand this item. What are we doing in connection with the Quebec bridge which makes a staff necessary?

Mr. EMMERSON. We guarantee the bonds and it becomes a part of the eastern section of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the responsibility is on the commission of seeing that the work is properly done.

Mr. HAGGART. Have the government taken it over yet?

Mr. EMMERSON. No. It is not yet completed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I must confess I cannot see why we should have a staff of eight men—an engineer, a transitman, a leveller, and five other men—for the purpose of seeing that the Quebec bridge is properly constructed. If we should have a corresponding staff on the line from Winnipeg to the coast in respect of which we also guarantee the bonds, it would cost the country an enormous amount. Is not this usually done by inspection after the work is completed?

Mr. EMMERSON. The work in connection with the approaches at both sides of the river has to be done by the government.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand that there is a contract, called a subsidy contract, entered into between the Dominion government and the local government and the company constructing the bridge, and under that contract it would be the duty of the Department of Railways and Canals to see that all the work is properly done. Is the bridge under the control of the Transcontinental Railway Commission or does it remain as it was?

Mr. EMMERSON. The approaches to the bridge are under the control of the commission, but the bridge itself has to be completed. Of course, the subsidy in aid of the construction of the bridge would be entirely subject to the department, but the guarantee of its bonds as a part of the transcontinental railway would necessarily be under the control and management of the commission.

Mr. HAGGART. I understood that the approaches were constructed under the subsidy contract the same as a bridge. How have you taken them over, and in what form has the commission let a contract for the building of them?

The approaches and the bridge were to be taken over under certain conditions from the Quebec government and the company which at present possesses it. Have the government taken over it or a part of it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, the government was not to take over the bridge, but it undertook to guarantee the bonds of the Quebec Bridge Company. That company now has to build not only the bridge but the approaches to the bridge from the vicinity of Chaudière junction to the north side of the river. This is quite an independent enterprise with which we have nothing to do except that we are interested in supervising the expenditure of the money.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

RICHMOND AND DRUMMOND FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

On the Order:

Second reading of Bill (No. 103) respecting the Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Tobin.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw attention to the fact that these Bills are not printed as shown on the order paper. The object of delaying the second reading of these Bills until they are printed is to give those who desire an opportunity of studying them, because the second reading endorses the principle of the Bill.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Not a private Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, practically it is so considered in reference to all Bills.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No.

Mr. SPROULE. And this is the commencement of a practice that we should not

allow to go too far, because it is easier to stop it now than later.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. All the Bills that are being read are printed.

Mr. SPROULE. The only evidence the House has that a Bill is printed is the order paper.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman will find this Bill on his file.

Mr. SPROULE. I have no right to look at the file, I have only a right to look at the order paper.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would like to inquire whether Bill (No. 101) to incorporate the Winding Ledges Power and Boom Company has been read the second time ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It has been referred to the committee on miscellaneous private Bills. There will be every opportunity to discuss it.

Mr. INGRAM. The last Bill I have on my file is Bill (No. 101).

Mr. SPEAKER. If objection is taken, I fancy these Bills will have to stand.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not think my hon. friends seriously object. I know nothing about any of these Bills, but any that are printed perhaps might be read a second time in order to expedite matters.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have on my order paper a memorandum that all these Bills are printed.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not object to any one of them, but I am only drawing attention to what I consider, if it were to continue, would be a very bad practice, because it would make it impossible for the members of this House to consider any of these Bills before their second reading.

Bill read the second time.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 90) respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—Mr. Smith.

Bill (No. 98) to incorporate the Imperial Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 99) to incorporate the Title Guarantee and Trust Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 100) respecting the Guelph and Georgian Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 101) to incorporate the Winding Ledges Power and Boom Company.—Mr. Costigan.

Bill (No. 102) respecting a certain patent of the Gold Medal Furniture Manufacturing Company, Limited.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 103) respecting the Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Tobin.

Bill (No. 104) respecting the Northern Bank.—Mr. Bole.

Bill (No. 105), to incorporate the Ontario Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Boyce.

Bill (No. 106), respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Black.

Bill (No. 107) respecting a certain patent of Celeste Joly.—Mr. Smith.

Bill (No. 108) to incorporate the Western Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Anderson.

Bill (No. 109) respecting the Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 110) respecting the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 112) respecting the Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Railway Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 113) respecting the Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Railways Company. - Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 117) to incorporate the Athabaska Railway and Oil Company.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 118) respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

National Transcontinental Railway—surveys, construction and other expenses, $1,328,500.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). I was speaking of the Quebec bridge section. Though that is the caption, it does not cover the Quebec bridge only, but a section of the line. I find that I was under some misapprehension myself with respect to the section, thinking it was simply the Quebec bridge.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How long is the section ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not the length, but it goes out through Chaudière towards the New Brunswick boundary.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no such section under the Transcontinental Railway Act as the Quebec bridge section.

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this whole amount of money to be spent on that section ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, this item covers the whole eastern section between Winnipeg and Moncton. This line is divided into districts, one of which is the Quebec bridge district which comes after districts A and B which I have already given.

Mr. SPROULE. This is for surveys, construction and other expenses. Could not the minister state what construction has been going on upon that bridge—I take it that this will apply to that work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Quebec bridge is distinct from this. The company build the

bridge. When they have the bridge completed, we have the opportunity of utilizing it in connection with the Transcontinental Railway. In consideration of this, the government guarantee certain bonds.

Mr. DANIEL. Where does section A commence?

Mr. EMMERSON. At Moncton, and runs to the Quebec boundary.

Mr. DANIEL. How much has been already expended on that section?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not gone into that feature of it, I am only giving the amounts required for 1905-6, commencing 1st of July next. The other information as to the expenditure of this amount is contained in another section of my remarks. That information should be given in connection with some other information which will be included in the report.

Mr. DANIEL. When may we expect that report?

Mr. EMMERSON. The chairman of the commission has informed me that it will be furnished within a few days.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the report contain all the information that the commission have in regard to surveys, and directions of surveys, location and everything of that kind.

Mr. EMMERSON. That information is all before the House, laid on the table within the last two or three days by myself, giving a statement of section A and all the different engineers in charge and the employees under them.

Mr. DANIEL. Does it give any location or anything beyond the statement of expenses?

Mr. EMMERSON. It must be borne in mind, as I have already stated, that these are mere trial lines that they have been running; the location survey will not come on until later, and until that is made the commissioners will not be in a position to give a report in a concrete form. As to that section they are now running trial lines. They are running lines down the valley of St. John river and across the divide which lies between the valley of the St. John and the Tobique; they are running lines from the Tobique valley up to what is known as the northwest Miramichi valley ; and lines down that valley to the southwest Miramichi at Boiestown and thence to Moncton. They are also running trial lines down the valley of the St. John to Fredericton and thence across the country to Chipman. These trial lines are simply a preliminary survey, and based upon them the final location survey will be made. Until that is done, the commission are not in a position to give information or to make their report favouring either one location or the other.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Before six o'clock the minister give us to understand that as far as the Quebec district is concerned, the men who had charge of that district were overseeing the Quebec bridge and looking after the government's interest there with reference to the bonds. Now, do I understand they have nothing to do with that part?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, they have a section by themselves. But, as I understand it, the duty will be cast upon the engineer in charge to make reports as to the progress of that bridge, and as to whether the law concerning it passed by this parliament last session is being carried out.

Mr. SPROULE. Then am I correct in understanding that we are not voting anything here for construction?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is not construction, it is simply 'surveys and other expenses.'

Mr. SPROULE. 'And construction,' that is in it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That comes in at a later period.

Mr. SPROULE. That is there either properly or not. If it is in properly, then we ought to know what has been done with regard to construction up to the present, how the money we have voted heretofore has been spent, and how the work is advancing ? But if it is not intended to use any of this for construction, the word should not be here.

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, that word 'construction' should be struck out. I move that the item be amended by striking out the word 'construction.'

Mr. SPROULE. Can you properly do that?

Mr. EMMERSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. SPROULE. You go before the Governor General with an item of expenditure, and he recommends it upon the grounds that this money is needed for two or three purposes, one is for trial surveys, another for engineers and another for construction. That is what appears in the account, and on the strength of that he recommends it. Now, you keep the whole amount of money, but you strike out the word 'construction,' therefore you can use all the money for other purposes and do no construction at all. It seems to me this is a peculiar way of handling the estimates after you have got the consent of His Excellency to the item.

Mr. EMMERSON. His Excellency, of course, would have regard to the details of the item. There is nothing in the items referring to construction, unless the surveys would be considered part of construction, or unless the incidental expenses connected

with surveys might be classified as construction. Of course there is this feature about it, that under the Transcontinental Railway Act, and under the Act relating to the Grand Trunk Pacific, the construction of this road would include the surveys and expenses incidental thereto, and the whole cost is to be computed in the rent of the line, and the Grand Trunk Pacific are to pay three per cent on the cost of construction, and, of course, surveys and other items would be included in the cost of construction. That is a mere matter of finance, a matter of construing terms.

Mr. SPROULE. That explanation may be of some use, but it is as clear as mud. What is the object of presenting these estimates to His Excellency at all for his assent? You require so much money to do a certain work; that has to be done on three different lines, a portion of that money is used for trial surveys, another portion for engineering and another portion for construction. Now, suppose you ask a million dollars, and you cut off two of the lines, the engineering and the construction, and you leave it all to trial surveys. Then you have a million dollars for trial surveys. If you had put such an item before His Excellency is it likely he would have consented to it? I have always understood that you could reduce the amount of the item properly without it being necessary to call his attention to it, but that where the amount was increased it was necessary to obtain his assent and this would be clearly increasing the amount of expenditure for one line.

Mr. EMMERSON. The matter is very immaterial because as I understand the expenses incidental to the surveys are part of the cost of construction.

Mr. SPROULE. How much is the minister going to use of that for engineering, how much for trial surveys, and what will he do with the balance ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The total amount in connection with the surveys and the railway from Winnipeg to Moncton will be $1,328,500. I wish to say that it is of course quite well understood that there are certain matters of information I am to bring down but which I shall have to obtain from the commission, and it might be well if I should allow the whole vote to stand until that information is procured.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We understood this afternoon that it was going to stand and perhaps it would be better to take the matter up a little later on.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is quite in accordance with my own view and I would ask to have the item stand.

Item allowed to stand.

Quarantine, salaries and contingencies of organized districts, $150,000.

Mr. FISHER. This item was before the committee a few days ago but I did not ask the committee to pass it then because I had not all the information about the expenditure. On going into the matter a little more fully I find I can reduce the item by $20,000 and move therefore the item be reduced to $130.000 instead of $150,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Does this item include salaries of officers and officials at all the quarantine stations in the Dominion ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. Are the quarantine officers expected to give all their time to the duties of their office ?

Mr. FISHER. Those in the organized ports do, with few exceptions. At St. John, we have one doctor and he gives the whole of his time to the work there ; his time is our time. At Halifax, however, there are two physicians and they are allowed to do private practice as well.

Mr. DANIEL. I ask the question because I was not aware whether the Agricultural Department is becoming completely militarized. I notice that the port physician at St. John has been made the principal medical officer of the district ; it seems that the example of the hon. minister is extending to his officials.

Mr. FISHER. A good example.

Mr. DANIEL. And that the Agricultural Department is really getting very much mixed up with the Department of Militia and Defence. Would the fact of this officer occupying both positions not interfere with the performance of his duty ?

Mr. FISHER. I am not aware of what the hon. gentleman refers to exactly, but I take it that this is a military appointment and that it has been accepted in the same way as clerks in the military service and in other departments here become members of different military corps. It has not been the policy of the government generally in any way to interfere with servants of the public taking part in the military service, but if it was a permanent office in the permanent corps, it certainly could not be held at the same time as the office that he now holds in St. John.

Mr. DANIEL. That is a permanent office as I understand it, and it is accompanied with an annual salary. The minister shakes his head, but I can assure him that what I am stating is the fact. I do not know how much of the time of this official is taken up by his duties as principal medical officer. I presume, of course, that in attending a camp he obtains leave of absence, and the time so spent in camp might very well be spent under leave of absence. The principal medical officer of the district must have other duties to perform which I should

think would require an office up town. I do not see how the port physician who lives on Partridge Island could attend to the duties of an office that would require his presence in the city. I would be glad to hear from the Minister of Agriculture what the duties of the principal medical officer are, and then the committee would be in a better condition to judge whether the two offices were incompatible with each other in the same person.

Mr. FISHER. The department had no knowledge of any such appointment. I was aware that Dr. Marks was a militia officer. He has asked for leave of absence to attend annual camp on one or two occasions, which has been granted to him upon his getting a substitute to do his work ; but I certainly think that a permanent office which would require his constant attendance for other purposes than that of quarantine would be incompatible with his position as quarantine officer ; but until I know what the office is and the nature of its duties, I could not say anything about it.

Mr. DANIEL. I thought the Minister of Agriculture was quite familiar with the military duties involved. The principal medical officer is paid an annual salary at $300. I do not wish the minister to suppose that I object to this gentleman receiving this additional office. I have no objection whatever. My point is whether the duties of the two offices are incompatible the one with the other.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I observed an item in one of the Halifax newspapers the other day to the effect that a gentleman who had a hospital for the treatment of trachoma had disposed of it to the government and was now returning to his regular city practice. Is the minister able to tell us what arrangement the government had with this gentleman when he owned this hospital ?

Mr. FISHER. That matter, which relates to immigrants, belongs to the Department of the Interior, and I do not know anything about it.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How many doctors are employed in this quarantine business, and has the Department of Agriculture any arrangement with the Department of the Interior whereby these doctors and the doctors employed to examine immigrants can work together ?

Mr. FISHER. There is no arrangement between the two services. The ships, when they come in, whether they have immigrants or not, have to obtain a free clearance from the quarantine doctors. They then come to the shore and land their passengers, and the immigration officials take charge of the immigrants and examine them. The diseases for which the immigration doctors examine the immigrants are not what are called quarantinable diseases. Trachoma and favus, which I think are the diseases my hon. friend has reference to, are not what are called quarantinable diseases, and the quarantine doctors would not stop people who are affected with them ; but the immigration authorities have power under a special Act to do so. There is no concerted action, because the two services are for two different purposes.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How many doctors are in the quarantine service ?

Mr. FISHER. We have a permanent officer at Sydney, N.S., two at Halifax, one at St. John, one at Louisburg, one at Charlottetown, one at Chatham, N.B. Several of these are paid small salaries, and carry on their private practice as well. Then we have the Grosse Isle quarantine station, and the station at William Head, near the city of Victoria in British Columbia ; also an officer at Vancouver. These compose what is called the organized force. Then we have an arrangement with the Customs Department by which, whenever a vessel comes in with disease on board, the customs officer calls upon a local doctor and he is paid according to the services he renders.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Has not the Department of the Interior medical men at all these places, and is it not imposing a double expense upon the country for both that department and the Department of Agriculture to have each its own medical officers at the same places. It seems to me that an arrangement might be made whereby one officer would do the work, and a good deal of expense would be saved.

Mr. FISHER. It is quite possible that some of the doctors I have referred to might be dispensed with if some such arrangement were carried out ; but so far there has been no combined organization. As we see the working of the two systems, we may be able possibly to work them together. I will remember my hon. friend's suggestion.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like the minister to explain to the committee the orders which are given to the quarantine officers with regard to the examination of ships arriving at any quarantine port in Canada—what directions the officers are required to carry out, what vessels they are required to examine and what vessels they are not required to examine.

Mr. FISHER. It is rather difficult for me to answer all that off-hand. There is a pamphlet giving the rules and regulations under which all work is done, comprising probably fifteen or twenty pages of printed matter. If there is any particular point on which my hon. friend wishes information, I could give him the answer at once.

Mr. DANIEL. The matter is important. I know that sometimes these regulations differ from those in force at other times. Sometimes vessels north of Hatteras coming to my own port of St. John are not required to be examined by the quarantine officers. So that as far as the quarantine by water goes, under those circumstances, we are not defended in any way against noxious or contagious diseases from those ports and occasionally we suffer on that account.

Mr. FISHER. My. hon. friend is quite right in saying that the regulations differ a little according to the circumstances. When there is not known to be any epidemic in the States on the Atlantic sea-board, north of New York—New York and not Hatteras is taken as the extreme limit south for that purpose— those vessels are treated with respect to quarantine as though they came from our ports, and are not examined. Any vessels coming from ports south of New York are examined. If any epidemic disease exists in the sea-board states, vessels from those ports are examined. Lately there was a small-pox epidemic in the United States north of New York, and for a while vessels from there coming to a Canadian port were examined for small-pox. But that order has been rescinded because the epidemic there has disappeared. That was the only occasion lately when vessels from ports north of New York were examined.

Mr. DANIEL. What are the regulations in force in regard to cases of infectious diseases which did not make their appearance when the vessel was examined by the quarantine officer but showed themselves a day or two after ? Upon what authority is thrown the expense of looking after any such case of infectious disease ? As we all know the incubating period of some diseases runs almost up to a fortnight, so that a person from New York or any other place might arrive at St. John or any other port apparently free from the disease and pass quarantine inspection, but after having been in the place for some days the disease which had been contracted in New York might break out. What is the policy of the department in regard to such cases ?

Mr. FISHER. When the vessel comes to port and is examined by the quarantine officer, if there appears to be no disease on board, she is given a quarantine clearance. The moment she receives that clearance and goes into a Canadian port she is held to be within the bounds of the province in which that port is situated, and the disease is treated the same as if it broke out in a house on shore. It becomes a provincial matter to be dealt with under the laws of the province. The Dominion government is not liable. A number of cases of that kind have come up and applications have been made for compensation, but the Department of Justice declared emphatically that the government was not in any way responsible.

Mr. SPROULE. Did not the Dominion government pay a portion of the expenses in connection with a small-pox case in Winnipeg ?

Mr. FISHER. That was the case of an infant. It was the Immigration Department which dealt with it and the vote was passed by parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister says that the government is not liable after the vessels gets a certificate of health. But two or three years ago a case of small-pox developed in Vancouver and the provincial authorities put in a claim against the government to be paid the expenses there. A similar claim was made in Winnipeg as well ; and to compensate for the heavy expenses the local authorities were put to by these immigrants suffering from small-pox, something was paid by the Dominion government, but whether paid through the department of health or the Department of the Interior, I do not know.

Mr. FISHER. I do not remember the exact case referred to, but I know there was such a case and payment was made. There were, however, other reasons. My department was told by the Department of Justice that we were not responsible, but the matter was taken up on different grounds entirely afterwards—on the ground that these people were immigrants and should be looked after by us. We have been paying for years a contribution to the Winnipeg hospital because they deal with immigrants and take care of them.

Mr. SPROULE. A vessel containing immigrants passed the quarantine officer at Halifax and got a clean bill of health, but by the time these immigrants reached Port Arthur small-pox broke out among them. The disease was carried on to Winnipeg and spread there to other parties. The contention was made that as the vessel had passed the quarantine at Halifax the Dominion government was responsible. Had the Dominion government done its duty, the municipality would not have been put to the expense it had to incur to quarantine the patient. I do not know that on that ground they could successfully prosecute a legal claim, but they contended that they had an equitable claim and we paid them something.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the minister pay for quarantining by land—by railway? Would the minister tell us what the orders are that are given to the gentleman who carries on this duty at McAdam and Vanceboro occasionally ?

Mr. FISHER. What work is done along the frontier we do there. When there is an epidemic in the United States we put on temporary officers along the frontier and

adopt the best means we can to shut out the disease. There are a number of regulations here, which, however, refer to the ordinary practice when there is no epidemic and when we have no special officials. But when there is an epidemic, temporary officers are appointed. Recently, off and on, for about two years, there was an epidemic of small-pox and these temporary officers were appointed. It was their duty to board the trains and examine passengers. It was a fairly complete but still, perhaps, not absolutely perfect examination in every case. Where the person came from a place where our officer knew there was disease, the newcomer had to show he had been vaccinated or else be vaccinated before he could be allowed to come in. If he came from a place where there was no disease reported or known to exist, he was examined to see if there was sign of disease and then allowed to proceed. The officers were employed by the month. Where and when the disease died out the officers were released, and, if the disease again became epidemic they were taken on again. That was the case more than once at McAdam Junction. These officers were paid $100 a month when they were at work.

Mr. DANIEL. Who gave the directions as to the duties of these officers? Was it the director general of public health, Dr. Montizambert ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. Referring to the subject of the development of disease on the ships after they have received a clean bill of health, I think it my duty to bring to the notice of the minister a case that occurred in my own town of North Sydney, in the month of May, 1902. A fishing schooner called the 'Arthur Binney' left Gloucester Mass., on the 16th of May, 1902, and, because of stress of weather or some other reason called at Liverpool, N.S., on the 20th of the same month, and, after remaining at Liverpool for a few hours cleared for the bank off the coast of Cape Breton. On the 30th of the same month, she came into the port of Cape Breton with small-pox developed on board. This schooner had a crew of twenty-four or twenty-five men. The quarantine officer went aboard and discovered one of the crew down with small-pox. He immediately, as was his duty, communicated with the Department of Agriculture thinking he would be instructed to look after them. Of course, he received the same answer which the minister—I suppose quite properly according to the law has given here to-night—that, as the vessel had touched in some point in Canada the government of Canada was not liable for her bills or charged with any duty in respect of her. After considerable negotiations we, as a town, were obliged to look after that crew for over a month. We had to put some in the hospital and to hire a tug-boat to stay with the vessel for the whole time, and incurred expenses of over $1,000. Now, I think it will be perfectly clear that, wherever the responsibility ought to be, it is not the duty of a small town on the sea coast of Nova Scotia to be liable for matters of this kind. There is no doubt that the government of the United States, and, perhaps, the fishing company to which this vessel belongs, would be pleased to pay these expenses if there was some constituted authority that had power to deal with them. But we as a town would not be recognized in dealing in a matter of this kind. We have to pay this bill even if we never get a cent of it back from any person. I quite understand that the minister's answer is according to the law. But I would respectfully suggest that it is not a safe condition of the law. It so happened that this vessel came to our town, and we were able to deal with the case. But if she had been in the lakes, in the interior waters of Cape Breton, she might strike simply a municipal district where there are no appliances or facilities to deal with such a case. The conditions would have been very bad indeed. I think the law should be changed and some regulations made by which the government, or some other authority which is able to deal with the matter within the towns and municipalities, should be put in a position to look after such cases. This, of course, is a comparatively recent case—1902—but there is no telling when another such case may arise, particularly in our harbour where hundreds of these American vessels come in. And I think it is, perhaps, the duty of the minister to see to it that some regulation is made either by his department or by the Marine and Fisheries Department, by which cases of this kind can be properly looked into. I have thought that some means should be found, either by negotiation with the government of the United States, or in some other way, by which our town may be recouped for this expenditure. I do not think it is fair that we should be obliged to expend over $1,000 out of our small funds to pay the expenses of a foreign vessel that should look after herself.

Mr. FISHER. I remember something of the case, and remember that I inquired about it. As my hon. friend said this American vessel had cleared from a Nova Scotia port before reaching Sydney. Consequently under quarantine law and shipping procedure she was a coast-wise vessel within the bounds of the province of Nova Scotia, and, under our practice as well as our law all matters pertaining to public health within the province, are under the jurisdiction of the provincial authority, and they alone are responsible. In this case it was not a question of a vessel passing quarantine or anything of that kind. She had to be dealt with because she was within

the Nova Scotia boundaries and had gone from one Nova Scotia point to another. So, though she happened to be an American vessel, a foreign vessel, yet, according to sea rule as I understand it, she was a coastwise vessel. If she had come into the first port with the disease aboard, it would have been our duty to look after her as she came from a foreign country. But she was cleared from there as having no disease aboard. When she came to the second port she had the disease aboard, contracted, apparently, within the province. At any rate, by quarantine practice as well as law, we could not control her or have anything to do with her. Therefore, it was a matter to be dealt with by the provincial authorities as could best be worked out. There will be occasional cases of hardship in that way. The Department of Justice and the government felt, in considering this case, which they have carefully done, that if we once began any departure from the clear law, we shall be involved in endless considerations of the merits of each individual case, making it difficult, if not quite impossible, to know where to draw the line.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister states there was a quarantine physician at St. John. I notice in the Auditor General's Report that another medical gentleman, Dr. Scammell, was there for a month at the rate of $4 a day. Was he taken during the holidays given to the regular quarantine physician?

Mr. FISHER. I know Dr. Scammell has taken Dr. Marsh's place on one or two occasions. It was possible he was acting while Dr. Marsh was away on leave of absence.

Mr. DANIEL. Twenty-seven days.

Mr. FISHER. It must have been under a leave of absence, because we never appointed a second officer there.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it usual to give quarantine officers one month out of twelve leave of absence?

Mr. FISHER. That is not the practice.

Health of animals, $150,000.

Mr. FISHER. This is for the general animal quarantine service, the examination and p otection of our live stock from the importation of disease. It also covers the expense of dealing with disease in the interior of the country, and doing the quarantine service at the ports and boundaries.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you submit all importations to the tuberculine test?

Mr. FISHER. We test all importations for breeding and dairy purposes, but not for slaughtering, as we did before. We keep them ninety days in quarantine.

Mr. SPROULE. What do you do with animals where the tuberculine test shows a temperature indicating tuberculosis?

Mr. FISHER. We ear mark them and stamp them in such a way that they will be shown to be affected, and then the owners take them away.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the use of going to the trouble of testing at all if, after you ear mark them, you let the owners take them away and do as they like with them?

Mr. FISHER. If the owners take them away with that ear mark they cannot sell them without the purchasers knowing that they are affected. If people buy them they do so with their eyes open.

Mr. SPROULE. I imagine we ought to have two objects in view in attempting to carry out quarantine regulations, one is the health of the animals in the country and the other to stamp out certain contagious or infectious diseases. If it is worth while to examine at all, and if it is found that the disease exists, it seems to me that we are not doing our duty if we do not go further and prevent the animals from coming in and remaining in the country, because one will affect a great many more.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it not the law that all cattle that are imported are placed in quarantine for a certain number of days?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. At how many places in Canada are there such quarantine stations?

Mr. FISHER. Halifax, St. John, Charlottetown, Lévis, Vancouver and Victoria.

Mr. DANIEL. What staff has the minister at each of these places?

Mr. FISHER. We have a surgeon at each port and a staff for looking after the animals. These are permanent appointments.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. How about the range cattle coming in from Montana?

Mr. FISHER. There are certain customs ports along the American frontier which have been selected as convenient for the importation of live stock, and it is only at these ports that live stock can be brought in. He will find a list of these ports on page 175 of the departmental report.

The following customs ports are hereby declared to be animals quarantine stations, and all animals imported into Canada subject to quarantine must be entered through such stations, viz.: Halifax, N.S.; St. John, N.B.; Charlottetown, P.E.I.; Quebec, Sherbrooke and St. Johns, Quebec; Niagara Falls, Windsor and Sarnia, Ontario; Emerson, Manitoba; North Portal, Wood Mountain, Pendant d'Oreille, Coutts and Cardston, N.W.T.; Gateway, Rossland, Nelson, Grand Forks, Vancouver and Victoria, B.C.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Does this item include the money expended under Order in Council passed on the 4th of March, 1904, and the regulations relating to mange?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Where are the particulars of that expenditure to be found ?

Mr FISHER. The expenditure for May has been made almost entirely this last summer, consequently there is no report of it yet. That will appear in the reports of the coming year, and in the Auditor General's Report for the coming year.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I understand that cattle come across at places other than Coutts, Pendant d'Oreille and Wood Mountain from Montana.

Mr. FISHER. If my hon. friend will look at the report he will see that besides those ports I have already spoken of, which are quarantine ports there are also inspection ports. But, I am just reminded that there are none of these in the Northwest Territories. These are in other parts of the country.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. What I desire to point out is that an Order in Council was passed in June, 1904, requiring the owners of cattle within a certain area to dip their cattle. This not only included cattle that were actually infected with mange, but cattle that were liable to become infected. As I understand it cattle are coming across from Montana into Alberta and no precautions are being taken to prevent cattle affected with mange from coming across. I want to know what precautions are taken at the border in regard to these cattle.

Mr. FISHER. There are no cattle coming across that are being entered at all in our country. There is a certain amount of drifting from one side of the line to the other all along the frontier. There may be an occasional drifting of the animals from the other side of the line to our side. We do the best we can to prevent that, and I believe at the present time there is an arrangement being made to take immediate steps to put a fence along the line, but this has not been done yet, and until it is done I do not know that there is any absolute way of preventing a certain number of range cattle drifting from one side of the line to the other. There is no entry of cattle through the custom house except through the ports I spoke of. I do not know if that is what my hon. friend referred to or not.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. What I desire to point out is that cattle come across, but by this Order in Council an expenditure is placed upon the ranchers of Alberta amounting to something like $100,000 to guard against this infection. Cattle are coming across infected with mange and are mixing with cattle which were dipped pursuant to this Order in Council last fall, and no precautions have been taken to prevent it. That Order in Council provides that all the owners of cattle within a certain area shall dip these cattle to prevent the spread of this disease, In that case precautions should be taken to see that all cattle which are brought across from Montana which are liable to be affected with mange are treated in the same way.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend is quite right. Any cattle coming across from the other side and entered at the custom house are dipped. As a matter of fact quite a number of American cattle that have drifted across have been found and dipped before they were returned to the other side.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Where are they dipped ?

Mr. FISHER. At Pendant d'Oreille, Coutts and Wood Mountain.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Are those government vats there ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, wherever we have a quarantine station we have a vat for dipping.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Do cattle come across at other points ?

Mr. FISHER. No, they cannot be entered at the custom house at other points.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. But, there are cattle coming across that are not entered at the customs. Every settler is entitled to bring in a certain number of cattle free of duty.

Mr. FISHER. I am informed that settlers have to come to these quarantine points when they bring in live cattle and that they have to make entry of them.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Yes, but does not the hon. minister see that cattle come across at places other than the four points which he has mentioned. He has given the names of four places where there are dipping vats.

Mr. FISHER. I am informed that there are dipping vats at five places.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. When were they constructed ?

Mr. FISHER. Last summer and fall. They are at Wood Mountain, Pendant d'Oreille, Coutts and Cardston and one is under construction now at North Portal.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Is there any on the Milk River range owned by the government ?

Mr. FISHER. I am informed that that is at Pendant d'Oreille. There is to be another at a place called Ten Mile, south of Maple Creek. It is not yet constructed.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Who constitute the Milk River Ranch Company ?

Mr. FISHER. I do not know anything about the ranch company, but I can find out.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I understood the hon. minister to say that there has been no fencing done along the line as yet.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think so. I have understood the Minister of the Interior has discussed that question and I was told not very long ago that it was decided to be done, but I know the government has done nothing yet. I think some private individuals have.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. There has been some fencing done.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, but it has not been done by the government.

Mr. McINTYRE. When cattle are brought in and die in quarantine does the government bear any share of the loss ?

Mr. FISHER. No, if an animal dies in quarantine the government bears no share of the loss.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I will have to trouble the hon. minister to let the committee have the dates when these vats were built by the government. I had no knowledge of any government owned vats.

Mr. FISHER. I am informed that the three at Pendant d'Oreille, Wood Mountain and Coutts were finished before the dipping commenced. The one at Cardston was not finished until later.

Mr. McCARTHY. Were cattle being brought in at Cardston without being dipped ?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think so.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Why not ?

Mr. FISHER. Because I do not think they were allowed to come in without being dipped.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Cannot the hon. minister let the committee have the dates when these vats were built ?

Mr. FISHER. I have not the exact dates.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. The hon. minister tells us that these vats were built last summer and fall. This Order in Council required all the owners of cattle—and it was a matter of considerable expenditure to the ranchmen in that part of the country—to dip their cattle before the end of October. If range cattle affected with mange were coming in from Montana after that date and running and mixing with cattle, and ranchers had to go to the expense of dipping even although there was no sign of mange in their herds, but which were simply running in the area in which the officials of the government thought there might be some danger, what was the use of putting these men to that expense ?

Mr. FISHER. I am informed that there were no cattle allowed to be brought in without dipping after the period of the Order requiring them to be dipped.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. What was the period of the Order ?

Mr. FISHER. The 1st of October.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. There was an Order in Council passed on the 4th of March, 1904. There was a subsequent Order in Council passed in the month of June calling on the owners of cattle within that area to comply with these regulations. Does the minister mean to say that no cattle came in after the 4th day of March ?

Mr. FISHER. There was an order of the department, by the Act I have power to issue orders, requiring all cattle to be dipped.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. What is the date of the order ?

Mr. FISHER. The 9th of August. That was the order describing the districts within which cattle had to be dipped. It referred to and continued the Order in Council dated June 27, which, I suppose is the Order my hon. friend had reference to a few moments ago.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I referred to the one of March 4th.

Mr. FISHER. The one of March 4th is simply the issuing of the regulations. The Order in Council of June 27th provided certain rules and regulations. Then this ministerial order was issued giving a description of the areas in which animals should be dipped and giving the details of the necessary precautions. The Order of August 9th required that all animals should be dipped between the 1st of September and the 31st of October, and I am informed that after November 1st, the end of the time of year specified, no range cattle were allowed to come in from the United States without being dipped.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it customary to furnish rifles and rubber boots in the cattle quarantine department ? I notice that it is only in Ontario that these are furnished ; the men in the other provinces have not made application for them.

Mr. FISHER. I am informed that where the men are slaughtering hogs for hog cholera they require rubber boots in order to be able to wash them so as not to carry infection from place to place as they would with leather boots ; they wash them in a disinfectant. The rifles are used for slaughtering the hogs.

Mr. DANIEL. How many stands of arms has the minister ?

Mr. FISHER. I do not know the number.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. This Order in Council requiring the dipping of horses refers to

all cattle whether they have mange or not. It is a compulsory annual event.

Mr. McCARTHY. But what is the guide ?

Mr. FISHER. The existence of mange in the district.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. That was just what I was referring to. The ranchmen who have range cattle have to construct these vats at their own expense and they do the dipping at their own expense and have to do it whether or not there is any mange in their herds.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Just because they are in a certain area. What is the system of inspection ? Has the minister certain inspectors and how are they paid ?

Mr. FISHER. All that work has been done under the Mounted Police. The areas are fixed by the inspectors upon reports of mange existing in the area. That area is defined and fixed by the ministerial order referred to, because there is mange known to exist in that area. I may say that the Western Stock Growers' Association at Calgary passed a resolution endorsing this proposition and declaring that they desire this to be done. I may say that for some years past the mange has been increasing amongst the horses on the western ranches and it has been a very serious impediment to stock growing. It is only because it was felt to be a necessity to take extreme precautions for the purpose of stamping out the disease that this system was adopted, and the veterinary authorities believe that by doing this for a year or two we can stamp out the disease. I may say that it has been quite successfully carried out this year. When the order was given I had no expectation of being able to carry it out. I appreciate that it is only when it is fully followed up that results can be obtained, and I believe that next year when this has been carried out again not half as much mange will be found in the district.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What is the composition ?

Mr. FISHER. Sulphur 2 pounds, oil of tar 8 ounces, raw linseed oil one gallon ; that is the hand dressing. The immersion, the dip is a solution of lime and sulphur of a strength of not less than 40 pounds of lime, and 24 pounds of sulphur to 100 gallons of water. This is to be applied at a tempeature of not less than 100 degrees or more than 120 degrees Fahrenheit, the treatment to be repeated within 20 days.

Mr. DANIEL. How many dips does it require to cure the disease : is one sufficient ?

Mr. FISHER. It has to be repeated in about 10 or 15 days.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Have you the resolution passed at Calgary ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE.

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Did I understand that this resolution fixes the dates within which the dipping was to be done ?

Mr. FISHER. I am informed it did mention dates.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Where can I get a copy ?

Mr. FISHER. In the department.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. It seems to me that when you require the dipping of cattle at a temperature of 100 of 105, considerable risks are taken in dipping in the latter part of October, and I would be surprised to hear that these dates were selected at a meeting of the stock association. Reference was made to an increase of mange within the area mentioned, practically all in Alberta. I think on investigation it will be found that the increase was due rather to faulty regulations at the border and the admission of diseased cattle in Alberta. No one knowing the facts would suggest that there has been an increase in mange there by reason of the way it has been looked after by ranchers in Alberta.

Mr. FISHER. I may say to my hon. friend that of 411,000 cattle which have been dipped, but 176,000 have received the second treatment up to the date of this report, which is a little before the end of October, and we had no reports of any harm having been done to any of these cattle. My hon. friend speaks of the fault of the arrangement. I do not attribute any fault to anybody ; I am only stating the fact that last season there was more mange than there was in previous years, and greater necessity for dealing with it. How it came about I am not prepared to say ; but I do say that the attention to the frontier has been far greater during the last few years than it was before.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I understand that an arrangement has been made between the Agriculture Department of this government and the Manitoba government in reference to the health of animals in Manitoba. Would the hon. minister explain the nature of the arrangement that has been entered into?

Mr. FISHER. There has been a good deal of discussion as to the health of animals in Manitoba, and there seems to be a good deal of difference of opinion as to whom to apply to. Applications had been constantly coming to us in regard to cases which have been before the local authorities, and in the same way I suppose applications had been coming to them with reference to cases as to which appeals have been made to us. The consequence was that in the last season I instructed the chief medical officer when visiting Manitoba to discuss the question with the local authorities there, and an

amicable arrangement was come to by which we practically take charge of all the work in regard to the health of animals in Manitoba.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Would the minister explain the difference between the system that has been in vogue up to the present time, and that which will be pursued in future under this government?

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend of course knows that we have had always to deal with the frontier of Manitoba, and the question was with regard to the interior of the country. I cannot describe minutely the difference of treatment, but our officers have been all over the country testing with the mallein test horses which did not show symptoms of glanders, but which had been in contact with the diseased animals and were in danger of infection. We gave the owners of these horses an opportunity to have them tested a second time in strict quarantine and also a third time. My hon. friend knows that it is hard to convince a man whose horse looks healthy that it is diseased, although the mallein test shows it conclusively. If a horse did not react under the test, he was of course freed, but there was supervision of it for a little longer. If it reacted a second time, the owner was still allowed to keep it for a while longer, and it was tested a third time. If the horse was then found to be diseased, the case was regarded as hopeless and the animal killed. I do not think that arrangement was ever carried out under the old administration in Manitoba. That is the chief difference.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. For the purpose of these tests is the province divided into districts, with different officers in charge of different districts, or have you a provincial officer who instructs the various veterinarians throughout the province to go and make the tests where required ?

Mr. FISHER. It is done through our officers, but the province is divided into districts. We do not assign any particular officer to any particular district. We have a chief veterinary, C. D. Macgillivray.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. How is he paid?

Mr. FISHER. He gets $1,500 a year.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Has he the appointing of the local men?

Mr. FISHER. No. He has the assigning of one of the other officers to a particular case, but he does not appoint them.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. There is no arrangement then entered into with the local authorities by which the officials who have been looking after this work in the past are to be continued?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. SPROULE. In regard to the mallein test for horses and the tuberculin test for cattle, has the minister any report of the number of imported animals that have been found affected, or is any trace kept of them after they come into the country? The hon. gentleman says the officers earmark them and let them go. That is something like yelling mad dog at a dog and letting him go. Is any watch kept over the cattle afterwards to see whether they have developed tuberculosis or not, or are they allowed to go until they die?

Mr. FISHER. We have of course from our different quarantine stations a complete record of all the animals that react under the tuberculin test. For a number of years back there has not been a case of a horse imported from Europe being affected with glanders. I am told that two coming from the United States have been rejected at the frontier of the Northwest Territories and Manitoba. I will just give a list of the animals tested for tuberculosis. Of those imported from Europe and tested in the quarantine, 191 in number, 52 reacted. That was to the 1st of November last. During the year there were tested for export 427 head of Canadian cattle of which 36 only reacted. That is a very creditable showing for Canadian cattle going abroad as compared with foreign cattle coming in. Only about 8 per cent of cattle exported reacted while 25 per cent of the importations reacted.

Mr. SPROULE. What do you mean by the earmark ?

Mr. FISHER. A piece is cut out of the ear in the shape of the letter 'T' just as the herdsmen have the fashion of marking the ear for numbering the animals under ordinary circumstances.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that one of our members, who is absent to-night, desires to discuss this matter, and I would ask that the item pass subject to the right of any one to discuss it again on another item.

Mr. FISHER. I am quite willing to agree to that. I will have to ask for a supplementary item for this year on this subject and everything can be discussed when that comes up; but if for any reason any one wishes to open the discussion on another item, I am quite willing.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Why is there a grant of $4,000 to the Winnipeg and Boniface hospitals and not to other hospitals ?

Mr. FISHER. I explained already, when that item was up, that this is a continuance of an old grant made many years ago for the first time to those two hospitals. There was then no hospital west of Lake Superior until you reached British Columbia except those two. The grant was made to them because they were taking care of the immigrants.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Then it should go under the head of immigration.

Mr. FISHER. Being a hospital grant, it has been from time immemorial under the head of quarantine and public health.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Does the hon. minister purpose continuing it from year to year simply because it was done some years ago ?

Mr. FISHER. They still do that work. Anybody who has been less than a year in the country is looked upon as an immigrant, and any such patient is attended to in the hospital and a record kept of the number of immigrants who have gone through its wards. A certain amount is paid per day for each such patient.

Mr. ROCHE. This refers only to immigrants ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you call that a marine hospital ?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not think it was customary to subsidize any but marine hospitals.

Mr. FISHER. This is the only one I know of.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What will be the government business on Monday ?

Mr. FIELDING. If the order for private business is exhausted and we take up supply, we shall probably go on with Public Works or Marine and Fisheries.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 13, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS (Yale-Cariboo). Mr. Speaker, I have here what purports to be a petition in regard to the separate school clauses of the Autonomy Bills, and, before presenting it to the House, I desire to make an explanation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. D. Ross) may speak to a question of privilege, otherwise it would be impossible for him to make a statement.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I rise to a question of privilege. This petition I received out of the House of Commons post office yesterday. It was addressed in what I believe is the handwriting of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). It does not state where those who signed it live or who they are.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. I ask whether this is a question of privilege ? It is simply a matter about receiving a petition under some kind of an envelope.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the rule is that if a member becomes responsible for a petition that is handed to him, an explanation on his part is permissible as to the authenticity of the signatures.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Well, Mr. Speaker, if I am allowed to do so, I think I can show the hon. gentleman who has raised the point of order that I am in order. It is expressly stated in the authority which I have here, May's Parliamentary Procedure, that when a member has any doubt as to the authenticity of a petition, and as he is responsible for the petition which he presents to the House, he has a perfect right to make an explanation before presenting it. Now, as I said before, I am led to believe that the envelope containing the petition was addressed in the handwriting of the hon. member for East Grey. I have no idea whether those signatures are bona fide or not. They purport to be residents of my district, but I do not know whether they are or not. It is quite evident that the petition has come through Conservative hands. However, with this explanation, I will present the petition.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (East Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, in handling a batch of petitions that have come to me, without any order and all posted in the city of Ottawa, I would say that there are some from my own district, some from the district represented by Mr. Lake and others from the district of West Assiniboia represented by Mr. Scott. They are all on a form sent out by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and I would suggest that if he intends to attend to the work of our western districts he put these petitions in a more business like shape. Many of the signatures to these petitions, as far as I know, are genuine, and I have pleasure in presenting them, but I would like to have the hon. member put the petitions in better shape.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Since my name has been brought into question more than once regarding this matter I wish as a question of privilege to say a word in reference to it. Many of these petitions are sent to me and as I do not know the

exact outlines of the constituencies, from the letters that accompany them, from the best information I have I send them to the member who, I believe, represents the district as I am requested to do. If an hon. member thinks they are not from his own district they must be from an adjoining one, and I would imagine that he would surely have no objection to presenting them, but if in a matter of this kind he has no respect for the wishes of his constituents and if he refuses to present them, if he will send them back to me I will be more than happy to present them. In regard to the petition presented by some hon. gentleman behind, I have it before me and I find there are one hundred and fifty names on it. In many cases the post office address is given and the letter accompanying it indicated that the petition came from his constituency. Therefore, I properly sent it to that hon. member and in so doing I did nothing wrong as far as I know. But, having done that, I would at least hope that the hon. gentleman would extend the same courtesy to his electors that I wish to extend to them when I am endeavouring to do my duty in a way which I think should not be offensive to anybody.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). May I suggest in regard to this matter that we should have some definite ruling about it? I do not understand that the time for presenting petitions is a time at which questions of privilege are to be discussed. It seems to me than any hon. gentleman in this House in whose hands a petition is placed must satisfy himself as to whether or not he will present it. If he does present it he accepts all responsibility in connection with it. If he thinks the circumstances are not such as to justifiy him in presenting it that is a matter entirely for himself. If beyond and in addition to that there is any question of privilege that he wants to discuss, the proper time to do it is upon the Orders of the Day being called. Any other course will lead us into difficulties and will bring us into debate in the midst of the presentation of petitions, because, if one hon. gentleman speaks on a question of privilege, every other hon. gentleman has necessarily the same right to speak on a question that concerns him in any way. I would suggest that the rule which I think is the proper rule is the one that should be followed hereafter.

Mr. A. N. WORTHINGTON (Sherbrooke). I wish to say in regard to the petition I have just presented that although the said petition is posted in Ottawa and bears the frank of the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) I have every reason to believe that it is genuine and I have much pleasure in presenting it.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT (Renfrew). Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the petition of James Robertson, secretary of Sand Point L.O.L.—which I understand means Loyal Orange Lodge—No. 1,393. The petition is on the usual printed form, the names are all apparently written in the same handwriting. It was mailed in the House of Commons here in the city of Ottawa and addressed in a handwriting which looks very much like that of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule).

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I rise to a question of privilege. As my name has been mentioned in this matter by the hon. gentleman—I think very improperly, and I shall ask the ruling of Mr. Speaker on that question—I have only to say that it could not be in the handwriting of the member for Grey, because he never signed any of these petitions or wrote a word in them. I emphatically deny the charge, and I think it is a gratuitous insult to his own electors who signed the petitions.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the clerk of the House has received from the clerk of the Crown in Chancery certificate of the election and return of Alfred Thompson, Esq., for the electoral district of the Yukon Territory.

CROWN CASUALTY INSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. H. GERVAIS (St. James, Montreal), moved :—

That the petition of H. G. Garland and others presented this day, praying to be allowed to lay before the House a petition asking for the incorporation of the Crown Casualty Insurance Company of Canada, notwithstanding the expiry of the time for receiving petitions for private Bills, be read and received and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. GERVAIS. The reason why the petition is late in being presented is because the incorporators of this company were under the impression that the delay had been extended to the 14th inst. I may say, as a matter of fact, that the legislation sought for is to enable these gentlemen to carry on an ordinary insurance business with the ordinary amount of capital, and they do not ask for any special powers. This delay during which petitions are to be presented in the House is purely what we call a trial delay, and I believe that if I went before any court of law the judge would give me permission to proceed with my case under such an application as this. On the other hand, there would be no extension when the delay is what we call a prescription delay or a limitation delay, the expiration of which causes the right of action to lapse; while the

trial delay would only extinguish the action itself and not the right to action—the former is used as a plea in bar and the other as a plea in abatement, if I may be permitted to use the phraseology of the common law practitioner. The present motion relates to a purely formal delay such as would be extended in any court of law, whether the principles of the English common or of the French civil law prevailed. As I am arguing this case before the highest court in the land, I should be granted this delay in order that I may have an opportunity to proceed with my case.

Motion agreed to.

FALSE REPRESENTATIONS TO INDUCE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 120) respecting false representations to induce immigration.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE. Would the hon. member explain.

Mr. LOGAN. The Bill which I am asking leave to introduce is along the lines of legislation proposed in this House on former occasions for the purpose of preventing the publication of false representations by persons living in Canada to induce immigrants to come here from foreign lands, particularly in reference to representations touching the labour market of Canada. I am convinced that there have been many cases of hardship in this country, even during the past few months, among immigrants who were brought here believing reports made to them that there was work awaiting them, that they could obtain positions here as soon as they arrived. This Bill is for the purpose of preventing that state of affairs and of punishing those who are guilty of such false representations. It provides that they shall be punishable on summary conviction by the imposition of a fine.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS.

NORTHWEST TELEPHONE COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 28) to incorporate the Northwest Telephone Company.—Mr. Turriff.

On section 10, business of company, &c.,

Mr. SPROULE. This seems to be an extremely wide clause. We have refused many applications for the powers which are given under some of these subsections, and this should be carefully considered before we commit ourselves.

Mr. TURRIFF. This Bill was carefully considered, clause by clause, by the Railway Committee and it was amended in several clauses. I do not see any particular objection to this clause; the other day an objection was made to the wording of subsection (f) of this clause, but there was no particular objection made to the clause.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, what was the conclusion with regard to that objection. The acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) himself suggested that the clause should stand in order that certain words which I had mentioned as more suitable than those contained in the subclause might be considered by the promoters of the Bill. I have the 'Hansard' report of my suggestion.

Mr. TURRIFF. If the hon. member would suggest some words that would be more suitable I have no objection to adopting them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did suggest them; the clause stood in order that they might be considered. If the hon. member will refer to the revised 'Hansard,' at page 2054, he will see what my suggestion was.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 17,—borrowing powers.

Mr. TURRIFF. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that in discussing this matter with some hon. gentlemen opposite, we arrived at the amount of $500,000 as the limit of the borrowing powers. I would accordingly move that after the word 'Company' in subclause (c) the words

To an amount not exceeding $500,000.

be inserted.

On section 17,—borrowing powers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I raised some objection to this when the Bill was up before. As far as I am concerned, I am satisfied with the amendment which has been suggested, but I do not speak for other hon. gentlemen who may have different views.

On section 19,—exercise of rights.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The only question that arose with regard to section 19 was one arising from the peculiar condition of the legislation as it now exists. You have three tribunals. First, the Governor in Council who fixes the rates; next arbitration to settle disputes regarding the long distance service; and third the Railway Commission to deal with certain matters under power vested in it by virtue of subsection four of section 19. This is more a matter for the promoters of the Bill, but must inevitably lead to confusion and points to the absolute necessity of having some general legislation by which all these matters shall be placed under the control of the Railway Commission.

Section 20, agreed to.

Mr. HYMAN. I beg to move that subsection 'F' of section 10 be amended so as to read as follows:

Acquire and use any privilege granted by any provincial or municipal authority and acquire, use and dispose of any inventions, letters patent of invention or the right to use any inventions in any connection with or appertaining to its business.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That would meet the difficulty as suggested.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. TURRIFF moved third reading of the Bill.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman whether, in view of the fact that the principle of interchange of traffic among telephone companies has been adopted by the House and made to apply to this company, the government have any intention this session of making a general law in the same direction.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall probably make an announcement on this subject to-morrow.

Mr. SPEAKER. Third reading to-morrow.

RED DEER VALLEY RAILWAY AND COAL COMPANY.

House went into committee on Bill (No. 76) respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. Is there a subsidy for this railway?

Hon. C. S. HYMAN. No.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Regina and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 19) to incorporate the Calgary, Red Deer and Battleford Railway Company.—Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 50) to incorporate the Calgary and Battleford Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 97) respecting the Kingston and Dominion Central Railway, and to change its name to 'The Montreal, Ottawa, Kingston and Georgian Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Harty.

QUESTIONS.

ROYAL CANADIAN MINT.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What is the estimated cost of equipment of the Royal Canadian Mint in machinery and appliances for coinage?

2. What is the estimated cost of working per year, including number and wages of staff; and by whom will the working staff be appointed?

3. What is the capacity of the mint? What amount of gold bullion could be coined per year, exclusive of the necessary silver and copper coinage for use in Canada?

4. What was the amount of gold held in reserve on January 1st, 1905, by the Dominion and by all the Canadian banks, respectively?

5. Is it the intention to coin free of charge all gold bullion brought to the mint? If not, what charge is proposed?

6. What charge, if any, is to be made for coinage of gold for the British government?

7. How much is it estimated will be coined for the British government each year?

8. What has been the face value of copper and silver coined for Canada each year since 1895; the cost of bullion therefor, the expense of coinage, and the cost of shipment to Canada?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance):

1. Based on the advice of the authorities of the Royal Mint the cost of machinery and appliances for coinage has been estimated at £13,000 or say $64,000.

2. The mint is to be a branch of the Royal Mint of Great Britain. Appointments will be made by the imperial treasury. The principal supervising officers required such as the deputy master, assayer, superintendent, chief clerk and master mechanic will most probably be chosen from the Royal Mint establishments. Besides these there will be a staff of mechanics, artisans and labourers who can be drawn from local sources.

The annual appropriation asked by the imperial government and assured by the Canadian government is $75,000.

3. The proposed plans provide for three presses of which one will be a standby in case of break down. Each press is estimated by the Royal Mint authorities to be capable of striking 110 pieces per minute, or allowing for unavoidable interruptions 200,000 pieces in a week of forty-seven working hours, which is apparently the number of working hours in a week at the Royal Mint. The two presses would thus provide in a week a total of 400,000 pieces.

4. On 31st December, 1904, the gold held in reserve by the Dominion amounted to $35,306,825. On the same date the Canadian banks held specie to the amount of $17,617,529 of which a small proportion is silver.

5. The Order in Council of 21st November, 1901, provides for a charge of three cents per ounce for amounts not exceeding 500 ounces, and a charge of two cents per

ounce for amounts above that limit. These are the equivalent of the charges in the Australian mints.

6. No regulation has been made on this point.

7. No information on this point.

8.—BRONZE COINAGE.

Fiscal Year.	Face Value.	Cost of Bullion.	Expense of Coinage.	Cost of Shipment.
	$	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1896.....	10,000	1,554 77	1,000 00	321 65
1897.....	10,000	1,710 93	1,000 00	377 84
1898.....	15,000	2,484 94	1,500 00	535 94
1899.....	22,000	4,211 08	2,200 00	685 21
1900.....	38,000	10,194 99	3,030 80	1,222 91
1901.....	36,000	8,618 48	3,625 55	1,371 97
1902.....	15,000	3,360 78	1,560 00	586 28
1903.....	30,000	5,540 17	3,040 88	1,102 48
1904.....	50,000	9,871 85	5,025 55	1,807 43

SILVER COINAGE.

Fiscal Year.	Face Value.	Cost of Bullion.	Expenses of Collection.	Cost of Shipment.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1895-6..	140,000 00	65,195 00	4,200 00	1,120 36
1896-7..	.....	.....	.....	.....
1897-8..	217,000 00	90,531 92	6,510 00	2,712 19
1898-9..	178,985 00	85,854 03	5,013 95	1,859 70
1899-1900	519,000 00	213,591 93	15,641 53	4,305 13
1900-1..	510,000 00	217,091 20	15,300 00	5,621 59
1901-2..	200,000 00	80,784 50	6,000 00	1,817 97
1902-3..	774,060 00	280,156 36	23,749 40	7,298 95
1903-4..	895,538 75	357,576 15	26,842 79	9,869 08

POSTMASTER OF BOISSEVAIN, MANITOBA.

Mr. SCHAFFNER asked :

1. Why and by whose recommendation was Mr. Alexander McKnight dismissed as postmaster for Boissevain, Manitoba, on September 1st, 1904 ?

2. Were there any complaints ? If so, of what nature, and by whom were said complaints made ?

3. Were any petitions received for his dismissal ? If so, by whom signed ?

4. Did the post office inspector in the province ask for Mr. McKnight's dismissal ?

5. How long had Mr. McKnight held the position ?

6. When were complaints, if any, first made ?

7. Did the Postmaster General furnish Mr. McKnight any reasons for his dismissal ?

8. Were there any petitions from Boissevain asking that Mr. McKnight be reinstated as postmaster ? If so, by whom signed ?

9. Did the department make any investigation before dismissing Mr. McKnight ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Postmaster General):

1 and 2. The change in the postmastership of Boissevain, Manitoba, was not made on 1st September, 1904, but in August, 1901, and was for the purpose of improving the efficiency of the service. The change was made on information which the department considered thoroughly reliable.

3. No.

4. No.

5. From November, 1886 to August, 1901.

6. July, 1901.

7. No.

8. No petitions asking for reinstatement of postmaster were received.

9. The information furnished the department fully satisfied it that the change was in the public interest. No further investigation, therefore, was needed.

PAMPHLET ON SCHOOL LEGISLATION SINCE CONFEDERATION.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. Who authorized and prepared for distribution the 'Brief History from Official Sources,' referring to separate school legislation since confederation ?

2. Has it been distributed to all members and senators of the Canadian parliament ?

3. If to others, to whom generally, and in what quantities ?

4. How many in all have been printed, and how many distributed ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) :

1. Hon. R. W. Scott.

2. It is not considered an official document.

3 and 4. It was sent to senators and members and to others who asked for it. I am informed that about 500 copies were printed.

CAST-IRON FURNISHED DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES, SOREL.

Mr. BRUNEAU asked :

1. How many pounds of cast-iron were furnished and delivered, from the 1st July, 1904, to this day, to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, at Sorel, respectively, by La Compagnie Pontbriand (Limitée), N. F. Patenaude, Beauchemin et Fils (Limitée), N. F. Patenaude, de Grilles Brevetées, the Dominion Foundry, Victor J. St. Amand, and the Canadian Foundry?

2. What was the total amount paid to each one of the aforesaid persons or firms ?

3. What is the amount actually due to each of the aforesaid persons or firms ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Inland Revenue).

1. La Compagnie Pontbriand (Limitée), 111,538 pounds ; were paid $3,389.77 ; N. F.

Patenaude, 82,628 pounds, was paid $2,609.29, due $220.78; Beauchemin et Fils (Limitée), 6,389 pounds, were paid $191.67, due $105.86; La Compagnie de Grilles Brevetées, 115,451 pounds, were paid $3,568.08, due $285.06; the Dominion Foundry, 24,927 pounds, were paid $817.81; The Canadian Foundry, 8,467 pounds, were paid $254.01, due $137.52.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Answered by No. 1.

HARBOUR MASTER, MONCTON.

Mr. STOCKTON asked:

1. Has Duncan Robertson, Moncton, N.B., been appointed harbour master of the port of Moncton? If so, when was he appointed?

2. Is the said Duncan Robertson a British subject?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Inland Revenue).

1. Yes; but has since declined to accept the position.

20th February, 1905.

2. The government has no information on the subject.

MANUFACTURE OF CORDAGE, KINGSTON.

Mr. CLARE—by Mr. Sam. Hughes—asked:

1. Has the government installed a plan at Kingston for the manufacture of cordage? If so, when, why, and at what cost?

2. Is the plant kept employed? If so, when, and to what extent?

3. Has the government manufactured cordage at Kingston? If so, when, in what quantities, and of what classes?

4. What quantity of cordage has the government on hand? When was it manufactured, of what quality or class is it, is it saleable, and why has it not been disposed of?

5. What quantity of cordage has the government sold, when was it sold, to whom, and at what prices?

6. When and how does the government propose to dispose of the present stock of cordage?

7. Does the government propose to continue to manufacture cordage, if so, why?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance).

1. Yes, in June, 1904, to work up into rope small quantities of hemp occasionally found in consignments purchased for the manufacture of binder twine, which our superintendent deems better suited for the manufacture of rope than of binder twine. It cost $2,400.

2. Yes, at intervals,—when sufficient suitable hemp has accumulated.

3. Yes, since June, 1904, fifty-eight tons, ⅞ inch, 1 inch, 1⅛ inch, 1¼ inch.

4. Fifty-eight tons. June, 1904 to March, 1905. The quality is excellent. It is saleable, but is not sold because it was not offered for sale until the 1st instant, there not being until then a sufficient quantity to attract the attention of large dealers.

5. None.

6. By tender to the highest bidder.

7. Yes, to the extent and for the purposes above stated.

CUSTOMS OFFICER, PINETTE, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked:

1. Has Hector D. Morrison, customs officer at Pinette, Prince Edward Island, been dismissed from office?

2. If so, why, and on whose recommendation?

3. What is the date of dismissal?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs).

1. Hector D. Morrison, subcollector of customs at Pinette, P.E.I., was retired from the Customs Service by Order in Council.

2. The officer was retired on the recommendation of the Minister of Customs, because the outport was abolished, the amount of customs business transacted thereat appearing not sufficiently large to warrant the maintenance of an office there.

3. The Order in Council abolishing the outport and retiring the officer is dated 23rd January, 1905.

MAIL CONTRACT, FARMINGTON AND WILMOT, N. S.

Mr. LANCASTER asked:

1. Who is the present contractor for carrying the mails between South Farmington post office and Wilmot railway station, in Nova Scotia?

2. When was the said contract made, and at what price?

3. Was the proposal for said mail contract accompanied by the usual guarantee by sureties on behalf of the contractor tendering?

4. If so, who signed the said guarantee, and who were the witnesses to their signatures?

5. How many tenders were received for said contract, and what are the names of each tenderer, and the amount of each tender respectively?

Hon Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General).

1. Minnie J. Pearson.

2. 1st April, 1901, with Alfred W. Randall, who on 1st October of the same year transferred the contract to the present contractors. The contract price was and is $71.99.

3. Yes.

4. H. M. Phinney and Alfred W. Randall are the sureties for Minnie J. Pearson and N. W. Phinney witnessed their signatures to the bond.

5. Five, viz.:

Alfred W. Randall	$71 99
T. Andrew Pearson	85 00
W. E. Crocker	75 00
A. W. McLaughlin	81 38
Zenas S. Banks	80 00

POSTMISTRESS AT KENT, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. LANCASTER asked:

1. Has Miss Anna Kent been dismissed from the office of postmistress at Kent post office, Nova Scotia?
2. If so, what was the reason for such dismissal, and when was it?
3. What salary was attached to the said office?
4. Who has been appointed in her place, and on whose recommendation was such appointment made?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). With a view to increasing the post office facilities in the district, the department established two new post offices, one called 'Centre Musquodoboit,' a short distance westerly of Kent post office, and the other 'Reynolds,' about two miles northeasterly. In consequence the Kent post office became unnecessary and was accordingly closed, thus dispensing with the services of the postmistress. The salary attached to the Kent office was $25 a year.

POSTMASTER AT KASLO, BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. LANCASTER asked:

1. Has Mr. Samuel H. Green, lately postmaster at Kaslo, B.C., been dismissed from the service?
2. If so, what was the reason for such dismissal, and when was the dismissal?
3. Who is the present postmaster at Kaslo, and when was he appointed?
4. On whose recommendation was the present postmaster appointed at Kaslo?
5. Who is the present contractor for carrying the mails between Kaslo post office, B.C., and the railway station?
6. Were tenders advertised for in regard to such mail carrying? If so, how were they advertised?
7. How many tenders were received, from whom, and at what prices?
8. What sum does the present contractor receive for such mail carrying?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General):

1. Mr. Samuel H. Green has been removed from the postmastership of Kaslo, B.C.
2. Mr. Green's removal was authorized on the 14th January last on representations which were believed to be correct, that he was an active political partisan, and had used the post office for political purposes.
3. Mr. D. P. Kane is the present postmaster at Kaslo. The office was transferred to his charge on the 1st of February last.
4. The present postmaster was appointed on the representation of Mr. W. A. Galliher, M.P.
5, 6, 7, 8. The side services along the line of railway between Kaslo and Sandon, including that of Kaslo post office, are performed by the Kootenay Railroad and Navigation Company for a bulk sum covering the carriage of mails on the railway between the two points, and, being so included, was not the subject of tender.

I observe that they have not stated the amount in the answer. I think I am safe in adding that it was a bulk sum of $1,550 a year.

MUTUAL RESERVE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. T. MARTIN asked:

1. Is the government aware that many suits are pending in England against the Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Company, of New York, brought by policy-holders?
2. If so, how many?
3. Is the government aware that every suit tried so far has been given against the company, and the company ordered by the judge to pay back all the moneys paid into the company as premiums, with interest at four per cent, and costs?
4. Is the government aware that the Lord Chancellor, in the case before the House of Lords, Foster vs. the Mutual Reserve Fund Life Association, of New York, confirmed Lord Justice Cozens-Hardy in his statement, viz.: 'I am clearly of opinion that the documents circulated by the company are tricky and misleading'?
5. Is the government aware that R. B. Angus, of Montreal, brought a suit against the company to recover moneys paid by him as premium, that it was tried in the Supreme Court of Canada last year, and judgment was given for the company; that it was appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in England, and that the company paid him $6,000 or thereabouts to compromise his claim?
6. If Mr. Angus was repaid by the company, why should not all the policy-holders in Canada be paid back their moneys without the trouble to them and expense to the company of law suits?
7. Has the government, through the Insurance Department, calculated how much money it would take to pay off Canadian policy-holders who would be entitled to receive their money on similar equitable terms as the Angus settlement? If so, how many policies, amount of policies, amount of premium?
8. Has the government any knowledge, through the Insurance Department, of how many policies will require to be paid off in Great Britain under the decision of the House of Lords? If so, what is the amount of such policies, and the premium to be paid back to such policy-holders?
9. Has the government considered that the repayment of lapsed and forfeited policies in Canada will entail a large sum of money? (a) How is this money to be paid out of the resources of the company in Canada or elsewhere? (b) What will the amount be according to statements lodged by the company with the Insurance Department?
10. Has the government taken into consideration what will be the position of policy-holders when policies have not lapsed, and what security they will have in the future?
11. Is the government aware that last year Insurance Inspector Cutting, for the State of Massachusetts, has refused to grant this company a license to do business in that state because they refuse to allow their books to be inspected?

12. If the government is aware that this license was refused, did they cause inspection to be made of the company's books, on behalf of the Canadian policy-holders, and when ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). As respects most of the matters referred to in the hon. gentleman's question, the government have no official information, but they are aware of the reports which have appeared in the public press in relation to the affairs of the company mentioned. The name 'R. B. Angus' in the hon. gentleman's question is probably a mistake, and is intended to refer to Hon. A. R. Angers. That gentleman, who had a claim against the company, has informed the Superintendent of Insurance that he has accepted the sum of $6,000 in settlement of his claim. The government, in common with the public generally, are aware of the difficulties which have occurred in relation to the affairs of this company, but have no reason to believe that any special investigation would be of assistance to Canadian policy-holders. The legislation of last session is believed to afford all the relief that is available. The company's license to do business in Canada was renewed under the provisions of that legislation, the conditions of which have been complied with by the company.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Return showing : (1) the number of permanent appointments, male and female, respectively, made to the Civil Service (inside division) in Ottawa, since July 1st, 1896 ; (2) the present strength of the Civil Service in Ottawa (inside division) permanent staff, specifying whether male or female ; (3) the number of temporary employees, male or female, on the pay-list for the inside division of the Civil Service at Ottawa for January, 1905 ; (4) the number of temporary employees, male or female, appointed since July 1st, 1896 ; (5) in addition to the permanent and temporary clerks at present employed in the public service in Ottawa, the number of artisans, labourers, or other workmen employed at Ottawa during the month of January, and showing to which department these men are attached.—Mr. Sproule.

Copies of all memoranda received by the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and any other official of the department, since January 1st, 1904, concerning the 'Lurcher' lightship.—Mr. Lewis—by Mr. Stockton.

Return giving the following information :—1. The stipulated price, in each case, of the 'Lurcher', and of the 'East Point,' Anticosti, lightships ; (2) the additional amounts received by the contractors in respect of these ships ; (3) any further expenditure for alterations, repairs and renewals incurred up to January 1st, 1905 ; (4) the dates, according to contract, the said boats were to be completed and delivered by the contractors ; (5) the forfeit stipulated in the contract for delay of delivery ; (6) the penalty named against the contractors for failure to complete the contract within the time limit. —Mr. Lewis—by Mr. Stockton.

Return for each of the fiscal years from 1st July, 1897, to 30th June, 1904, of the expenditure on capital account upon the Drummond Counties Railway, and of the descriptions of work and materials for which such expenditure was made. —Mr. Foster.

Copies of all correspondence, Orders in Council, agreements, reports, &c., in connection with the taking over by the Dominion government of the Halifax and Esquimalt defences.—Mr. Foster.

Copies of all advertisements, tenders, contracts, plans, specifications and papers relating to the construction of the several sections of the Murray Harbour Branch Railway.

2. Of the several articles of rolling stock referred to at page 2186 of 'Hansard' of 28th April, 1904, supplied on capital account to the aforesaid railway in each of the years there mentioned ; with the prices at which each article was charged to capital.

3. The names of the companies, persons or railways from which each such article was acquired, and the price therefor ; stating if the articles were new or second-hand.

4. The use to which each such article was applied when acquired, what compensation was received for such use, from whom, and how the proceeds were applied.

5. Where each such article of rolling stock is now, in whose use, and on what terms.—Mr. Barker—by Mr. Foster.

For copies of all correspondence, letters, petitions, &c., in possession of the government, or any member or official thereof, relating to land damages claimed by Thomas Curley, Charles Mitchell and others, of Village Green, Prince Edward Island, for lands expropriated for the Murray Harbour branch of the Prince Edward Island Railway.—Mr. A. A. McLean.

Copies of all correspondence between the Department of the Interior and Robert Buchanan, Peter Veregin, Simeon Rieben, and the Dominion Lands Office at Yorkton, or others, relative to the claim of Ivan Shukin to the patent for the northwest quarter section 23, township 31, R. 6, to 2nd M.; and to any cancellation proceedings in connection with the said land.—Mr. Lake.

GREAT BRITAIN AND HER COLONIES. —UNITED IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria) moved :

That in the opinion of this House the best interests of Canada and the empire at large would be advanced, and the peace, progress and prosperity of humanity be assured, by a full partnership union of Great Britain and her colonies ; wherein there would be a united Imperial parliament, empowered to deal with inter-imperial, international, commercial, financial and other necessary national problems ; but leaving to the existing parliaments their present powers, functions, control of tariff, and other matters necessary for their own purpose.

He said : Mr. Speaker. As you are doubtless aware it was my intention to move this motion a week ago to day, but owing to the sad death of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. E. F. Clarke) a number of us were absent from the House to pay him

a last tribute of respect by attending his funeral in Toronto. No one regrets the demise of our good friend Mr. Clarke more than I do. I may say that it was arranged he should second the motion which I have the honour to move to-day, and had he been spared to do so, I am sure he would have discharged that duty in his usually able and enthusiastic manner whenever the interests of the British Empire were concerned. The motion will undoubtedly suffer owing to his loss.

My object in proposing this motion is more educative; more to bring the question before parliament and the country than to obtain a vote at the present time, and consequently it is not my intention to divide the House. In studying out this problem I find that I am at least 50 years behind some of the ablest men who ever adorned the public life of Canada. The Hon. Joseph Howe, one of the greatest of Nova Scotians, long years ago, as early as 1862; aye, as early as 1846, took a firm stand upon this question; he wrote:

> The question of questions for us all, he declared far transcending in importance any other within range of domestic or foreign politics, is .... not how a province or two can be strengthened by a fort or by the expenditure of a million of dollars, but how the whole empire can be so organized and strengthened as to command peace or be impregnable in war.

I quote from page 190, vol. 2, of the speeches of the Hon. Joseph Howe, these words from an address delivered on the organization of the empire;

> Of course if they expect us to be colonists for ever, and make no provision for our being anything else, upon their heads, and not upon ours, be the consequences of the separation, which when this is apparent, will be inevitable. I prefer full incorporation with them, in one great empire, free participation with them in its good and evil fortunes, its perils and its distinctions. All this I believe to be practicable, and shall not despair of its fulfilment.

About the same period, the Hon. Joseph Howe laid down an argument in connection with the federation of Canada, and in 1851—some of us were not born then—he portrayed what would result from the fusion of Canada into one great Dominion. He said:

> Throwing aside the more bleak and inhospitable regions, we have a magnificent country between Canada and the Pacific, but out of which five or six noble provinces may be formed, larger than any we have, and presenting to the hand of industry, and to the eye of speculation, every variety of resource, climate and soil. With such territory as this to overcome, organize and improve, think you that we shall stop even at the western bounds of Canada or even at the shores of the Pacific? Vancouver's island, with its vast coal measures lies beyond. The beautiful islands of the Pacific and the growing commerce of the ocean, are beyond. Populous China and the rich east are beyond, and the sails of our children's children will reflect as familiarly the sunbeams of the south as they now have the angry tempests of the north.
>
> The maritime provinces, which I now address, are but the Atlantic frontage of this boundless and prolific region; the wharfs upon which its business will be transacted and beside which its rich argosies are to lie. Nova Scotia is one of these.
>
> Will you then put your hands unitedly, with order, intelligence and energy to this great work?
>
> Refuse and you are recreants to every principle which lies at the base of your country's prosperity and advancement; refuse and the Deity's handwriting upon land and sea is to you unintelligible language; refuse and Nova Scotia instead of occupying the foreground, as she now does, should have been thrown back, at least behind the Rocky mountains.
>
> God has planted your country in the front of this boundless region; see that you comprehend its destiny and resources; see that you discharge with energy and elevation of soul the duties which devolve upon you in virtue of your position. Hitherto, my countrymen, you have dealt with this subject in a becoming spirit, and whatever others may think or apprehend. I know that you will persevere in that spirit until our objects are attained.
>
> I am neither a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, yet I will venture to predict that in a few years we shall make the journey hence to Quebec and Montreal, and home through Portland and St. John by rail, and I believe that many in this room will live to hear the whistle of the steam engine in the passes of the Rocky mountains, and to make the journey from Halifax to the Pacific in five or six days.

The prediction of Joseph Howe made in 1851 has been borne out to the letter in regard to our Dominion; I believe, Sir, the time is near at hand when his aspirations will also be given effect to in relation to the unity of the empire—a full confederation of equal partnership between all parts of the empire. Speaking in London, England, on July 8, last, the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain said:

> What would the United States be at this moment if the several colonies had remained separate? I believe that our difficulties in making a united empire are not greater than those with which Washington and Hamilton were confronted.

I may be permitted for a few moments to digress in order to observe the tendency of civilization in national affairs. That trend is undoubtedly towards unity; unity in national life and absolute local control in local affairs. The failure of the great empires of the past; such as the Mado-Persian, the Assyrian, the Grecian, the Roman, the Carthaginian—their failure was because that while they had centralization in national life, they also tried to have centralization in local matters. The tendency of modern civilization has solved the problem of empire building. Great Britain was probably the first federation of nations, and had Great Britain divested the imperial parlia-

ment of many of the details of legislation which it possesses, and conferred them on England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales by enlarging the powers of county councils and local bodies, not national, I believe the British Federation would be the better for it to-day. Then we have as an example at our doors the federation of the United States of America, founded on the centralization of national affairs with absolute local control over matters of local concern. In the United States we have that form of government worked out to a marked degree of success. In Canada our own institutions show the exemplification of the same principle ; Germany possesses a similar federation, and under the new constitution the Republic of France has carried out to a very larg extent the same idea of centralization of national affairs with absolute control in local matters. Long years ago I had the privilege of being a school teacher, and I remember that on an old map of the world, England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, each of the provinces of Canada and each outlying colony of the empire was painted in a different colour. As a teacher, I sometimes found it difficult to make it clearly understood by the students that these were all part and parcel of the great British Empire. So one Saturday in my leisure hours I took down the map and painted all the British possessions one colour—needless to say, Sir, that that colour was red. I see some hon. gentlemen smiling ; I may possibly have been indulging in painting some other things red, on later occasions, but I have always looked back with pleasure at that old map of the empire. It was the first map I had seen in which all the British possessions were of the same colour, and from that time onward I have felt that had these British colonies remained legislatively united it would have been better for the empire and for the world at large to-day. However, there is no use regretting the past ; all we have to do is to endeavour to make improvements in the future.

At the outset I will be met with the proposition that a federation of Great Britain and the colonies is absolutely impossible, because the people who constitute the British Empire are not of one race. If you will show me any great nation or any nation which has ever existed all of one race, I will show you a nation that is not a success. England is made up of many divergent nationalities; France from the earliest times has had a mixed population, Latins, Normans, Celtic and Teutonic, all united and clearly traceable at the present hour in every part of France. In Switzerland there are three different races, the Teutonic or German, the French and the Latin or Italian in the south.

Then we are told that uniformity of language is necessary. I need not go beyond Canada to point how fallacious such an argument is. In my own experience in travelling from end to end of Canada I have encountered 22 or 23 different languages, but the people speaking these varying tongues were all peaceable, law-abiding citizens, each with the good of the nation at heart, striving to make it as strong and noble as possible. Neither uniformity of race nor of language is essential to the upbuilding of a country. Others will say: But you must all be of one creed. I notice by the census returns that Canada has a very large number of creeds, I think somewhere in the neighbourhood of 100, the United States have about 130 or 140, and in the British Empire throughout the world there are about 1,000 creeds that are recognized. If I may be allowed to digress I would say that I always thank the Lord for the great number of creeds, the more there are the less danger there is of any one of them becoming in the ascendant and the less danger there is of persecution. I do not for a moment nor do I think that any one will consider that creed is an essential element, or that all people of a nation should be of one creed. But, we will be told : You must absolutely have all these nations co-terminous ; they must be in close proximity to one another or you cannot build an empire. They will say that the ocean divides us. If one passenger starts from Halifax or Portland for Vancouver or San Francisco, and another steps on board an ocean steamer at either of these Atlantic ports for Liverpool there will be little difference in the time required by them to reach their respective destinations. Telegraphic communication between the eastern shores of North America and the old land to-day is as easy as it is between the Atlantic and Pacific. While the oceans seemingly separate us from the old land they really unite us. Does any one pretend to say that the Dominion of Canada would be able to place the products of its Northwest in the market of the motherland if we had to traverse the entire mileage now covered by ocean on land ? The freight rates would make transportation impossible. In short, the ocean is a bond of union, a connecting link rather than a line of separation. In other words, the waterways of the world are the free man's highways, and while mergers and capitalists of all descriptions may control railroads and terminals they have as yet failed to control the ocean highway. As a very prominent man in New York not long since told me, were it not that the city of New York is open to the sea so that steamships of any company and of every nation may enter the harbour and keep down freight rates, New York would be at the mercy of a few railway companies, a few banking institutions, a few insurance companies, and a couple of telegraph companies. He pointed out that the whole commercial life of New York was preserved by the fact that the city lies by the ocean. Therefore, the ocean between Canada, Australia, India, South Africa

and the motherland are really bonds of union rather than dividing lines.

If these are not essential, what are the essentials? I would again refer to speeches of Hon. Joseph Howe to point out what are the essentials of nation building. In the first place we must have a noble manhood, we must in addition to the noble manhood have a certain community of interest. This we all have. The motherland buys what we produce and have to sell, and we consume those things of which the motherland has a surplus. I am satisfied that the entire House will agree with the statement that for whatever product we choose to name from any colony there will always be found a market either in the motherland or in one of the colonies.

We will also require in the upbuilding of a nation like this a high tone in national life, and above all things we must have that sentiment without which no home, no community, no nation can succeed—we must have the sentiment which has been aptly expressed in the words in reference to the old British flag:

'Tis only an old bit of bunting,
'Tis only an old coloured rag,
Yet thousands have died for its honour,
And shed their best blood for the flag.

In whatever part of the empire one travels he finds that old sentiment for the British flag, emblematic as it is of liberty, law and order. He finds that sentiment strong to-day.

The next question which suggests itself is: Is the time ripe for the upbuilding of the empire, for the full federation of the empire ? I think the first minister will agree with me that in so far as the colonies are concerned, and even in so far as the mother country is concerned, the time is ripe. Public sentiment in each community may not always be ripe, but public sentiment in each community must have leaders. The speeches of the right hon. the premier (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), of the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) are being quoted and used throughout the length and breadth of the motherland to-day. I find also extracts, and very brilliant extracts, from the speeches of the present Minister of Finance of this country (Hon. Mr. Fielding) in favour of a full and closer union or a full partnership union between Canada and the motherland.

She is at the pinnacle of her greatness. No nation has ever attained a higher position. She is the parent of responsible government, having taught the nations of the earth the rights of man and the proper methods of governing, humanity. She has reclaimed nearly one-half of the world and made savage and waste lands teem with plenty. In the Soudan alone, in the few years anterior to Britain's acquisition of that country, there were upwards of three million natives massacred there in less than ten years—massacred as the result of inter-tribal conflicts among barbaric and semi-barbaric people—but since Britain has acquired the Soudan, the loss of life has been comparatively small and that country to-day has become productive. We find that she has attained a position in trade and commerce and manufacturing, especially inventions, unequalled by any other land in the history of the world. We find that since responsible government was established by Great Britain in the year 1700, the world at large has made more progress than in all the years anterior to that period. But above all we find that in every land, as well as in Britain and her colonies, the spirit of British justice is glorified and the spirit that is associated with the term British justice is taken as the key note for justice everywhere. Yet strange to say, in spite of all this, Great Britain seems to be hated by those she has served and upbuilt. They would cripple her in trade and prestige, and, if they dared, would even resort to war in order to disrupt her empire and give her an inferior place among the nations of the world. It is well known to-day that in the Transvaal, the secret plan of European countries was that Britain should be disrupted and South Africa knocked of her empire. It is well understood that the possesison of South Africa is absolutely essential to the maintenance of the British Empire. In 1765, when Great Britain was at war with all Europe, she lost about 1,700 vessels rounding the Cape of Good Hope on their way to India, and she became convinced of the necessity of having large coaling stations and depots in that vicinity in order to maintain her possessions in South Africa and thus keep intact the integrity of the empire.

Her colonies are now growing into manhood. They are loyal to the core. Their loyalty was shown in the South African war. Although the colonies had no part in the government of South Africa and had nothing to do with the war or its causes, be the latter good or bad, nevertheless when the call for arms was made they responded loyally and did their duty fearlessly and well. The colonies, being new, are filled with a resourceful people, whose individuality is rapidly developing and the individuality of any young people in a new country is always a great force. Our young progressive people are animated by noble aspirations for the future ; and if a union does not take place between Great Britain and her colonies, rest assured the fault will not lie with the colonies, but with the mother land. We find persons occupying public positions in Canada and the empire at large predicting for Canada one of the five following positions. Many claim that the future destiny of the Canadian people is necessarily annexation to the United States. Others say that Canada will become either a republic or a monarchy. In the latter

event, I do not know where we would get our sovereign unless we chose to elect the First Minister or the Minister of Finance to that position. Others again say that we should remain in our present dependent position but build up our own army and navy. And others claim that we should not only do this but also contribute financially to the support of the empire's military service. But there are others, with whom I am glad to class myself, who aspire to full partnership and union with the mother country in all matters in relation to war and trade and politics so that we should have a parliamentary union between Great Britain and all her colonies.

In order that the present position of matters may be better understood, I think that a litttle resume of Great Britain's association with the continent of North America will not be out of place. In 1776 and for ten years anterior to the rebellion of 1776—in other words the war of independence—there were, according to eminent American historians, agitations being carried on by able men for the establishment of a republic on the continent of North America. This was backed up by those who had been exiled from the old land as convicts, because in those days Great Britain used many of the present states of the union as penal settlements. These and their children were filled with animosity to the mother land, and heartily joined the movement for the establishment of a republic. We have had recently from American historians of the most eminent type a good deal of data in connection with this movement. They have shown that for ten years previous to 1776 there was a tyrannical and aggressive movement against those who did not coincide in the views of the agitators, which practically amounted to intimidation. We find that this movement made headway, due in great measure to the reluctance of the loyalists to make a quarrel. We all know how reluctant people are to attack any public movement. They may have the idea that the movement has for its object some improper end, yet they will hesitate to take action to stamp it out. Therefore anterior to 1776, the loyal men, who could have brought the British government to a sense of its duty, hesitated to take action owing to their reluctance to bring on a quarrel. Another cause which gave the movement headway was the weakness which leads to making compromises with and concessions to wrong. It is all right to observe the law of compromises, but there are conditions under which the law of compromises or the making of concessions is absolutely contrary to the best interests of a people. It is now well known that foreigners engineered the movement in the United States and that the folly and neglect of the British government tended undoubtedly to fan the agitation into a flame. The result was that Great Britain lost one-half of the North American continent. The next period in the history of Britain's rule in America may be taken as the period culminating in the years 1837 and 1838. We find by careful examination of history to-day that for ten years anterior to 1837 and 1838 an agitation had been going on in the old provinces of Upper and Lower Canada. In Upper Canada it was carried on by English speaking radicals and in Lower Canada by French speaking radicals, and we find that the end aimed at was either the independence of Canada or its annexation to the United States. That agitation was also advanced by the acquisition of foreign gold. The object aimed at was undoubtedly to disrupt the empire. In the agitation were men of considerable ability, but I am proud to say that many of those who took part in the rebellion afterwards became among the most loyal subjects of the empire and proved their allegiance to their Queen and country on more than one occasion. Passing on I find the next great movement looking towards the disruption of Britain's colonies in North America and their separation from the mother land began in 1886 and continued on to 1896.

The movement at that time took the more plausible guise of commercial union, unrestricted reciprocity, continental free trade, and other notions of that kind. But with the acquisition of office by the gentlemen engineering this movement—these movements, rather, for they were as varied as the weather—and all these agitations disappeared; and now we find the leaders of these movements occupying the first places in the hearts of the people of the country high in the estimation of their sovereign, labelled G.C.M.G., K.C.M.G., and all that sort of thing—showing what transformation scenes can be worked in the drama of the empire's life

Many believe that during the Boer war there was another critical period in the history of Canada's connection with the motherland. That war was undoubtedly the result of a conspiracy on the part of the nations of the earth to disrupt the empire. But, when the time for action came they hesitated. Britain had a record for war, and the nations did not care to incur her anger. As I have pointed out, their idea was that the war would lead to the loss of South Africa, and this to the loss of India, and so to the breaking up of the empire and the encroachment of other nations upon British territory. We find that at that time Canada hesitated to do her part in having troops go to the assistance of the empire. But, after due consideration the First Minister himself gracefully yielded, and the troops left Canadian shores and took service in South Africa.

At intervals during the past few years, there has been a spasmodic agitation looking to the severance of the ties that bind us to the motherland. For instance there

is the agitation in favour of Canada making her own treaties, the agitation in favour of building up our navy, the agitation in favour of cutting off appeals from Canadian courts to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the agitation in favour of having no imperial general officer commanding in Canada. And, Sir, the endeavour was made, as far as possible, to create prejudice throughout the length and breadth of Canada against Great Britain and her judicial tribunals because of the decision in relation to the Alaskan boundary. I have regretted that this matter was not brought up in the House, for then an opportunity would have been afforded to remove some of the prejudices created by the press of this country—not alone by the press of one party, I am sorry to say, but by a large portion of the press of both parties, carried away by misapprehension as to the true state of affairs. Another agitation was the endeavour to create sympathy for the Boers in the war. And another of these agitations, strange to say, was for the removal of the Union Jack from these parliament buildings. The question has been asked in this House by what authority the grand old Union Jack was flying over the parliament buildings of Canada. This shows the extremes to which some gentlemen will go. Then, many of us are a little surprised that there should be such an endeavour on the part of the Department of the Interior to bring in immigrants of outside nationalities to our shores. I have never found fault with the fact of a movement to promote immigration. But, so far as I have been able to go, I have endeavoured to agitate in favour of bringing in British immigrants rather than those of other nations. Many have been surprised to see the large number of foreign immigrants, for, it will undoubtedly be three or four generations before the decendents of these people become real Canadians and good British subjects. Many have regarded with more or less suspicion the argument in favour of not permitting Canadians to serve the empire under arms beyond the bounds of Canada. We watch these things with more or less surprise and suspicion. The latest movement of this kind is that of Canada securing from the imperial government control of the two great naval stations, Halifax and Esquimalt. I shall not discuss that subject at length, but only say that I do not endorse it, as I am satisfied that it does not tend in the direction of upbuilding the empire and strengthening Canada's connection with the motherland. In 1871, when Britain partially withdrew her forces from the continent of North America, she handed over to Canada munitions of war valued at $4,350,000 as a present. She has also handed over 11,718 acres of land situated in strategic and central positions throughout the length and breadth of the country. Now, Britain seems to have handed over her remaining stations on this continent, Halifax and Esquimalt. This, I say, I regret. I shall quote again from that staunch old statesman, old Joseph Howe, to show that away back in 1862, he foresaw the danger and took the line then which I am endeavouring to follow to-day. In 1862 Mr. Howe addressed a notable letter to Right Hon. C. B. Adderley, in which he deprecated the plan of each section of the empire trying to defend itself, and insisted most strongly on the propriety and necessity of unity in defence.

> He did not believe it was the duty of the friends of the empire, but the policy of its enemies to attempt to divide its forces ; the task of its friends was to unite and combine.
>
> If I understand your argument, you would have half a hundred little standing armies, scattered all over the globe, paid out of fifty treasuries, and with uniforms as various as were the colours in Joseph's coat, with no centre of union, no common discipline, no provision for mutual succor and support.

Further Mr. Howe said :

> I would have one army that could be massed within a few days or weeks on any point of the frontier, moved by one head, animated by one spirit, paid from one treasury. Into this army I would incorporate as many of the colonial militia as were required to take the field in any province that might be attacked, and, from the moment they were so incorporated, they should be moved, paid and treated as one imperial force.

These sentiments, long ago expressed by Joseph Howe, I am satisfied represent the true patriotic position for the empire to assume. And, if these words are true of an army, how much more are they true of a navy. I, therefore, would deprecate this latest movement of the Dominion of Canada taking over Halifax and Esquimalt and carrying out the policy which Howe opposed many years ago and which those who truly understand the position, I believe, will deprecate to-day.

But, Sir, all attempts to disrupt the old empire have failed, and I am satisfied all will fail. A short time ago I was conversing with a very eminent American statesman. We were passing along the street in the city of Toronto. In one of the shop windows was a very handsome portrait of Her late Most Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria. This American said to me, 'That women has done more good than any human being that ever lived, and she holds a place in the hearts of the people of the United States even far beyond that which she held in the hearts of the people of the British empire. They regarded her as the noblest woman that ever lived.' And he went on in this line. Then I drew his attention to King Edward, and asked him the

opinion of the American people of the present Sovereign, and he said, they were all agreeably surprised and delighted to find that he was turning out such a great ruler and statesman, and he added, 'If you people of the British empire furnish the world with another such example as these two sovereigns, I am inclined to think that by the time his rule is over we of the United States will be prepared to undo our Act of 1776 and ask to be readmitted to the empire.'

Now, Sir, the first position I shall briefly discuss is annexation. I shall not enter into details further than to point out a few leading considerations. Many who advocate annexation claim that we would thereby avoid any extravagant expenditure in military matters; that we would never become responsible for Britain's wars or for expenditures connected with her wars; but if we were annexed to the United States, a republic and a free people, we would not be put to any of these great costs for war. Let me examine these contentions. In the first place, we would be in the back field on the farm, our farmers would be worse off, and would not be enjoying the same advantages as the agriculturists of the United States. From a material view point, you will find that the advantage of being near large centres of population is increased from 10 to 20 per cent. Farmers are paid better prices, they obtain goods cheaper when they live near large centres than when they live in the outlying districts. Therefore, Canada should avoid, as far as possible, being the backfield of the farm. Next, in relation to military expenditures, take last year, when there was no war going on, the United States spent on her army $115,035,411; on her navy, $102,965,102; on army pensions, $142,550,266, or a total of $360,541,779. That was the sum paid by the people of the United States last year for war and war purposes, and that does not include the interest on the war debt for wars previously conducted. Exclusive of interest, the people of the United States paid per head last year $4.50 for war and war purposes. I gave the figures on this subject on another occasion last year, I gave them in detail, I will now give them in general totals. The United States have paid for wars and war purposes, from 1790 up to the present time, $16,877,000,000; whereas the wars of Great Britain in all parts of the world during the same period only amounted to some $13,000,000,000. In other words, the United States has spent for war and war purposes in the last 120 years, in round numbers, $4,000,000,000 more than the British empire has paid. In this connection, Edward Atkinson, of Boston, a well-known writer upon economical subjects, in his last pamphlet, says:

> On the 26th of January, 1904, I again published an analysis of the expenditure for the year 1903, with an estimate continued to June 30th, 1904, based upon official figures. I then proved that on the 30th of June, 1904, the cost of war and warfare for seven years would prove to have been one thousand million dollars ($1,000,000,000) in excess of the normal cost of supporting the government of the United States during the previous twenty (20) years at the rate of five dollars ($5) per head. My computation that the cost of the war and warfare to June 30th, 1904, would prove to be one thousand million dollars ($1,000,000,000), was an underestimate. It very nearly reached the sum of ten hundred and forty million dollars ($1,040,000,000). The end is not yet.

On page 22 of the same pamphlet he says:

> The excess of expenditure on war and warfare over 1882-9 during the eight years under Presidents McKinley and Roosevelt has been over $1,500,000,000.

That is the excess of expenditure in these eight years alone. And this is the nation to which our anti-military friends would wish Canada to be annexed in order to avoid taxation for military and war purposes. If Canada were part and parcel of the United States to-day, her contribution for war and war purposes, instead of being the paltry sum of $2,500,000, would, on the pro rata population, be upwards of $30,000,000; that is the sum we would have had to pay last year if we were a part of the United States; and this year I believe the expenses are to run higher. When we consider the growing sentiment of the United States in favour of closer connection with the empire, I think we may fairly dismiss from our minds the idea of annexation to the United States finding any considerable foothold in the hearts of the people of this country.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Who wants annexation? Where is the sentiment?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am saying that the sentiment, which was strong and which is sometimes found in the hearts of certain persons, has no basis in reason, particularly on financial grounds. But that sentiment, whatever there was of it, has vanished, as well as the policy of the leaders of the hon. gentleman's own party in favour of continental free trade, commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity, the only result of which policy, if it had been carried out, would have been the annexation of this country to the United States. Another proposition that we sometimes hear is that of independence—and perhaps my hon. friend will say, Who wants independence? But I want to tell him that the signs of the time indicate that there are many who favour independence. In the first place, I may say that the configuration of Canada positively debars it from ever being an independent nation. I have no hesitation in saying that as between annexation on the one hand and the independence of Canada on the other, I, as a resident of the province of Ontario, would hold up both hands in favour of annexation to the United States in preference to Canadian independence. We have one

community here on the east separated from a community in the far west, and there is no use disguising the fact that the rocky region to the north of Lake Superior will never be thickly populated ; in other words, Canada will be of a pismire shape, as Hon. Joseph Howe long ago pointed out, and ultimately the great west would throw in its lot with the people to the south, and the east would form a community by themselves. The great bond of union in Canada to-day is not the Canadian Pacific Railway, is not the new Transcontinental Railway, is not the fact that we have any great community of interest, so much as it is that the British flag floats over the entire country from the Atlantic to the Pacific ocean. Militarism under Canadian independence—where would the gentlemen who stand in such mortal terror of militarism find themselves ? We would either have to lie under the protection of the United States or we would have to protect ourselves. Had we been part of the United States last year, had we paid per head the same as the people of the United States paid, the cost to this country, as I have already shown, would have been upwards of $30,000,000, instead of the $2,500,000. If we were independent, the necessary expenditures for building up a fleet and protecting our commerce—and Canada stands high in the commercial world—would be away up in the hundreds of millions ; the necessary cost for defences on the sea coast would be away up in the hundreds of millions of dollars, and the necessary cost for the rifles that my right hon. friend says he wishes to see in the hands of every able-bodied man in the Dominion of Canada, would be away up in the fifty or sixty millions of dollars, not counting anything at all for any other incidental expenses in connection with it. Were Canada independent to-day, to place herself on a footing to be compared with any second-class nation in the world, she would have to go to an immediate expenditure away up in the hundreds of millions. With her immense frontier, with her shipping trade and her coast line, Canada would find herself confronted with all that expense ; and, if so, what would we have and what would we be ? I saw in 'Hansard' the other day that one of the hon. members from the maritime provinces asked a question of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Prefontaine) concerning some Canadian sailors who were imprisoned in Uruguay, and who had been lying there for some time. Suppose Canada were independent, how would we reach them ? Send down the gun-boat 'Canada' ? My hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden), I am afraid, would have to turn out his army and go down there.

An hon. MEMBER. Send down the 'Minnie M.'

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The 'Minnie M.' would not reach that port. She only goes to ports where there is no danger.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES.

Mr. FOSTER. She is in dry dock.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What would be the condition of affairs in case Canada were independent ? In the first place it would cost millions of dollars more than Canada would be entitled to pay as part of the British Empire for many years, and we would find ourselves confronted with similar conditions in other parts of world. I venture to say that within a short time after that question was asked the other day communication was had by my right hon. friend the leader of the government with the old mother country and that to-day a man of war is sailing around Uruguay demanding of the ruler—I do not keep myself posted on those gentlemen ; I do not know whether he is an emperor or a president, but whatever he may be, no doubt there is a man of war sailing around the shores of Uruguay demanding reparation for the Canadian boys who are imprisoned in that place. It is much cheaper for Canada to have the old motherland do it, to have the British taxpayer foot the bill, than to undertake the job for ourselves, and it is far safer.

More than that ; they say that the United States will protect us, that she has assumed the sovereignty of this continent. Did any one ever know of the United States giving something for nothing ? I never did and if the United States were to look after our interests make no mistake about it, Canada would be called upon to pay for it very dearly. Furthermore, the spirit of Canadians is such that they will not be protected by the United States. A new country like this should be made up of a high spirited and independent people who would decline to be protected, who would be prepared to stand up for their interests without being under the protection of the United States on any occasion. In the acquisition of the two little naval stations at Halifax and Esquimalt merely paying the amount $2,000,000 a year for the maintenance of these positions, not paying for the building of the forts, nor for the placing of the guns, nor for any of the other things which have involved millions of dollars of expenditure Canada is doing something magnanimous. If we had to construct these works, to provide guns and to construct battleships necessary to protect our commerce in all parts of the world, what would the cost be ? To-day I regret that, it being Monday, there are a number of members who have not yet arrived. However, I trust that they will take this matter into their serious consideration, and I am satisfied that the most ardent advocate of independence to be found in the Dominion of Canada, if he examines the question calmly and dispassionately, will cast it into the waste paper basket of his political life and will stand shoulder to shoulder with the rest of us in the upbuilding of the old land. The lowest sum that I can figure out, putting

it as radically low as possible, that Canada would be called upon to pay for the next thirty years, were she independent, would be from $60,000,000 to $100,000,000 a year in order to place her on a par with the commonest second-class nation of the world. I have prepared here a table showing the shipping of 100 tons and upwards, Lloyd's register 1904-5, giving the net tonnage, the cost of defence, the population and trade of each country. It is a long table and with the permission of the House, I will refer to a few of the figures in connection therewith and will then hand it in, if it is satisfactory, to the House. This information is collected from the best American and English returns. I may say that the right hon. leader of the government has before to-day asked the permission of the House to do this, and it has been granted :

—	Net tons in thousands.	Defence in thousands	Population in thousands.	Trade in thousands.
		$		$
Argentina	88	14,516	4,794	281,600
Australasia	454	4,442	4,740	874,000
Austria-Hungary	585	69,003	45,000	750,000
Brazil	163	38,879	14,000	300,000
Chili	108	8,685	3,050	112,000
Denmark	597	9,638	2,404	218,000
France	1,693	204,455	39,000	2,488,000
Germany	3,369	164,000	56,000	2,689,000
Greece	401	5,402	2,433	47,000
Italy	1,187	81,811	32,475	625,000
Mexico	23	5,713	13,604	118,000
Netherlands	687	16,176	5,263	1,513,000
Norway	1,717	5,298	2,239	123,000
Portugal	99	10,618	5,428	93,000
Roumania	19	8,328	5,912	129,000
Sweden	751	13,248	5,175	251,000
Canada	683	2,524	5,371	467,064
United States	3,849	360,000	80,000	2,500,000
Great Britain	15,391	314,000	42,000	4,700,000

Canada ranks ninth amongst these nations in tonnage and shipping. She ranks last in expenditure for defensive purposes on her army and navy. She ranks eleventh in population, and ninth in trade. A brief comparison : Canada has a shipping tonnage of 683,000 tons ; the Netherlands has a tonnage of 687,000 tons. Canada spends for defence $2,524,000 ; the Netherlands spends for defence $16,176,000. Canada has a population of 5,371,000 ; the Netherlands has a population of 5,263,000. Then, we find that Canada pays not much over one-eighth of what the people of the Netherlands pay for defensive purposes. Then, let us take Chili, which is a South American Republic, entirely out of the range of war. Chili has 108,000 tons of shipping, an expenditure for war purposes of $8,695,000, and a population of 3,050,000. Argentina has a tonnage of 188,000, a war payment of $14,516,0000 and a population of 4,794,000. Denmark has a tonnage of 597,000, an expenditure of $9,638,000 for war purposes, a population of 2,464,000, and a total trade of $218,000,000. Comparisons with all these nations do not redound to the advantage of our own country, and they show that we are sitting here in this Dominion supinely letting the British taxpayer foot our bills.

The figures of Canada and United States tonnage do not include the wooden vessels on the great lakes, nor do the British figures include the small coasting vessels ; Australasia includes New Zealand.

Among all these nations Canada alone spends nothing for war purposes. If Canada were independent, she must keep pace with the United States ; we would have to do our share or the United States would not protect us. Either, we would become annexed to that country or we would have to undertake an enormous immediate expenditure for defence. The question may properly be asked : Why should we do anything that would involve a great expenditure for such a small concern when we can get along much better at a small expense for a great concern ?

The next proposition is that we should remain under the British flag, but, control our own army and navy. That is not open to discussion. It is a humiliating position for a great people. I could easily show the weakness of such a position as regards defence purposes, as regards the upbuilding of a nation and as regards fair-play and the adjustment of the cost. The proposition to remain under the British flag while at the same time contributing to imperial defence may pass without comment, because that principle of taxation, direct or indirect, without representation would not commend itself to Canadians. There, therefore, only remains the one proposition of a full partnership union. There are a few objections occasionally raised to this idea, but their refutation is self evident and I need not trouble the House with any remarks on that point. In favour of a full partnership union we have the tendency during many years towards union and amalgamation in our national, our geographical, our political and our commercial life. The old fear that you cannot successfully manage large concerns, disappears in the light of history. When the Republic of the United States was proclaimed, it was declared that it could not last for any time; so with the union of Great Britain and Ireland, and so with all the federations which have become successful in history, but, they have all dissipated the fears entertained at their birth. History shows that combinations of great peoples have tended to the advancement of humanity. In the British Isles the combination of the great races has made that country what she is to-day.

I need not point out to the House that this movement which I propose, would bring peace and prosperity to the empire and to the whole world as well. It would do away with the necessity for the great expenditures now made by different nations on their armies and navies. In our own country we have a great many of our young men familiar with the English and German languages, the English and French languages, the English and Russian languages, and these young men would take their places in filling the commercial agencies and consular agencies and ambassadorial positions in various parts of the world.

An hon. MEMBER What about the Gaelic

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. They say Gaelic was the language of the Garden of Eden as it is the language of 'the superior regions', but I do not know to what country we could send a Gaelic speaking ambassador unless we could translate him beyond this earthly sphere. This full partnership union would tend to do away with the race and creed prejudices which we find agitating not only Canada, but agitating the motherland at times. Justice would be assured in every corner of the empire; freight rates would be lessened and immigration to Canada would be encouraged. Let me point out that since 1871, 4,159,922 Britishers left the shores of Britain for the United States, while only 708,000 came to Canada, 833,000 went to Australia, and 655,000 to other parts of the world. Under federal union, the aim of the motherland would be to encourage her children to emigrate to her colonies rather than to foreign lands, and instead of the United States getting 4,000,000 Britishers and Canada only 700,000, these figures would soon be reversed. This full partnership union would secure to Canada the trade of supplying the motherland which is now in the hands of foreigners. In 1903 Great Britain imported goods from foreign countries to the value of $2,100,000,000, while from the colonies she imported only to the value of $560,000,000. Of this foreign trade $600,000,000 dollars worth was of manufactured articles while the colonies only supplied $70,000,000 worth. Of this foreign trade $620,000,000 were for raw materials and articles mainly manufactures, while from the colonies Great Britain only took $240,000,000. Of this foreign trade $900,000,000 went for food and drink and tobacco, and the colonies only secured $253,000,000 worth of it. Britain imported from France last year $250,000,000 worth of goods most of which might have come from Canada, and Britain taxes herself millions against French and German and Russian aggression while it is needless to say she has not to tax herself one dollar against Canadian aggression. Britain imported from Germany last year goods to the value of $172,000,000, a large portion of which might have come from Canada. Britain imported from Holland last year $173,000,000 worth of butter, cheese and dairy products, all of which would have come from Canada and under a full partnership union it undoubtedly would have come from Canada and the other colonies. England imported from Russia last year goods to the value of $155,000,000, all of which might have come from Canada and Russia we may say is the arch enemy of Britain. An estimate has been made that if the British and colonial workmen had produced only twenty-five per cent of the manufactured articles imported into Great Britain and Ireland yearly, there would not be a pauper in the empire. Britain imported from foreign countries last year $175,000,000 of grain and flour and from the colonies only $75,000,000 worth. Britain imported meat products, animals &c., from foreign countries to the value of $195,000,000 last year and from the colonies only $55,000,000 worth. Of eggs, butter and cheese, Britain imported $255,000,000 from foreign countries, and only $60,000,000 from her colonies. Under full partnership union, Britain's colonies could have supplied her with the entire bill, and who will deny that if such a result followed, there would not be greater prosperity in the empire. Canada supplied only $95,000,000 worth out of the $200,000,000 of food products imported by Great Britain, whereas under a full partnership union Canada would have secured the greater part of this trade.

There would undoubtedly be a great growth of population in Canada; it would secure to Great Britain and the colonies the trade of the various British possessions and protectorates. In the past there has always been the open door in these regions and all the nations of the world have had the same access to these markets as has Great Britain, although Britain's soldiers and Britain's money have brought these lands under civilization. The other nations that have not contributed one dollar to this purpose have now the same trade rights as Britain in those lands. Under a full partnership union this free access would be denied by Great Britain to other nations. If this policy were carried out it would compel other nations to grant Britain fairer tariff privileges. I need not go into details of how it would affect the empire from a military point of view. It would reduce the cost of war to a minimum and guard us against foreign aggression.

Let us see of what the British empire would consist under a full union.

	Area.	Population, 1904.
Great Britain and Ireland..	121,000	42,790,000
European possession, other	121	200,000
Asiatic possessions—		
Cyprus..	3,590	250,000
India, &c..	1,900,000	300,000,000
Ceylon and Maldives.. ..	26,000	3,600,000
Eastern Asia..	2,000	1,000,000

	Area.	Population, 1904.
Africa, South	1,238,000	6,300,000
" West	600,000	33,000,000
" East and Central	750,000	8,000,000
Mauritius, Seychelles, &c	900	400,000
Australia, New Zealand, &c	3,200,000	5,000,000
Canada	3,750,000	5,600,000
Newfoundland	40,200	217,000
West Indies and South America	122,000	1,500,000
Falkland Islands	7,500	2,000
Antartic, South Georgia	1,500	.....
	11,762,810	407,859,000

Twenty-five per cent of the habitable surface of the earth is controlled by the British empire to-day. It has a population of 407,000,000 persons out of 1,800,000,000 people on the whole earth, or 22 per cent of the population of the earth to-day. Canada alone is larger that the whole of Europe without Russia. Europe's population in the fifteenth century was only 50,000,000; the English speaking people of the world to-day number upwards of 150,000,000.

The shipping of Great Britain and her colonies is now more than one-half of the entire shipping of the earth.

The coaling and naval stations of Great Britain are found in every sea. Where would Canada be for coaling stations throughout the world in case she declared her independence? Begging of Great Britain. Canada, Egypt, India, Australia and New Zealand can supply the empire with all the agricultural products it requires. The commodities are now largely drawn from foreign nations for protection against whose aggression the British and the colonial tax payers burden themselves by millions of pounds every year. Under a full partnership union I maintain that every part of the motherland as well as the colonies would be infinitely benefited.

Some will say how are you to effect this? It is not for me to say. I understand that there is likely to be a council of the various portions of the empire at an early date. I trust that the First Minister may see his way clear to taking a part in that conference and let me hope that he will return from it in a better state of health than he returned from the last conference. I would not attempt to dictate or to do more than suggest what the plan of union should be, but the only way to arrive at a conclusion is to make a series of suggestions and then eliminate what is not necessary, what is impossible and what is undesirable, and in that way I am satisfied that the genius of the empire can very quickly arrive at a satisfactory solution of the whole matter. My idea would be to perpetuate a limited form of monarchical government and undoubtedly, Sir, the present sovereign of Great Britain and Ireland would continue to be the sovereign of the united parliament of Great Britain and all her colonies. There should undoubtedly be an executive council and there should be a parliamentary body. Some think there should only be an executive council but my own opinion is that there should be a parliamentary body, elected from some large unit from all parts of the empire and from this body the executive council should be chosen. The powers conferred upon this great imperial parliament, should embrace inter-imperial or as some prefer to say intra-imperial matters, international matters, commercial affairs, imperial finance, and other necessary national problems. It should control the army, the navy, consular agents, commercial agents, ambassadors, and all other similar officers. Taxation should be levied on a uniform system based on population, trade or revenue or a combination of these.

Each parliament should continue as now, and each should control its own tariff subject to a preference within the empire to be determined by the imperial body.

The preference duty should be levied by the parliament of Greater Britain, collected by each integral part and credited to the exchequer of the empire. The preference should be low on raw materials, on necessary breadstuffs, foods, &c., and high on manufactured articles, and the same uniform principle should be carried on throughout in reference to all nations. In case one part of the empire should pay more per head than another the proportion should be fairly arranged. These are details but I make the suggestions.

If foreign nations would reduce their tariffs against Greater Britain the preference as against these nations might be reduced, and any most favoured nation arrangements should be made only by the greater imperial parliament.

It would be necessary to maintain a large navy, an imperial navy not a navy, as Howe pointed out, of fifty different little nations all over the world, but a great imperial navy that could strike a blow in any part, a navy over which every Canadian would have as much control as any individual in any other part of the empire, a navy whose officers would be, pro rata, taken from Canada, a navy the money for which would be controlled by our Canadian representatives as much as by any representatives from the motherland or Australia. These are, in general terms, the outlines of a naval scheme.

For land purposes there would undoubtedly be a standing army for such an empire, but I maintain that the time has come when military service must be largely managed through militia. Untrained men and officers did good service in the rebellions of 1688-90. They did splendid service in the American war of independence, and in South Africa. Untrained men and officers—I use the statement advisedly. One-half the men at Waterloo classed as Wellington's veterans had not been within their military

jackets six weeks, and yet they resisted the onslaughts of the finest soldiers of Europe. About 20 per cent of the men who climbed the heights of Alma were less than a year in service and more than 20 per cent of them were under 20 years of age. These were the men who fought the battle of Inkerman.

Many lads who were out in South Africa had never handled a rifle before. Untrained men have over and over again shown that they could be relied on in war, but trained militiamen have again and again shown that for many purposes they are equal to the best regulars. The Canadian militiamen and the militiamen of Australia and New Zealand made a record in South Africa which for ever disposed of the idea that trained militiamen were a menace, or, as General Hutton once told the British government, that the Canadian militia would be a menace to the regular troops in South Africa. With a large navy, a small army and a well trained militia throughout the length and breadth of the empire, the empire would be ready for defence at a moment's notice against any enemy. A good many people are under the impression that when men have been out a few years in camp they cannot reconcile themselves to taking up again the avocations of peace, but that idea has been completely dispelled by the fact that our boys of South Africa soon found new positions in civil life when they returned, and are as peaceful, law-abiding citizens as you will find in the whole Dominion. I do not think it is necessary that I should prolong my remarks on this subject, but I might point out that while Great Britain undoubtedly has committed mistakes in the past, and while undoubtedly she has her faults ; yet, Sir, we do not love her on account of any fossil ways or barnacles fastened to the old ship of state, but she has a strong hold in the hearts of the people, not only of her own race and lineage, but of all those who owe allegiance to the old Union Jack. Her noble and free institutions ever endear her to the people in every land over which that flag floats. The love of individual liberty, which is implanted in the hearts of freemen the world over, is largely due to her influence. The love of law and order and British justice is implanted in the hearts of the people, not only of Britain, but of other lands living under responsible government. As far as the Canadian people are concerned, her glorious record in war and literature and progress of every kind, give her a place in our affections from which it will be impossible to remove her. In the past she has guaranteed our credit, she has defended our soil, she has spent millions of money in maintaining troops and fortifications in our country. When the British troops were removed from Toronto, the business men of that city felt they had suffered a great loss, and it is only because the Dominion government are replacing the troops which have been taken away from Halifax that the people there can reconcile themselves to any such change. Although she may have in the past pursued a mistaken policy, it is not too late to undo what has been done. If our hon. friends opposite had not succeeded to power in 1896, they would still be pursuing the same phantoms that they were accustomed to follow in the past. But now that they have been clothed with the responsibilities of office, they find how impossible it would be to manage this country under their old policies. So that if there are any who favour annexation to the United States or independence, I am satisfied that when they come face to face with the great problem of administering the British empire under a system of full part-American war of independence, and in nership union between the motherland and her colonies, they will let the visions of the past vanish and join hands with those of us who go in for a federation of the empire. I was very sorry to read in the papers that an hon. member of this House not long since expressed somewhere or other the opinion that one Canadian was as good as twenty Doukhobors or a hundred Englishmen. Now, while I do not take second place to any man in upholding the capability of Canadians, I think that any gentleman who, whether in the heat of excitement or otherwise, made such a statement, should take the first opportunity of standing before the people and apologizing for it. Whatever fault England may have—and I have no English blood in me, though I can boast of having the blood of two or three other nations—no nation in the world can boast of having done so much for the upbuilding of humanity in all parts of the world. But I find this sentiment so much more beautifully expressed in a few lines from the pen of Eliza Cook that I will take the liberty of quoting them :

There's a heart that leaps with burning glow
The wronged and the weak to defend—
And strikes as soon for a trampled foe
As it does for a soul bound friend—

It nurtures a deep and honest love ;
It glows with faith and pride,
And yearns with the fondness of a dove
For the light of its own fireside.

'Tis a rich rough gem, deny it who can,
And this is the heart of an Englishman.

The spirit of sneering at England and Englishmen has become too common among a certain class in Canada of late. I was rather sorry to see gentlemen occupying positions in the cabinet, or knocking at the doors of the cabinet and the First Minister, applauding the sentiment expressed by an hon. member of this House when he made the comparison between an Englishman and a Doukhobor. I would much prefer that those gentlemen would have the good grace, whatever they may feel in their hearts, to refrain from expressing such disloyal and impertinent sentiments. It is all very well

to say that a silken cord binds Canada to the motherland, but a little auxiliary bond would do no harm. If Canada had not the auxiliary bond of federal unity in addition to the silken tie which binds together the provinces of Nova Scotia and British Columbia, I am afraid the silken tie would be hardly equal to the strain put upon it. It is straining sentiment rather too much to say that this silken tie would be sufficient to hold the Canadian provinces together without the still stronger bond of political union. I trust that the time is not far distant when all the colonies of the empire will, in addition to the silken tie of sentiment, join the mother country in the still stronger bond of political union. To give an instance of what sentiment there is in the hearts of the people in other lands, I shall read an extract from the letter of a lady who lost her son in South Africa—a lady known to other gentlemen in the House besides myself. I refer to Mrs. Voss, formerly of Campbell, in Griqualand West, but now of Cape Town and Douglas. She lost her son in the South African war, and in the letter which I shall quote she gives expression to a sentiment which I feel is that of the majority of the people in Canada to-day :

> I never acknowledged the receipt of your snapshots sent me during the war. I never had a chance to do so then as we were so unsettled. I have them still and always feel sad when I look at them, and think how our family was lessened. It is hard to lose one's children anyway ; but as long as I had even one son left I would give him up to fight for old England, for with all her mistakes and faults she is still our dear old mother country—the mother of nations, the founder of responsible government for all lands, and the model for law, order and justice for the world.

This, I believe, is the sentiment that permeates the hearts of the great mass of the people in every corner of the British empire. I have great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in moving the motion which stands in my name.

Mr. R. G. MACPHERSON (Victoria city). Mr. Speaker, there was an undertone to the speech of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) against which, as a member of this House, I wish to utter my earnest and vigorous protest. I do not think that the people of Canada need to sit at the feet of any Gamaliel to learn patrotism; or do I think that the fact that a man declares his patriotism on the housetops makes him any the better citizen. The suggestion which was ever present in the speech to which we have just listened would lead those who were not in touch with the people of Canada to think that there was a considerable number of our citizens who were in favour of independence or annexation. I do not think that a man is doing any member of this House justice, or doing himself justice, when he suggests, or makes any statement which would lead people to believe, that there is any strong feeling in this country in favour of either of these things. Practically every man in Canada is a loyal citizen of the empire. That I believe ; and I believe further that the man is the best citizen who does his best to build up the resources of this country and to promote charity and unity instead of imputing to his fellow citizens motives of disloyalty to the empire. When a man declares his patriotism at the expense of his brother men, I would as soon listen to the strumpet proclaiming her virtue. Canadian sentiment and true British sentiment can best be shown in this country by trying to promote confidence and good will among our people. To declare for a spirit of toleration, to avoid anything that would lead to condemnation of one's fellow citizens because they happen to be of a different race or of a different religion—this is patriotism. I say that the man who declares in our streets that the people of this country will take up arms and shoot down their fellow citizens because they do not accept the same religion or the same ideas of scholastic education as he does is the greatest rebel that Canada could produce. I yield to no man in loyalty to my own country. But I hope my voice may be stilled for ever when I can find no better use for it than to suggest that any man borne north of the 49th parallel is unpatriotic or desirous of dividing Canada from the rest of the empire.

> Oh, we are the men of the Northern Zone,
> Shall a bit be placed in our mouth ?
> If ever a north-man lost his throne,
> Did the conqueror come from the south ?
> Nay, nay, and the answer blent
> In chorus is southward sent,
> Since when has the southerner's conquering steel
> Hewed out in the north a throne ?
> Since when has the southerner placed his heel
> On the men of the Northern Zone ?

And I say that this parliament would be better employed in trying to sow the seed of toleration, to spread the gospel of charity throughout our country than in the consideration of academic subjects such as that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) has brought up in this speech with its accompaniment and under-current of innuendo seeking to place the stigma of want of patriotism upon his fellow-men.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford). For years I have looked upon this as one of the most important questions that can engross the attention of either the Houses of parliament or of the citizens of the empire. It is with much pleasure that I rise to say a few

words in support of the resolution so ably introduced by my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes); and I am sure that the discussion so far as he has engaged in it has been one of instruction to the House and to the country. The facts and figures he has collated will be valuable reading, and they will pass down to the country, I think, as something that can be studied with advantage, something that will tend to educate the people of this country on a question of the very deepest importance. I shall not endeavour on this occasion to address myself at length to the matter of defence which has been so ably dealt with by my hon. friend, but shall confine my remarks largely to the trade question. I have taken for some years a deep interest in interimperial trade, in the shape of preferential trade within the empire. That is a subject I think that should appeal to members of the House on both sides. I shall endeavour in addressing myself to this question to avoid any matters of party strife so far as possible. It may be necessary in the course of my remarks to refer to some acts of the administration that have been done, presumably in their opinion, in the best interests of this country and of the empire. I may find occasion to criticise some of those things, but I trust any criticisms I may make will not be received as a partisan attack upon anything that has been done in the interests of the Dominion as a whole, or the empire.

The matter of imperial trade is a subject of the very first importance, and I intend in the first place to take up that phase of the question. I am a believer in the proposition that sentiment should be strengthened by interest, that is, that the sentiment that binds us to the mother country should be increased by the common ties of advantage, of interest and of inter-trade. There is a movement at present on in Great Britain, and I think it is being watched with deep interest, not only in the British Isles themselves, but throughout the British dominions, and throughout the civilized world wherever the Anglo-Saxon tongue is spoken. There is a movement on foot in England to-day designed to bring about a closer union between Great Britain and her colonies by means of preferential trade arrangements, and in such other ways as may be devised to strengthen the bonds of the empire, to increase the unity of the empire, and to cause that as the years go by we may be more and more grafted into one permanent and substantial whole. I have been for years an advocate of a policy that will tend to draw the colonies more closely to the mother country; and while I hope I will not take a back seat with those who say that sentiment is strong enough to hold us just where we are, I say that if sentiment is that strong, so much the better. But there may be others to which sentiment does not appeal; and I would remind this House that there is a stream of immigration coming to this country at the present moment from almost every country under the sun. We are a cosmopolitan people to-day, we are receiving immigrants from almost every clime. Is it not a serious consideration what the citizenship shall be that we are to establish in this great northern half of the hemisphere? I think that is a question that should commend itself to us; and as I pass along I shall refer more particularly a little later on to the naturalization laws of this country, to which I think the best attention of this House should be given at a very early date in connection with the immigration that is at present coming to our shores. I regret the Minister of Finance is not yet in his place, as I desire to refer to the tariff as it at present exists.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I am opposed now, as I always have been to the tariff as it exists in regard to the admission of imports from Great Britain under what is now called the preference. That may sound strange from a man who claims to be an imperialist; nevertheless that has been my view long before the present government took up the question, and I have not seen any reason so far to change the views I hold upon preferential tariff. I contend that such tariff never should have been given at all until there was a quid pro quo from Great Britain herself when we gave that concession. We have given now freely for several years a great concession to the mother country. That has been in operation now I think for some seven years. I hold in my hands figures that have been collated by a gentleman who I think is acquainted with the subject, a man who understands the figures as the trade and navigation returns come down to us. I find that we ar sacrificing now at the rate of about $4,000,000 per annum of revenue that we would have collected on imports that we have been receiving had not this preference existed. Now under the general tariff on imports we have been receiving during the last four years importations of the following amounts:

	Amount.	Duty.
1901	$ 78,466,819	$ 23,826,836
1902	88,021,607	26,696,301
1903	99,181,500	30,041,564
1904	99,167,713	30,168,411
1904 (under surtax tariff)	4,976,610	1,896,528
	$369,814,249	$112,629,640

In all those four years we have imported in round numbers $369,000,000 under the general tariff, and we collected thereon in customs duties $112,000,000, being an average of 30·46 per cent upon all those goods that entered the country under the general tariff. Under the preferential tariff we imported as follows:

1901..	$ 27,502,937	$ 5,280,144
1902..	30,635,889	5,729,231
1903..	37,614,505	7,068,789
1904	44,765,253	8,889,410
	$140,518,584	$26,967,574

In all these four years we imported from Great Britain and the colonies under the preferential tariff in round numbers $140,000,000 worth of goods, and we collected thereon $27,000,000, being a percentage of 19:19. This is a difference between the preferential tariff and the general tariff of 11 per cent in duty. The amounts that we would have collected on these goods if duty had been collected at regular rates was $3,969,000 on an average $4,000,000 of duty sacrificed each year under the present preferential tariff so-called. Last year, 1904, the loss to the revenue was no less than $5,045,000, being in round numbers over £1,000,000 sterling that we have sacrificed in duties that would have been collected had not the preferential tariff existed as it does at the present time.

Now I am opposed to the preferential tariff as it at present exists, for the reason we have received during those years nothing in return from the mother country. That may be disputed by hon. gentlemen opposite, but I think they will have difficulty to show that we have received from the mother country any particular advantage that we had not previously enjoyed or that we would now enjoy were that tariff not in existence. We are sacrificing then in round numbers $5,000,000 in duty under the present preferential arrangement. What has that done? The admission of those goods has injured many factories; it has shaken the woollen trade to its foundation, and many other industries are suffering as a result of the present preferential arrangement. Now I contend that it was not a business proposition in the year 1897, nor is it a business proposition to-day, that we should admit into this country year after year the large importations of goods from Great Britain with this disadvantage to our own manufacturers, and not at the same time receive any advantage to the other interests of this country. I contend that is not a business proposition, and the sooner this matter is put upon a business basis so much the better for imperial connection, and so much the better for the empire itself. I hate to see anything clothed in false colours and I feel that this preferential tariff, launched in 1897 was launched under false colours. I regret that the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) is not here, but I shall read from the Budget speech of 1897 the resolution with which he prefaced his remarks when the preferential tariff first came into existence so that there might be no misapprehension as to the words of the hon. gentleman or as to the intention of the hon. gentleman when he moved this preferential arrangement. The resolution was as follows:

That when the customs tariff of any country admits the products of Canada on terms which, on the whole, are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the reciprocal tariff herein referred to, are to the countries to which it may apply, articles which are the growth, produce, or manufacture of such country. When imported direct therefrom, may then be imported direct into Canada or taken out of warehouse for consumption therein at the reduced rates of duty provided in the reciprocal tariff set forth in Schedule D.

That any question that may arise as to the countries entitled to the benefits of the reciprocal tariff shall be decided by the controller of customs, subject to the authority of the Governor General in Council.

That the controller of customs may make such regulations as are necessary for carrying out the intentions of the two proceeding sections.

Occasionally a fisher when he is baited for herring may catch a whale. Occasionally a man loaded for small game may bring down a bear, but the chances are that neither of these things will occur, and when the Minister of Finance catches an empire by something that was not intended in the first place to unite that empire, I think he will be just as much surprised as the fisherman or the huntsman who goes out for small game and catches a big prize. The minister in this resolution makes no more reference to Great Britain than to any other country that is prepared to treat us with equal favour. There is nothing in the proposition submitted at that time that would warrant us in believing that the minister intended to unite the members of the British empire in a common bond of trade. No such thing was intended or thought of, as I have been told on the platform on more than one occasion. The reform party was under pledge to the Dominion that taxation would be reduced when they came into power. Was it not the intention of the hon. gentleman when he introduced that preferential tariff that he would reduce the taxation upon the people of this country and fulfil the promises that had been made upon many a hustings throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion? I have met this on the platform; my recent opponent stated in my presence that that was one of the main reasons that inspired the present preferential tariff. Now if that is the reason how are we to expect that the British empire will be united by such a resolution as that of the Finance Minister. It is unreasonable to expect that. If we want to unite the empire for trade, commerce or defence we must set out with a definite proposition in view, we must have a goal for which we are striving and an object which we hope to attain. That was evidently not in the mind of the hon. gentleman when he brought down the preferential tariff. If that preference is a failure

—and I believe myself it is largely a failure at the present time—it has not received that acceptance in the old country that was hoped for, it has in fact been minimized there, the British manufacturers saying that it is of comparatively little use, although I believe it has been of more use to the British manufacturer than he supposes ; I believe it has been of large value to the British manufacturer but of nothing like as large a value as it would have been had it been enacted with the proper spirit, with the desire to unify the empire, the reason it has not brought the advantage that people expected it would bring is that it has not had at its back the people most favourable to the policy. We wished and we have always striven for a return for anything given. We contend that it is not a business proposition to throw down one third of our tariff and to ask nothing in return. I have always been opposed to that ; I am opposed to it still, and I believe it is detrimental to the policy we have so much at heart. That may be disputed by hon. gentlemen opposite. They will say : Do you advocate the withdrawal of that preference ? I would go the length of advocating the withdrawal of that preference if I felt that I could do so without being misunderstood in the British Isles themselves, and I feel now that there would be a difficulty in advocating the withdrawal of the preference ; it would be considered in some quarters as a retrograde step ; it would be considered by some that we were taking back what we had already given in a gracious mood, because it had not given to the manufacturers of the old country and ourselves the advantage that had been expected. Whether or not that be the case, I contend that this House and this country are discussing something more than an academic question, as was pointed out by our hon. friend opposite just before the House rose at six o'clock. It is not an academic question ; it is being discussed keenly at every fireside in Great Britain. It is one of the great questions before the British empire to-day and while we may treat it lightly the day is near at hand when we must decide on one or other of two things : Are we going to approach more nearly to the Throne, are we going to be drawn more closely into the imperial bonds, or are we going to fall farther and farther away ? Those are questions that every man in his heart should answer truly because there is no doubt that the signs of the times, as the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) pointed out this afternoon, are not that imperial unity is gaining ground in this country. I am sorry to have to make that confession but I am forced to do so by the facts and by recent events. It is not long since we have seen two or three of the ties that bind us to the mother country severed. There are not so many of them and how many are going ? How many more can we afford to part with and still be considered part of the British empire, within that great family of nations, Great Britain and her colonies? How many more can we afford to snap? Not long ago we had the First Minister asking for treaty making powers. Is that a request that makes for imperial unity ? If we have those powers who is to enforce the treaties ? Where is the arm that can enforce them if we make them ? Great Britain has a navy and an army that can enforce them; we have no right arm, no army or navy to enforce them. If we have the treaty making power we must be prepared to take the responsibility of these treaties, and if the countries with which we make treaties do not carry them out we must have at our back a power that will enforce fulfilment.

We were recently told by the Minister of Militia that in the near future Halifax and Esquimalt will be manned by Canadian instead of by British troops. That may be considered bearing part of the burdens of empire, but I submit that in my judgment that is another weakening of the cords that bind us to the mother country. I contend that this is a dangerous step. I submit here as a proposition that will appeal to both sides of the House, that any army, any band of soldiers, or any navy that is fit to defend the shores of Canada or any army that is fit to repel the attack that might be made upon Halifax or Esquimalt, ought to be good enough to defend the shores of Cornwall, to man the fortifications of Dover. I say that any troops that can man the fortifications of this Dominion are good enough to send abroad.

That is what should be done if we have troops to spare. We should have interchangeable regiments. What an education and an inspiration it would be if we could send a first-class regiment to garrison an important point in the motherland, and at the same time bring over a regiment, equally good but no better, to man our fortifications. Such an interchange would strengthen the bonds of empire; such an interchange would strengthen that silken cord that binds us to the motherland. These ties that bind us are but light it is true, and it is not for us to ruthlessly part them asunder. How many of these ties with the motherland are left us now? I am sorry to say but few remain. True we have a Governor General yet, but Sir, if we go on parting with them so lightly, then in the near future we may see the very last cord snapped. All these moves to which attention has been called to-night tend in the direction of independence. I believe that the danger is even more serious, than our friend from Victoria would lead us to expect. I believe that there is growing up in the youth of this country a desire for independence. On its face that may be flattering, for every youth looks to the day when

he will be independent of the parents who brought him up and cherished him. Every young man rightfully longs for independence and desires the arrival of the day when he shall have the privilege of exercising the rights of manhood and full citizenship. It is no doubt a proper ambition, but it must not be forgotten that the exercise of such a right brings with it, counter responsibilities. A young man on attaining the age of 21 years, takes upon him the responsibility of his manhood and that responsibility he cannot shirk. Are we prepared to accept the responsibility of independence; are we prepared to make these military expenditures that our friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) has spoken of, and which I do not think he exaggerates? If we had to contribute for defence purposes as do the people of the United States, our proportionate payments for defence last year would be $30,000,000 instead of $2,500,000. It is all very well to talk about independence, but are we prepared to foot the bill? Are we prepared to put our hands down in our pockets and pay out these vast sums, which would be necessary to defend our shores? Where would we be if we were called upon to send an army or a navy into a foreign country to rescue any of our citizens; where would we be if we had not Great Britain to fall back upon? When we adopted the preferential tariff we made a sacrifice on behalf of Great Britain; a sacrifice which has not been fully appreciated because its value has not been recognized because of the conditions under which it was made. Last year the Minister of Finance in his budget speech hinted that there was a danger that the preferential might be recalled unless there was some movement in England to reciprocate with us. I draw his attention to the fact that our industries are being hit by the British preference, and that at the same time we are receiving nothing in return for it. We have been asked in the old country, and we are asked to-day: what are you going to give us if we tax our food for your benefit? They do not appreciate what we have given, and the question is with them: what are you going to give us now? There was the danger of giving something that was not asked for; there was the fact of having parted with $5,000,000 of our revenue without receiving any recompense. If it is proper that this House and this country should enter into a trade treaty with the United States, or with Germany, or with France, it is surely equally right and it is surely equally good business, that we should enter into some kind of a commercial arrangement with the mother country. There are those who say that such an idea is conceived in a huxtering spirit, and that if we give anything we should give it freely. That is all very well in sentiment, but in practice the best way to preserve friendship and to avoid unpleasantness is to have a fair, straightforward and well understood business arrangement. If we are going to have an arrangement that means: take all we give, and give nothing in return, it is not the way to make for imperial unity. Let any man cast his eye around his own neighbourhood and see how many families have been dispersed because of this absence of the application of business principles in the home; let any man cast his eyes around his own neighbourhood and see how the father has cursed the son and the son has cursed the father because he has been asked to labour for years without any stated reward. We know that families have been parted because a business understanding within the household was not come to. The father employed the son or the daughter to do his work without having provided any fixed compensation, and the result was that after years of hard service the son or the daughter was forced to leave the father's house and to receive in the house of the alien and the stranger that recognition which was denied at home. The best way to avoid unfriendliness among nations as among families is to have a direct business arrangement. When this preferential tariff was given to the mother country there should have been some return instantly asked for. We should not have been content to hand out $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 of our revenue and receive nothing in return. You have heard that some of our industries are feeling this preference and the pressure causes them to set their face against this policy. When the preference was given I said and I repeat it now, that it would prove a serious blow to the sentiment that was making for imperial trade unity. I may be mistaken on that, I hope I am, but I fear I am not. I would sincerely like to know that I am mistaken in that judgment. I believe that the woollen trade of Canada to-day is denouncing the preferential tariff for its destruction. I have heard the sentiment expressed on the platform: we don't want any more of the preferential arrangement because it injures us. I submit that if a business arrangement had been entered into between Canada and Great Britain, these men instead of cursing the preferential tariff as the ruination of their business would be to-day praising it. I believe they would recognize that it had brought a flood of immigrants to our country, that it had peopled the vast territories of the west with Englishmen, Irishmen and Scotchmen, the best of all settlers for Canada. I believe that if we can get Anglo-Saxon immigrants we want no other class. I believe that it is only our failure to get these which causes us to turn our eyes to the other nations of the earth. The immigration from the old country has not been such as to inspire us with the belief that this preference has received at home the attention that it should

have received. Sir, there is to-day a great movement on foot in the British Isles. There is a statesman there advocating a policy of empire; a statesman who has furnished an example to the statesmen of Canada. That gentleman has taken his political life in his hands; he has sacrificed office and power and all that makes for greatness; he has taken these in his hands and set them down upon the earth and said: I stand for preferential trade between Great Britain and her colonies, and as that is unpalatable to the cabinet of which I am a member, rather than injure them I will step down and out of government. And Sir, the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain laid down office, and laid down all the glory of his position for the sake of advocating this policy which he believes to be the best policy for the British empire. Let me ask, Mr. Speaker: are we prepared to make any sacrifice in the interest of the great empire to which we boast we belong ? If so it is time that this parliament should put itself on record. I am pleased to think, Sir, that on this, one of the first opportunities I have had of addressing you, I have the privilege of speaking on so great a subject and one so dear to my heart. I had hoped that I might some day have the honour of speaking on this question in the House of Commons of Canada, and so I hasten to embrace this, the first opportunity of placing on 'Hansard' my views with regard to British connection and the unification of the British race. I know of no cause in which I would be willing to make greater personal sacrifices; I know of no cause in which I feel I could work with so much interest and so much enthusiasm as in this great cause of welding together the mother country and the colonies.

If any feeble word that I could speak or any feeble act that I could do would draw the colonies and the mother country any closer together, I should feel most honoured and delighted to speak that word or do that act ; and it is with this object in view that I take up to-night this question of preferential trade and endeavour to point out to this House the importance of keeping that question on every occasion well to the front. Let us not be drawn away with the idea that national independence is the aim and the goal of Canada, and that we are prepared to lay down that British connection of which we have boasted so long. Every generation is called upon to bear its part in the history of the world, and our part in the history of the Dominion and of the empire is to hand down unbroken and uninjured that connection between the mother country and the colonies that we had when we came upon this stage. That is an obligation that rests upon every member of this House. Let us not be a party to handing down to the next generation a weaker bond of empire, a weaker link than that which binds us at present to Great Britain. It is weak enough—let us not trifle with it. The day has come when we must have a goal ahead of us ; we cannot drift on for ever. We have, it is true, drifted fairly well together of late. But the day is not far distant when rude winds and waves may drift us apart. That day may be nearer than we think, and I contend that it is in the interest of every man in this House, in the interest of every citizen of this Dominion and of every citizen of this great empire, to endeavour in all his thoughts and actions to draw the various portions of the empire closer together, and by no word or deed, to cause it a pang or a thought sundering. I trust that the discussion that has been statrted in this House to-night will be continued, if not to-night, on some future occasion, and that as we are called upon to exercise the various responsibilities that rest upon us as a Dominion, we shall not be slow to recognize that we have a part to play.

We have of late years, it is true, been giving our loyalty nominally to Great Britain, but our trade to the United States. Is that a good proposition, lip loyalty to the empire and trade loyalty to the United States ? The trade returns show that we are importing about two and a half times as much from the United States as we are from Great Britain. That does not look as though our loyalty and our trade were united. It would be quite proper, I think, for the authorities at home to say to us : If that is the case, Canada, we would be willing to have a little more of your trade, even if we have from you a little less lip loyalty. That is a proposition which I think the people of Great Britain might probably well make to us ; and perhaps they are thinking this to-day, in spite of the preference which we have given, for which we sacrificed about $5,000,000 last year. They say we are not contributing one penny towards the maintenance of the British army or navy. I say this country should have collected that duty, if we had it to give away, and should have handed it over to Great Britain for defence. Then we could not have been taunted with the statement that we are not contributing one penny to the British army or navy. We should be just before we are generous, and we should, I think, contribute our fair share in support of the navy or in some other way add to the defences of the empire before we begin to give away our revenue in this way, at the rate of $5,000,000 per annum, as a free gift, giving a discount which is the greater the more the purchase is. It is rather a peculiar feature of trade, that. Generally the arrangement is the other way—the discount goes to the buyer ; but in this case it goes to the seller. That is a peculiar feature of the present preferential arrangement. It may be justified as good business, but it is not the ordinary business way of doing things. The more we buy, the more our

contribution, that is the arrangement under which the present British preference exists. It does not appear to be a good business proposition. I would rather see the discount go to the buyer in the usual way, and we could then hand it back, and not be taunted with the statement that we are not contributing a penny to the British army or navy. It may be said that we cannot contribute, as we have no representation. That I admit is a serious difficulty ; but there are ways of overcoming all difficulties, and if we set our minds to overcoming these difficulties, we shall be able to do so.

I said the British preference has been disappointing in its working out. According to the mother country, it has not been the advantage that it was supposed it would be. I have a few figures on items which we import from Great Britain and which might be largely increased, while the imports of the same items from foreign countries might be diminished. I have a long list with which I will not weary the House ; but I will mention a few of the items by way of illustration. The first item on the list, which is alphabetically arranged, is ale, beer and porter, of which we import from Great Britain $108,000, and from foreign countries $140,000. The ale and beer of the mother country are noted throughout the world, and it seems strange that we should not be able to import nearly all of our consumption of these. Of books, periodicals and all other printed matter we import from Great Britain $422,000, and from foreign countries $1,500,000—less than one-third from the mother country. Of bricks, tiles and clay, we import from the mother country $221,000, and from foreign countries $695,000. Of cottons, on the other hand, we import $5,000,000 from Great Britain as against $2,000,000 from foreign countries. Of drugs, dyes, chemicals and medicines we import $1,531,000 from Great Britain and $4,000,000 from foreign countries. Thus I might go on through a long list of items the imports of which from the mother country and other colonies might be largely increased without interfering with Canadian trade. That is the basis on which our preferential arrangements should be made—with the view of giving the largest advantage to the mother country and the sister colonies and at the same time as little disadvantage to the manufacturers of this country as possible.

I have been accused on more than one occassion, and may be accused now, of trying to ride two horses when I stand for adequate protection to home industries and at the same time for giving a liberal preference to the mother country under a reciprocal arrangement. I stand to-day for mutual preference. I stood ten years ago for preference as I then understood it ; but that name has been appropriated to a jug-handled policy of which I do not approve. Therefore I am compelled to announce myself to-night as a mutual preferential trader. If we give an advantage to Great Britain, we want an advantage in return. That is where I stand—on a purely business arrangement. It may sound like an absence of sentiment ; but I believe that is the best way to maintain friendship between this country and Great Britain as well as between this country and the other colonies of the empire. I believe that the only way to go about a preference that will be satisfactory all round is to sit down and, as I think the Prime Minister said, negotiate a trade treaty.

There is no good reason that I know of why we can enter into trade treaties with all the nations of the world, but when it comes to considering a treaty between Great Britain and her colonies, we should say : take anything you want ; let us have no understanding, no arrangements. That is not a business proposition. It will not lead to satisfaction in the long run and is apt to be misconstrued and misapplied. However great may be the strength of the empire, in the loyalty of its people to their King, Crown and flag, that strength would be greatly increased if we had a common bond of trade uniting us as well throughout the length and breadth of the civilized world. I believe that is the goal we should strive for. What we require is a comon bond of trade to give substance to the sentiment of unity between the mother country and her colonies. That I believe to be the policy of Mr. Chamberlain, and for that reason I am a supporter of his policy as far as I understand it. In some of its details, I am not quite sure how it will work out.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Hon. gentlemen opposite are quite welcome to their laugh, but I think that even they will admit that it is not likely that any great policy propounded in this or any other country will be completely free from defects. Human nature itself is defective, and it is only reasonable to expect that even our best considered treaties will be lacking in some respects ; but no matter what arrangement we may enter into with the mother country, we have no right to expect to have everything our own way. The policy to be followed should be one of give an take, one of mutual sacrifice, and that is the spirit which governs the relations between the Dominion and the provinces to-day. We in the western provinces pay a duty on coal in order to protect and encourage the great coal industry of the provinces down by the sea. And on the other hand our maritime provinces pay willingly a duty on flour for the benefit of the great milling industry in the west. A similar spirit should govern our relations with the mother country. To unite an empire all its component parts should be willing to give and take, should be willing

to make each a sacrifice in the common interest. Just as it is not selfishness, but unselfishness which is the highest attribute of man, so the spirit of mutual sacrifice is that which is best calculated to give strength and unity to a nation and an empire. When we ask the mother country to make sacrifices in our behalf, we should be prepared to make some return, and I trust that every part of the British empire is ready to contribute its share of sacrifice in the common interest of all. Is it not desirable that we should make sacrifices with regard to the mother country with the view of drawing ourselves more closely into this great imperial family? That is the chief consideration by which we should be governed, and a sentiment of that kind is more likely to draw us together than any other consideration we can submit to this House or country. We hear sometimes the possibility mentioned of either independence or annexation. Well, Mr. Speaker, I for one take my stand here—and I am not ashamed or afraid to announce it to-night—for British and imperial unity—the unity of the British empire ; and I trust I shall never be afraid to announce that sentiment either in this House or elsewhere. It is what I feel in my heart and take pleasure in declaring by my tongue. One of the noblest impulses of the human heart is the desire to make a sacrifice for the mother country. Are we to receive all the advantages and bear none of the burdens? For my part I consider it a crying shame and disgrace to this country to-day that we should be in such a position that the finger of scorn can be pointed at us, as being a nation that is quite willing to accept the services of the British army and navy in our defence, but will not contribute a cent to the cost of that defence. That is a position in which we ought not to be. I believe the day is near at hand when we will have to decide to do more for ourselves and shoulder our own responsibilities. The British navy is being withdrawn from our shores, the British troops are being removed from Halifax and Esquimalt and there is a serious problem facing us. What means have we at our disposal to defend our own country ? If the strong arm of the empire was not at our back, where would we be to-day ? That is the problem with which we are now face to face, and we cannot long shirk the duty of having to decide whether we are prepared to subscribe a reasonably fair amount in support of the British army and navy. In depicting the dread prospect of war, in which the colonies would suffer equally with Great Britain, the late Chancellor of the Exchequer used these words : 'The weary Titan totters under his more than human load' and he asked why the colonies should not bear some share of the more than human load laid on the British taxpayer. And I might ask how long is this Dominion going to contribute only a paltry two and a half or three millions to the defences of the empire, relying on the strong right arm of the mother country to do the rest ? How long are we prepared to stand idly by and see the poor workingmen of Great Britain bear all the taxation ? Some will say : You will never ask the working men of Great Britain to bear a tax on corn. Perhaps we will not, but we are asking them to bear a tax that is weighing them down far more heavily than would the tax on corn and that is the tax of upholding the British defences. We are asking them to pay the vast sum which these entail while we, who are more prosperous than the people in the old land, are not ready to contribute one pound to the maintenance of the British army and navy. How long can we continue to occupy such a humiliating position ? The time has come when we shall have to put ourselves on record with regard to this great question, and it is one of the most serious we have to face. Hon. gentlemen opposite profess to view our present position with satisfaction, but for my part I cannot share in their complacency. I must say that I view it with more or less alarm. I may be considered a pessimist, but I cannot help regretting seeing the last vestige of British troops leaving our shores, and the British navy being recalled from our waters. For my part I fail to see the wisdom of such a course. I do not know what the authorities of the mother country have in view, but it does appear to me that a mistake is being made in withdrawing British troops from our shores, and leaving us unprotected save for that protection we may have from our own militia. I should be th last man to cast any reflection upon our militia. The men are able, willing and strong, and I am not depreciating their ability and readiness, but I say that any man good enough to man Halifax or Esquimalt is good enough to man any British port in South Africa or Australia or any part of the British empire where he may be called on to go.

This is the spirit in which I would enter upon the defence of the empire. If we have anything to contribute, we should do it in an interchangeable way. We can then retain control of the troops to some extent—they can be Canadians, though they have gone abroad for service ; they would be under the British flag, serving the same King and devoted to the same empire.

I had not intended to speak at so great length upon the matter of imperial defence. But before I sit down let me call the attention of the First Minister and of this House to a question in this connection that, I think, is worthy of most serious consideration, and that is the unification of the naturalization laws of the British empire. We are receiving, as I have said, immigrants from all lands. Some of them, of course, may be British in sentiment, others are not ; some of them may have ties to the mother country, others have not. But what are we giving

them as an idea to work for ? What are we setting up before their minds as the goal for which they should strive ? What are we conferring upon them in the way of citizenship ? Is there such a thing as Canadian citizenship ? If there is I am not aware of it. The question put to a man in our country when he votes is : Are you a British subject ? If he is a British subject and otherwise qualified, he is entitled to vote in this country ; but if he is not a British subject he is not entitled to vote. Are hon. members of this House, are the people of this country, fully aware that we cannot make a British subject in this country ? The naturalization laws, as I understand them, will not permit us to make a British subject in Canada. We may make him a British subject so long as he retains citizenship within the borders of the Dominion. But as soon as he goes aboard ship and is three miles from the coast, he becomes again a citizen of the country from which he came—he is no longer a citizen of Great Britain or of Canada ; he is at the mercy of any nation that chooses to attack him. In effect, he has no citizenship at all. Here is a serious question to be considered. We are receiving amongst us citizens and subjects of every country, and we are giving them what they believe to be good British citizenship. But that is not what we give them ; we cannot confer upon any individual in this country the full rights of the British citizen. If a German comes to our shores he may become a British subject while he remains in Canada. But, if he goes upon the high seas, or goes to any other country, or even to the mother country itself, he is a German still, though he has been a British subject while here. A Frenchman may be a Briton in South Africa, but when he goes to Great Britain he will be a Frenchman again, because no British colony can confer full British citizenship upon the natives of other countries. This is a serious question, and one that should be faced. We are taking from the country to the south of us at the rate of 50,000 people a year, I am told. When they take the oath of allegiance to the King they lay down their right of citizenship in the United States. What are we giving them in return ? They may think we are giving them full British citizenship, which they are willing to exchange for that in which they were born, but we are not able to confer upon them the rights of British subjects beyond our own territory. What I stand for is a common citizenship throughout the empire. That is a citizenship of which we may well be proud ; it is a citizenship for which much blood and treasure have been sacrificed ; it is a citizenship for which any of us might be delighted to lay down his life if thereby he might be the means of transmitting to others the liberty that we received from our forefathers. I am not speaking as one born in the British islands. I have the distinction of having been born in the Dominion and in the province in which I am speaking. I am a Canadian-born British subject, and I speak in the best interests of the British empire. I am desirous of seeing the empire unified, and I raise my voice in behalf of the resolution proposed by my hon. friend from Victoria. This has not been brought in as a mere academic question, as the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) said it was ; it is a very timely introduction of a very great subject to the attention of this House and this country. We could easily spend time upon matters of far less importance. This House has sat year after year, but never, so far I know, has it placed itself upon record upon this question. I would like to see it place itself upon record, and so I am glad that this resolution has been introduced. It may not come to a vote to-night. Nor do I say that the resolution is, word for word, as I would have drawn it. But with the principle of it I am in hearty sympathy. It may well appeal to us as members of this House and representatives of the British empire. It is well that we should take it into our serious consideration that we as citizens of Canada are not doing our duty by the mother country and by the sister colonies. I have referred almost entirely to preferential trade with the mother country. But before I sit down let me say that I believe that the preferential tariff with reference to the West Indies introduced by hon. gentlemen opposite—and I give them full credit for it—is a masterly piece of service to the empire. Here were these sister colonies suffering through the depression of their industry—the sugar industry. Great Britain turned a deaf ear to their appeals ; in fact, as a free trade country, she could not give them an advantage in her market. But I am glad to say that hon. gentlemen opposite have done a masterly piece of service to this country and to this empire in extending the brotherly hand of helpfulness to our oppressed fellow-citizens in the West Indies. For I look upon them as fellow-citizens. I do not know whether other hon. gentlemen so regard them, but I do. They are living under the same flag, under the sway of the same King and within the borders of the same empire. I regard them as my fellow-citizens, and I am pleased that the Finance Minister has extended his hand to them, and has helped them as he has done. I believe that, under the preferential arrangement he offered, the imports of sugar have increased from $907,533 two years ago to $5,236,451—that is an increase of 377 per cent. This shows the advantage of preference between colony and colony. Having done that for the West Indies, we have done a great service for the empire and have given help where it was most needed. We have extended the hand of brotherly fellowship and assistance, and I do not think it has cost us much. It is true sugar is dearer now than it was. But this is not

because we are receiving it more largely from the West Indies, but because the beet-root crop of Europe was a failure last year. Do not attribute the increase in the price of sugar to the assistance we have given the West Indies. But here is an object lesson. We have increased our sugar trade from the West Indies almost four-fold. If that has been done in one item, it could be done in a group of items. Why cannot we receive an advantage on our wheat, our butter, our bacon and other products of the farm in the markets of Great Britain ? I think the British could well give us that advantage, and I hope they will do it in the near future. I believe they must sacrifice, as we must sacrifice something and all must be done for the general good.

I for one believe that we can stand better for British civilization, for British advancement and for the success of the Anglo-Saxon race by remaining under one government and one flag, than we can by breaking up into various homogeneous nations, each one going its own way, every one a different road, every one it may be antagonizing the other. I believe that the future of the Anglo-Saxon race lies in unity. I believe that we can best advance the progress of civilization by retaining the British empire as it at present exists. It is true that the great empires of the world have passed away, all the old empires ; and it remains to be seen, and I believe it will be seen within the present, or at most, the next generation, whether the British empire is going to reverse this order of things or go to pieces. I believe one thing or the other will happen in the very near future. If Canada sets the example of breaking away, it will be but a short time when South Africa and Australia will follow suit. Where will Great Britain be, shorn of her great colonies? That is a question that should appeal to-day to the minds of every British citizen within the sound of my voice, and within this country. I believe that is a consideration that should appeal to every one of us, and that we should be ready to make sacrifices in behalf of it. Great liberties are only won by great sacrifices. The great heritage of the British nation is ours, and are we going lightly to part with it ? Are we going to snap link by link the ties that have bound us to the mother country so long? Are we going to see them ruthlessly broken, and stand by and say, Amen? I trow not. Mr. Speaker, these are considerations that I think are worthy the attention and the very best thought that we can give them. We will be best serving the interests of the nation and of the race by retaining our position in the empire. We can hunt better in a pack than we can in units. In conclusion, with your permission Mr. Speaker, I will break into poetry and give you four lines from Kipling.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I am glad to be able to elicit applause from hon. gentlemen opposite. I am going to give you four lines from Kipling to illustrate what I said about the desirability of hanging together as a pack instead of breaking up into units :

Now this is the law of the jungle,
As old and as true as the sky,
The wolf that would prosper must keep it,
The wolf that would break it must die.
As the vine that encircles the tree trunk,
The law runneth forward and back,
The pack is the strength of the wolf,
And the wolf is the strength of the pack.

Mr. A. A. BRUNEAU (Richelieu). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the question raised by the motion of the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) is not a new question. He said that colonial representation in the Imperial parliament has been asked for years ago, and in order to prove his statement, the hon. member quoted the opinion set forth in 1851 by the Hon. Joseph Howe. My hon. friend could have gone back twenty years further in the history, when this question was discussed in England. In 1831, when Lord Grey's government introduced their Parliamentary Reform Bill, that question of colonial representation into the Imperial parliament was discussed for the first time. As the number of members of the House of Commons in England was to be reduced by thirty-two through that Bill, it was suggested to make up the difference by granting representation to the British colonies. As the effect of that measure was to be more especially detrimental to the Tory members, Mr. Hume introduced, on the 16th August, 1831, a motion to the effect that the colonies should be represented. But, before that proposition was made, the British press had discussed the question and, strange to say, the reasons given at that time were about the same as those that might be brought to-day in favour of my hon. friend's motion. They wanted colonial representation in the Imperial parliament for the very reason alleged by the hon. member ; they claimed that India and the other colonies with their immense population should necessarily be represented in the Imperial parliament, in order to submit to that parliament their complaints and grievances. Such representation, it was said, would be a desirable innovation, because it would cause the colonies to share in the settlement of matters of Imperial concern. British capital had been invested in these colonies and it was only fair, they added, to allow them to be represented in order to give that capital an opportunity of safeguarding their interests at a given moment.

As regards the members making up that representation, their numbers were not to

exceed fifteen of twenty, if statements of the newspapers of those days are to be credited. Canada was to have four representatives, Jamaica two, and so forth. The famous principle: 'No taxation without representation' was appealed to, and it was stated that the colonies having representatives in the British Parliament, would no longer have that reason for revolting. Had such steps been taken in years gone by, they said the thirteen states composing the union would not have declared themselves independent. Such were the reasons brought forward.

Mr. Hume, member for Middlesex, moved August 16, 1831, that the Reform Bill be referred once more to the committee with power to amend it by granting some representation to the colonies. The main reason submitted by Hume was the necessity of doing away with grievances and preventing them from arising in the colonies. It will be remembered that, at that time, in 1831, Lower Canada, and even Upper Canada, had flooded the British House of Commons with petitions for redress. Hume requested that the colonies be granted nineteen representatives, three of whom for the British possessions of North America; and when he came to particularize as regards Canada, he spoke in the following terms:

I will now come to the British North American colonies. If it be wished to keep these colonies in our power, our object must be to place them upon the most friendly terms with the mother-country. I am persuaded that all the bickerings and unpleasant feelings which, I am sorry to say, do exist in these colonies, might have been prevented if the colonist had possessed any fair and adequate means of stating in this House, from time to time, what are their feelings and wishes, and what are the evils under which they suffer. Year after year have these colonists sent petitions to us,—and I have now a petition from them signed by 10,000 persons,—complaining of grievances which, I am persuaded, never could have existed if the complainants had been fairly represented in parliament. I propose that the older provinces of Lower Canada, containing a population of 423,630 persons, should have one representative in the British parliament. Upper Canada contains a population of 198,000 souls, and I propose that that province should likewise send a member to parliament. I am aware that in stating the population of the colonies, I have, in every case, made the amount less than it actually is, but I have taken the numbers from the official returns in the Colonial Office. I very well know that the province of Upper Canada, instead of 198,000, contains 265,000 souls.

I now come to the remainder of the British colonies in North America. The province of New Brunswick contains a population of 22,000 souls; Nova Scotia, with Cape Breton added to it, has a population of 142,000 souls, whilst the population of Prince Edward Island is 23,000, and of Newfoundland 60,000,—in short, these colonies, with the Bermudas, comprise a population of 300,000 individuals, and for these I only ask for one representative in this House. By this plan the whole of the West India islands, and the whole of the British colonies of North America, will have six members to represent their interests and to express their feelings in the British House of Commons. In Upper and Lower Canada the representatives can be elected by the representative legislative bodies of these provinces, and the other colonies must choose delegates who shall elect their respective members.

As you will see, Mr. Speaker, by reading that part of Hume's speech, in his opinion, the representation of colonies was the remedy to all grievances of which these British colonies complained at the time.

One of those who took the greatest interest in colonial questions as they came up in the British House of Commons, and who might be termed the Charles Dilke of that period, and who had specially concerned himself with Lower Canada, rose in his turn and spoke in very strong terms against Mr. Hume's plan. The reason set forth by Labouchère go to show that colonial representation was not a new subject, even as early as 1831, in the British House of Commons, since Labouchère quoted Burke's opinion as to the utter impracticability of such representation, inasmuch as representatives of the colonies could not at the same time subserve the empire and the colonies. Such a plan is impracticable, he said, as, on the one hand, representatives of the colonies could not properly vote to levy taxes on the people of England, while British members could not properly vote to levy taxes on the colonies. Mr. Douglas, Lord Althorpe, Sir E. Taunton, Sir Chas. Wetherell, Mr. Burge, Sir C. Forbes and Sir Geo. Murray, fought either for or against Mr. Hume's motion, which was rejected without a vote being taken.

As these facts show, the question of the representation of colonies in the British parliament is not a new one. While this question was being discussed in the papers of the mother country, it was also coming up on this side of the Atlantic; and, what will no doubt be a surprise to many hon. members, the proposal relative to colonial representation in the British parliament was brought up on this side of the ocean, not by an Englishman, not by a Scotchman, not by an Irishman, but by a French Canadian, Mr. Pierre de Sales Laterrière.

Mr. de Sales Laterrière was a political writer who represented the city of Quebec from 1825 to 1829, who was afterwards elected for the county of Saguenay, 1830 to 1834, member of the Legislative Council in 1832, and member of the special council in 1838, after the suspension of the constitution, following the uprising of 1837. He was the first statesman to advocate here the representation of colonies in the British parliament. I must state just here that his reasons and motives for asking such a measure were entirely different from those set forth by the hon. member for Victoria. Mr. de Sales Laterrière was of opinion that we French Canadians would be annihilated,

swallowed up with our laws, our usages, our manners and our customs, in the vote of the United States, if we did not enter into a closer union with England, barring which we were fatally to fall under the sway of the neighbouring republic. There, in his opinion, lay the remedy to the grievances of the Papineau party.

The hon. member for Victoria stated this afternoon that one of the causes of the uprising in 1837 was the influence of foreign gold spread throughout Canada. I beg leave to contradict this statement. I have made a special study of that period of our national history, and I am in a position to state that never was there such a glaring mistake committed. In going over the records of that period and in trying to unravel the causes which brought about the uprising of 1837 and 1838, has the hon. member ever been struck by the strange situation brought about by the constitution of 1791, which united Upper and Lower Canada ? By virtue of that constitution England had subjected a house which was to comprise a majority of French Canadians to a hostile majority, to the rule of the 'family compact.' The population of Lower Canada, made up for the greater part of Catholics, had elected a certain number of English and Protestant representatives. The French Canadians, always tolerant, had been generous to the point of sending a few of their English fellow citizens to represent them at the outset of the regime created by the constitution of 1791.

But the position was an odd one for, while the French Canadians were a majority in the House, the three superior powers were in the hands of a minority inimical to all our political, civil and religious rights. In the first place, the Governor, who received his instructions from Downing Street ; then the Legislative Council, made up of appointees opposed to the constitution of 1791, and lastly, an irresponsible Executive Council, selected, not from among the members of the House, but by the Governor himself ; there was no cabinet responsible to the people.

One of the principal causes of the rebellion of 1837 was the unjust distribution of patronage. The family compact had its nominees, its favourites of power, who, being quite independent of people, submitted them to unjust treatment and, often in offensive terms, showed them they had been vanquished on the plains of Abraham. Then in virtue of the constitution one-seventh of the lands granted were set apart for the support of the Protestant clergy.

All those who are familiar with our political history know to what disputes the land question gave rise, even under the Union. It is under those circumstances, when Lower Canada was thoroughly dissatisfied with the policy followed by the mother country,—and rightly so, I fear not to say,—it is at the time we were asking redress from the metropolis, that Laterrière suggested that the colonies should be represented in the British parliament. That was on the 10th of August, 1831, six days before Hume put his motion before the Imperial parliament. His letter appeared in 'Le Canadien.' Three days later, that paper, which was at the time the organ of the patriotic party, of Papineau's party, answered Mr. Laterrière : Our colonial system is defective ; it is defective, taking into account the principle and object of colonization ; it is defective from the standpoint of patronage ; it is defective inasmuch as we are deprived of the benefits of responsible government ; it is defective as regards the constitution of the Legislative Council.

On October 5th, 1831, Laterrière replied in 'Le Canadien' :

England has protected her colonies by increasing for their benefit the duties on foreign products. The purpose of England, in looking after her colonies, protected as they are by her strong fleet, has been to ensure markets for her products.

Her colonial undertakings have been pursued on exactly the same principle as that of all nations, ancient and modern.

On the other hand, he added, the constitution gives us the right to complain and obtain redress. Mr. de Laterrière does not deny that there is not an unfair distribution of patronage ; but the reform Bill will, he adds, swamp the Tory party in England. Government patronage will no longer be inimical to us. Then he returns to his favourite topic and makes the following statement :

'We are not in a position to constitute here a nation sui generis ; England will cut us off one of these days ; what will become of us ? There is in England a strong party favouring the emancipation of the colonies.' 'Then,' he added, 'we will surely fall under the sway of the United States.' Then, again, colonial representation was not to interfere in any way with the powers of colonial legislatures. This is almost the very wording of the motion introduced by the hon. member for Victoria.

On the 8th of October, 1831, 'Le Canadien' answered as follows :

'The real question is this : will such a measure insure redress ?' No. There are two causes to our ills, added 'Le Canadien.' Exclusive legislation of commerce by the mother country, which reduces business to a state of uncertainty, and government patronage left into the hands of foreign officials.

You wish the colonies to be represented, was it asked ; on what principle will you base that represenattion : I shall put the same question to the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). On what principle are you going to base that representation ? Are

you going to base it on population? If you are, you will obtain a perfectly absurd political system, since the colonies would then rule over the sovereign states.

The 'Herald,' of Montreal, which was at that time the organ of the Tory party, entirely approved of the plan submitted by Mr. Laterrière. 'La Minerve' disapproved of it.

But the reason set forth in 1831 by Mr. Laterrière in support of his plea for colonial representation no longer exist. Through changes which have taken place in the Foreign Office of the mother country, a broad and far-seeing policy has been adopted; England has discarded old prejudices, and better days have dawned for the French Canadians. And that is why we salute her flag with as much respect as we revere the parliamentary institutions which she granted to us after 1837.

No, foreign gold has not been the cause of Lower Canada's uprising in 1837. Our ancestors did not sell themselves. They fought for their rights. Compare the causes which brought about the revolution of 1688 in England and those which brought about the war of independence in America in 1776, with the causes which brought about our own rebellion in 1837, and nobody will be found to defend the colonial system as it then existed.

England has understood at last that her old colonial policy was not in harmony with the spirit and needs of the times, and we have become, shielded by her powerful arm and under her kindly guidance, one of the happiest countries in the world.

We make our own laws, and as far as I have been able to judge from a personal experience extending over nearly fourteen years, we are succeeding fairly well at it, especially since the Liberal party have come into power.

We have cut up, and are continuing to cut up our country with canals and railways. We are spending a good deal more money on agriculture than on military barracks.

We are not sinking, as they are in Europe, under the weight of permanent armies. Our favourite arm is the pioneer's axe, a more powerful factor in colonization, in my humble opinion, that the most destructive war engines, including even Krupp or Creusot guns.

We enjoy responsible government, and above all we enjoy provincial autonomy. Under the constitution, each province has its attributes, its rights and its privileges, and these enable us French Canadians who are the great majority in the province of Quebec, to preserve our civil, political and religious rights.

But if the reasons given by Laterrière in support of his plea for colonial representation in 1831 do not hold any longer, the same objections which were then made to that proposal have still their full force in 1905.

The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton has not quoted a single historical precedent in support of his claim. Of course, he stated that the United States were under a federal system as is the case with Canada; but that does not show the necessity of our being represented in the Imperial parliament. I find only one precedent, and it is in contradiction with the principle of the motion introduced by my hon. friend. The downfall of the Roman commonwealth was the result of the taking in of the allied Italian states. Towards the decline of the Roman republic its allies, who had supported the greater part of the burden of the war, wished to be admitted to the enjoyment of the privileges of Roman citizenship. Civil war was the result of the refusal. In the course of the war which ensued, these privileges were granted to a great number of these nations, piecemeal, as they severed their connection with the general confederacy.

But to-day, thank God, we enjoy all the privileges of British citizenship and these should suffice. On the other hand who is anxious to obtain such representation? Without in the least wishing to offend the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton, who has introduced his motion in very moderate terms, I might observe that he is more of an Englishman than the King himself; somewhat the same compliment as used to be paid formerly to the Ultramontanes in the province of Quebec: That they were greater Catholics than the Pope.

The hon. member stated that if we were more closely united to England, the flow of immigration towards Canada would be much greater—and that was the part of his speech which struck me most. It seems to me the correctness of such a statement is very doubtful and would require to be more fully demonstrated.

The reasons given by Labouchère still hold; and I consider as he did that such a system is impracticable and utterly unworkable. The duty we owe to the empire is totally different from that we owe to the colony. Do you wish to have the proof of this? I was not in the House at the time, but I appeal to the memory of old parliamentarians in our midst, such as the hon member for Victoria (Mr. Costigan). the right hon. Prime Minister, the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). When, in 1879, the protective policy was adopted, is it not the case that a party in the House objected on the ground that British connection would be injured, that Great Britain would suffer? What was the reply? Let British connection perish, rather than let protection go!

You may like, Mr. Speaker, to know something of the views expressed by the newspapers of the country regarding the motion introduced by the hon. member for Victoria

and Haliburton, since it appeared on the order paper. I may quote, in the first place, 'La Patrie,' whose editorial chair is occupied, I believe, by the ex-Minister of Public Works, Mr. Tarte, a man perfectly well posted on the subject, since he was, if I am not mistaken, the first French Canadian to join the league of Imperial federation. This is what I read in 'La Patrie' of January 31st last:

Mr. Hughes has postponed the discussion of his motion to the effect that the time has come for Great Britain and her colonies to establish an Imperial parliament. The member for Victoria is a soldier, a genuine colonel, and, over the bargain, a charming man. He will deliver his speech; it will be followed by a debate, in the course of which party leaders will speak with measure, prudence, caution, &c. And we shall remain as we are!

It is to be hoped that the motion introduced by Mr. Hughes will be dealt with seriously, and that it will afford an opportunity for discussing the question of our future relations with the mother country.

These relations will long remain what they are to-day. Even if the colonies were to express a wish to be represented in the Imperial parliament, England would not consent easily.

See what objections her statesmen have to the simple proposition of granting a preference to the colonies on the markets of Great Britain. These last objections will disappear one of these days, which may not be very far off. I for one hope to see the British Empire bound into one immense commercial union, which will ensure its prosperity and its strength.

It is desirable that the representative members of the House of Commons should freely express their views on the important question raised by Col. Hughes.

"La Presse," on February 2nd last wrote as follows:

If it is our money that is wanted in exchange for the privilege of our being represented at London let things be right away put in their true light. What could a handful of Canadian delegates obtain by going over to London? In the ordinary course of things, we would obtain, no doubt, what is granted to us to-day without representation; for we recognize that Great Britain is exceedingly well disposed towards us. But, in difficult matters, involving complex international questions, England could never but consult her own interests. They are so superior to ours. It has always been the case; we were always shoved aside, and we did not complain of it either, because, practically, and barring the recent Alaskan boundary incident, we had not asked for anything.

The case would be altogether different if our views clearly expressed to the Imperial power were flatly rejected. There is nothing like a refusal. Spite and bad feeling are its outcome. Our littleness is rendered apparent; and little by little discouragement, disgust invade the strongest soul, and the most willing. The mainspring is broken.

Take for instance the Alaskan incident. It was the first time that we had a voice in the councils of the British nation. The award rendered did not deprive us of the twentieth part of what had formerly been taken away from us in the State of Maine, along the Northwest boundary and in the Straits of Fuca. Nevertheless our disappointment broke out with greater force and bitterness than on any preceding occasion. The reason is that we had been snubbed; we had failed in our efforts, which had cost us a good deal of labour, a good deal of thinking and had even inspired us with some idea of our personal importance.

If we were to be represented at London, our minds would be kept working over these questions. We would be kept in a state of fever about matters which do not in any way trouble our slumbers to-day. And the final result would be that a satisfactory condition of things would have been made bad.

Several speakers in England, in answer to Chamberlainists emphatically asked: 'What do the colonies want? Why not wait until they make their requirements known?'

But the colonies do not ask for anything. They have given what they had to give. As for the remainder, let us stick to the old English proverb: Let well alone.

'Le Canada,' of February 1st last wrote as follows:

Imperial federation is a question of immense scope, which the Laurier government has not been charged by the people to decide. It implies too deep a change in our present situation, and in a direction so totally different from that indicated heretofore by the trend of our national spirit that no one could think of launching such a scheme before having obtained a direct and clear expression of the will of the Canadian people in that regard.

I may also refer the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton to the opinion expressed, over a year ago, in connection with the Dundonald incident, by Mr. Goldwin Smith, who recalled that Henley, the famous Canadian oarsman had been termed a 'foreigner' by the English people. And he added: That is the people which the advocates of Imperial Federation would unite with us, with Australia, with New Zealand, with South Africa, with the West Indies, not to mention India, for the election and maintenance of a common government.

I shall not dilate any longer on the views expressed by the organs of public opinion in the province of Quebec; but, in answer to the hon. member for Brantford, I shall refer the House to the colonial conference held in London in 1902, and where Canada was represented. Our situation was discussed from the business and political standpoints, as also from that of the naval and military defence of the empire. That conference had been called by Mr. Chamberlain. Canada was worthily represented there by her present Prime Minister, who energetically and clearly defined our position towards England. As regards our political relations, Sir Wilfrid would not even consent to foresee the possibility of a change in the present condition of things. A resolution was passed convening similar conferences for every fourth year. It will be admitted that this was not going very far.

As regards our commercial relations, to which the hon. member for Brantford has referred, I may be permitted to remind him that if my information is correct, he went over to England at the time of the conference of the Boards of Trade of the Empire, and again, if my information is correct, he advocated there the same idea as he has this evening. The hon. member, I think, did not have an enormous success.

As regards our commercial relations the Canadian ministers, with great diplomacy, expressed the view that the preferential tariff, granted by us to the mother country, should entitle us, in return, to a preference on the British markets. At that time—tempora mutantur—Mr. Chamberlain did not recognize the benefits derived from our preferential tariff. The Canadian ministers hinted that it might be possible to increase the duties on certain goods, in such a way as to ensure greater protection to certain British products, but they added :

> If after doing all in their power to obtain from England a change in her tariff, the Canadian government found that the principle of a reciprocal preferential tariff was not agreeable either to the colonies or to England, they would then consider themselves at liberty to adopt such measures as they considered opportune.

As for us we are in favour of the latter policy, in preference to that advocated by the hon. member for Brantford.

The question of military defence was also submitted to the members of the colonial conference. The object was to have the conference pass a resolution whereby each colony would have agreed to contribute : An Imperial military reserve or service in case of necessity outside of the limits of the colony wherein the said reserve would have been established. The representatives of Cape Colony and of Natal were in favour of that policy advocated by the Secretary of War, Mr. Seddon.

The Canadian representatives objected to this ; they claimed, and rightly so, that it was preferable :

1. To perfect the military instruction of their force ;

2. To reorganize the force ;

3. To complete the necessary equipment, the mobilizing of a field force, ' while retaining to the colonies their rights to determine from time to time in what manner and to what extent they would assist.'

That policy has been carried out, last year, by the revising of our law relative to Militia and Defence.

As regards the question of naval expenditure, all the colonies agreed to contribute, with the exception of Canada. Each colony contributed as follows : Cape Colony, £50,000 a year ; Australia, £200,000 a year ; Natal, £35,000 a year ; Newfoundland. £4,800 a year ; New Zealand, £40,000 a year.

As regards Canada, its representatives refused to make any promise ; they stated that the government intended to establish a local naval force in Canadian waters, but that they were not in a position to make any offer of assistance in the same way as the other colonies.

The hon. member for Brantford seems to forget that, as a nation, we are youths on the verge of manhood. Our colonial status is but a step on the way towards a nobler condition, and one more worthy of a great people. We will then be powerful friend, devoted allies of the old mother country, impelled by the same feelings of generosity and loyalty.

Our country equals in area several of the largest kingdom of Europe ; its mineral wealth, its forest wealth, its fisheries and its water powers are great ; it is drained by one of the finest rivers in the world, and will soon be connected from ocean to ocean by two great transcontinental railways ; its people are religious and moral folks, who pray to God for their daily bread, and find their happiness in family life and the church. Of late years especially, we have made immense strides in all branches open to human intelligence. Nay, more, we have revealed ourselves to the whole world surprised to see rising in the west a new nation, still young, but self reliant and conscious of its vigour, and proudly asking that her agricultural and industrial products be given admittance to the markets of Europe and Asia. A brilliant future is evidently in store for us, and blind is he who does not perceive that we have as yet written the first chapter only of our history and that colonial representation in Europe or Imperial federation are not and cannot be the final stage of our political and commercial development, whatever may think to the contrary all the Imperialists in Canada. We should not be surprised at the motion submitted by the hon. member ; he should be congratulated for having given us an opportunity of discussing such an important question. At any rate, political constitutions have, since the earliest history of mankind, busied the minds of philosophers and legislators. Varying in form according to the nature and character of the various races, epochs and localities, they have lived through ages amidst strife and dispute, and after a lapse of sixty centuries, they are still before us as a subject for discussion, meditation and study. They are the guiding star of peoples ; they are pregnant with tyranny or with liberty. That is why they have brought about so many bloody revolutions, undertaken either to overthrow or maintain them. Human works are they and therefore not immortal. If we glance over our own political history, we find that the Quebec Act of 1874 was in force only seventeen years ; that the constitution of 1791, which divided the two Canadas, lasted only forty-nine years ; the union of Upper and Lower Canada was maintained twenty-seven years only and re-

placed by the Act of British North America ; and sooner or later the British North America Act will be replaced by some other constitution on whose first page will be inscribed in glowing letters either the principles of Imperialism as advocated by the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton, or those of Nationalism, so eloquently propounded by the hon. member for Labelle, or those of independence.

In 1791 the two Canadas were separated because it was believed that Lower Canada would treat upper Canada unfairly if united with it, as Lower Canada had a larger population. That constitution after all lasted a half century only. The union of Upper and Lower Canada, forced on the latter to make pay a share of the former's indebtedness, lasted only twenty-seven years. The British North America Act replaced it, and sooner or later—witness the history of the whole world from time immemorial as well as ours—that constitution will be replaced by some other. The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton hopes to see the colonial tie last for ever. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) defends the nationalistic principle ; others wish to see the principle of Independence condemned by the hon. member for Brantford, come out with flying colours. And lastly others, although in small numbers and without a voice in this House—would like to see Canada merged into the United States.

Let me then define, in a few words, the principles of Imperialism, Nationalism and Independence. Imperialism as defined by the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton, means the unification of the empire. That is to say England first, England second, England always. That is why Imperialists are opposed to Home Rule for Ireland. They wish the colonies to contribute to the military and naval defence of the empire, in opposition to the policy advocated at the colonial conference by the Canadian ministers.

However, recognizing the British political principle : No taxation without representation, they ask, through the hon. member, colonial representation, in order to obtain the unification of the empire and our contribution to its naval and military defence. They want a Zollverein, which will make of the metropolis and its colonies a single and permanent commercial entity.

In July, 1904, Mr. Chamberlain said at Rochester : 'I believe we could attain the great object of imperial federation by putting our people in contact with that of the colonies and that our commerce would be greatly benefited thereby.'

Then commercial federation, as the preliminary step towards the political and military federation of the empire, such is the object pursued by Mr. Chamberlain. England first, England second, England all the time.

To these principles of Imperalism which I merely enunciate without expressing any opinion as to their merits not more than regarding the merits of Nationalism or Independence, let us now oppose the Nationalist principles which are summed up in Canada first, Canada again, Canada always. Any expenditure undergone by Canada must be for the benefit of Canada.

Accordingly, they have seen with pleasure England recall her troops from the military posts at Halifax and Esquimalt. They are favourable to the passing of a commercial treaty with England, which would ensure to both countries reciprocal advantages. They allege that we owe nothing to England. It is not for our benefit, say the Nationalists, that she has conquered India, Egypt, the Soudan, the Transvaal, since, according to Sir Charles Dilke, the British fleet exists for the protection of commerce and not for that of the colonies. They claim for Canada the right to make her treaties subject to ratification by England. They also claim for Canada the greatest measure of independence consistent with the maintenance of the colonial tie. That is why they have approved the appointment of a Canadian officer commanding ; that is why they approve of the provision under which our militia cannot be sent outside of Canadian territory except for the defence of the country. That is why they have approved of the dismissal of Lord Dundonald.

As for those who want independence, they give reasons very different from those given by the hon. member for Brantford. Advocates of independence desire Canada to be a sovereign and perfectly free state. I am not expressing any opinion as to the merits of these various policies ; but I think it might be of some benefit to the House to make known the grounds on which independence is claimed for Canada. It must be admitted that England by handing over to us Halifax and Esquimalt has furnished to the advocates of Canadian independence a strong argument, especially if we do not lose sight of the Monroe doctrine propounded by the neighbouring Republic. In accordance with that doctrine, the United States are bound to protect the countries of this continent against all foreign aggression. Allow me to quote the words of a man who has occupied a prominent position in Canada, and who was a warm advocate of independence :

When Washington, liberator of the United States, stood up for Independence, the population of the thirteen states numbered 2,000,000 only ; their budget was for $8,000,000 only. What progress in the lapse of one century ! People from all over the earth throng towards its borders and take their share of the sumptuous banquet offered for their subsistence. The territory of the Republic is cut up in all directions by railways and canals, which are in such great need for the transportation of products that they hardly suffice to carry them from one end of the Union to the other. And the European nations bless from day to day

this prosperous Republic which distributes to them, in abundance, gold, raw material, bread, life. The resources of that nation are incalculable. She could give no better proof of it than the way in which she paid up her public debt as rapidly as it had been contracted.

Never has their been a people to show greater ambition, a greater spirit of enterprise, a keener faith in the incredible energy of the human will. Where will they stop? The wave rolls on with increasing force gathering into the Republic the varying elements swirled into the ocean of its material prosperity. Their wealth and their population are encreasing at an unheard of rate. Now do you think that if the colonies of New England had remained in tutelage they would have found such an unlimited scope for development and attained such marvellous results? Do you suppose for one single moment that if the United States had been held back by the colonial tie, their genius would have been as free, their spirit of enterprise as daring and sublime? Would they have become in such a short time one of the richest, of the most powerful and of the most respected nations of the earth, if they had remained colonies?

Such are the reasons urged by those who want independence for Canada. They want a sovereign and free Canada.

Let me quote the following words uttered by Mr. Chamberlain, at Rochester, on July 26th, 1904:

We are speaking of our colonies. You know, ladies and gentleman, that these colonies are not ours, inasmuch as we have no right of ownership over them. The colonies are states absolutely independent. Nothing could prevent them from cutting themselves away from us to-morrow. We would not be in a position, we would not dare, to keep them back by force. They are bound to us by a voluntary tie, the obligations of which have never been heretofore well defined. Had they refused to contribute a single man or a single penny (to help England in the South African war), we would have had no ground for complaint.

Such are the reasons given in support of the principles of Imperialism, Nationalism or Independence.

I do not think there is any necessity of speaking of those who favour annexation to the United States, as their numbers are too small; but allow me, Sir, before concluding, to state once more that we are opposed to the principle of colonial representation for the reasons I have just given. And in so stating, I am the spokesman of the people of my own nationality. However, we do not oppose it impelled by any feeling of disloyalty to the British Crown, as suggested by certain newspapers in Canada who are inimical to us. Some people consider us French Canadians as an obstacle to national unity. In the meantime, we have more than once safeguarded that national unity. Less than a quarter of a century after we had been ceded to England, there was an uprising of the American colonies. At the time we had no very great reason to cherish the military and civil officers which our new metropolis had sent to replace the French governors. Our hearts were still bleeding, and our only solace was the guarantees contained in the treaties. Nevertheless, at the command of our leaders, at the signal given by Bishop Briand, our militiamen followed Carleton and saved the country.

Yes, we were the men who at that time saved Canada for the British Crown. Had we listened to the suggestions of Lafayette, had we taken arms under the Stars and Stripes, England's power on the American continent would have been shattered, and nothing of it would be seen either in Quebec, Ontario or Manitoba.

She would not have retained those provinces any more than she was able to repress the thirteen states of New England.

And thirteen years later, when the American colonies tried once more to have us follow in their train, our French Canadian militiamen, under Mr. de Salaberry, repulsed the enemy. At the call of Sir George Provost, at the call of bishop Plessis, with courage and loyalty, we strengthened the power of England over this country settled by our ancestors and which was then much more the fatherland of the French Canadians than that of the Anglo-Saxon element.

That spirit of loyalty has never failed. At the time of the Trent affair, at the time of the Fenian raids, or whenever it was necessary to contribute men or money, we have shown ourselves to be faithful to our oath of allegiance.

National unity! Do you know what will bring it about? It is the national spirit. And the national spirit is, first, loyalty to the Crown; it is, in the second place, respect due to treaties and compacts; it is love of the country; it is discarding of prejudices in all sections of the country. That respect, that love, that discarding of prejudices will bring about a co-operation of muscle, heart and brain throughout the country; and that three-fold co-operation will make of us truly the nation which the fathers of confederation, Sir John Macdonald and Sir George Etienne Cartier, Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Hector Langevin, Mr. George Brown and Mr. McGee dreamed of establishing in 1867.

A grateful country has erected close to this building a bronze monument to the memory of Sir George Cartier. The artist has represented him holding in his left hand the Canadian constitution, and, with his right hand, showing it to passers-by. If we are willing to respect the fundamental principles of that constitution, the nation dreamt of by the fathers of confederation will be united, glorious and prosperous.

Mr. J. B. BLACK (Hants). Mr. Speaker, the member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) was kind enough to make reference to some remarks that I was said to have made in this House. He was

also kind enough to volunteer some advice which I have not asked. I can scarcely understand why the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) should have assumed to advise me to apologize, considering that, as he claims, he has not a drop of English blood in his veins. I presume that same generous spirit, that same desire to assume other people's burdens made him do this that prompted him to take the responsibility of the South African war off the hands of the British people and to go down to South Africa to conquer the Boers. I believe he did the trick and returned to his grateful countrymen with no greater mishap than having in some unexplained way got his trousers wet and his boots full of warm water. I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that I have never consciously wounded the feelings of any man, any individual or any nation. I have for forty years been practising a profession that has forbidden me the time or the opportunity to learn the arts of public speaking. I have had no time to do it, and, by the way, I think it was a pity that the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) had not been barred in the same way for forty years. But I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, that I was speaking on a subject, which is of great interest to every medical man. I was speaking on a subject, which is dear to every man who loves his fellowmen ; I was speaking in a very modest way for I have never made any profession to being a speaker. I was a stranger in a strange audience and I said what I had to say in a very quiet and very unassuming way. I was taken off my course by the siren voice from that gentle spirit that reigns in the breast of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and I did, in repeating a sentence, use the word 'Englishmen.' I might have said just as well Scotchmen or Irishmen.

Mr. BARKER. No.

Mr. BLACK. I could just as well have said either of these ; the name of the country dropped from me quite unintentionally. Anybody who listened to me on that occasion knew what I was trying to say, that the money spent in saving the lives of good Canadians was better than money spent in bringing immigrants into this country. Everybody who has the spirit of fairness in him will know that this was what I meant, that I meant no insult to Englishmen, or to any one. I have no reason to insult Englishmen and while I will not apologize at the order or on the advice of the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes), if there is an English born member in this House who thinks that I did him or his nation a wrong, I shall be most happy to apologize. It was my first speech in parliament as I said before; it was my first slip and I hope it will be my last. I would be very grateful if that mistake of mine would terminate as the sin referred to by Lawrence Sterne when Uncle Toby swore. Sterne says it was his first oath; it was my first slip. It was 'Uncle Toby's first oath' and the accusing spirit which flew to Heaven's chancel with the oath blushed as he brought it in. And the recording angel as he wrote it down, dropped a tear and blotted it out for ever. Perhaps some kindly reporter may have dropped a tear on that slip of mine and blotted it out for ever. Look in 'Hansard' and see.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) has opened a subject which has engrossed the minds of some of the best men of the British empire for many years past, and my hon. friend is aware that so far no solution has been found for the problem which has been opened by this question. My hon. friend remembers that, I think some twenty years ago, the Imperial Federation League, which had been created for the very purpose of trying to find some solution, some means of effecting a federation of the British empire, was abandoned and dissolved, and the statement was made openly by the president of the league, Lord Rosebery, that it was dissolved because no practical means could be found of effecting the object which the league had in view. I must say to my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) that I do not think a solution is to be found within the four corners of his motion. I do not know how far you can reconcile the first part and the latter part of that motion. In the first part my hon. friend says that it would be advisable to have a full partnership union of Great Britain and her colonies, and in the latter part of his motion he says that such a union will leave to the existing parliaments their present powers and the full control of their tariffs. It is difficult to conceive how it is possible to have a full partnership union of the empire, and at the same time leave to the present existing parliaments their control of the tariffs. If there is anything which would go to make possible a full partnership union, my hon. friend would be the first to admit that it would be the possession by the parliament of such a union of the power to deal not only with financial but also with fiscal matters, and if at the same time the parliaments existing to-day would retain the powers to make tariffs, each as at present with a view to what is best for itself, I think it would be difficult to have at the same time the paramount union of the British empire and her colonies. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) saw the difficulty which would be encountered if we attempted to carry out such an object as my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam.

Hughes) has in view and at the same time retain the measure of power which we have at the present time. I do not think that it would be possible to find in any of the self-governing colonies, any desire or any intention to part with any of the powers which they have at the present time. I am disposed to agree, I agree altogether with what has been stated by the hon. member from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) that the British empire is a great factor for the peace of the world. It is I think, an advantage not only to the empire but to mankind at large, but at present we are proud to say and to believe that the relations of the British empire within all its parts are absolutely satisfactory and so long as they remain satisfactory I think it is idle to hope or to think or to suppose that any departure will take place from the existing relations. It is not in accordance with the traditions of British history, it is not in accordance with the traditions of the Anglo-Saxon race, however, to make any change in their institutions until these institutions have been proven insufficient or deficient in some way. You may follow British history from the time of the Roman conquest to the present day and you will be obliged to admit that not one of the constitutional changes that have made England so great and proud has taken place except when some grievance has been found to exist in the realm. As soon as a grievance was found to exist in the realm the British people, not at all rapidly, somewhat slowly, but always effectively made the necessary changes. If, however, the conditions existing at the present time in the British empire are deficient and no longer answer the purposes of the empire, I have for my own part no doubt that means will be found to remedy these deficiences. But so long as they are found satisfactory, so long as there is contentment in every part of the British empire, as there is to-day, I am sure that all efforts to change these relations will be futile. The British empire to-day is composed of nations; it is an aggregation of nations all bearing allegiance to the same Sovereign, and there is this difference between the British empire of the present day and the empires which have been seen in the past, that whereas the empires of the past rested on force, the British empire so far at least as the great colonies are concerned, rests altogether on the will of the colonists themselves, under such circumstances, my hon. friend has brought to the attention of the people of Canada, a question which I believe is not ripe at the present time. I do not find fault with him for doing so; it is a question which can always be treated, and treated advantageously even though at the present time it seems to be premature. I hope my hon. friend will withdraw his motion.

77½

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). I desire to add only a few words to what the Prime Minister has said. I am very glad indeed to learn that the right hon. gentleman regards the relations of Canada with the empire as so entirely satisfactory, for it is not more than eighteen months ago when he himself announced in this House, that they were so absolutely unsatisfactory that we must attain to a greater share of the treaty making power. I do not know what my right hon. friend then meant; that is what he said, he may have meant something else and it is for himself to explain at the proper time. The right hon. gentleman certainly took very strong ground at that time with regard to the relation of this country to the rest of the empire by reason of the occurrences which led up to the Alaska boundary award. However that may be, if the right hon. gentleman entertained any doubt on that subject he has changed his mind.

I agree with him that the development of our relations with the rest of the empire came by a process of gradual evolution and as necessity required. That has been the history of our country for the last one hundred and fifty years; it has specially been the history of the advances we have made in our rights of self government from 1837 up to the present time. It has been step-by-step that we have gained the almost complete—I might say absolutely complete—rights of self government which we enjoy in Canada to-day. Another thing that might be added is that in respect to all these matters the initiative has been taken by the people of Canada through the public men of Canada. It is therefore a very worthy subject which the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) has brought to the attention of the House. Even those of us who may not be disposed to absolutely agree in all his remarks, nor in the words of the resolution—indeed some of us see difficulty in practically carrying out the scope of his resolution according to the proposals suggested in it—but all of must agree that he has brought before the House a very interesting question, and one on which it is well worth while that the House should deliberate as it has done to-day.

As to the financial features of the resolution, I for one have been of opinion for a number of years, that the material prosperity of the empire, and the ties which bind its different portions together, may be improved and strengthened by a system of mutual trade preferences within the empire. I have advocated a policy of that kind, so far as this country is concerned, both in this House and upon the public platform. I have seen no reason whatever to take back anything I have ever said on that question, and I absolutely believe at the present time that that policy is a good one for this country and for

the empire as a whole. I realize to the full, that while we are at perfect liberty to form our own conclusions in Canada as to the wisdom of that policy for the empire at large and for Canada especially, nevertheless it is equally within the right of all other portions of the empire to come to a conclusion for themselves. A movement was inaugurated by Mr. Chamberlain in the British Isles some two or three years ago ; it is a movement that no one of us expected to see begun for the next fifteen or twenty years, although most of us believed that it would be inaugurated sooner or later. It has encountered a great deal of opposition, and what the outcome of it shall be at the next general election we do not know. In so far as it touches the material welfare of the British Isles it is a matter entirely for the people of the British Isles. Speaking for myself as a Canadian, I am heartily in sympathy with the movement and I believe that the people of Great Britain, the people of Canada, and the people of the other dependencies of the British Empire could come together upon a business basis and make an arrangement by which each would give to the other certain preferences and certain advantages, in trade matters which they do not extend to other countries. If this could be accomplished, it does not seem to me there is room for doubt that it would result in great benefits not only to Canada but to all portions of the empire. I for one sincerely hope that many who are within sound of my voice, may live to see that great project become an accomplished fact.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am highly gratified with the result of the debate. We have obtained an expression of opinion from the First Minister, and also from the member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau) and also from the leader of the opposition, I would like to compliment the hon. member (Mr. Bruneau) upon the very able speech he delivered, but I regret that my want of familiarity with the language in which he addressed the House has prevented me following his speech closely. However, I knew enough of it to know that the first to uphold colonial representation in the imperial parliament was a French Canadain. I learned among other important and new facts contained in that speech, that the time is not far distant when others of that race in Canada may be found advocating the same imperial policy.

Before the dinner hour the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson)—who is now conveniently absent from his place—rose to reply to my remarks and by his profession you would imagine he was a follower of the meek and lowly one, while from his practice you would think he was a representative of the nether regions, judging by the manner in which he plunged into your humble servant, because, as he said, I had charged members on that side of the House with favouring independence and annexation. I hold in my hand 'Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Liberal party' by Willison and on page 114 will be found an article from the pen of the present Prime Minister, written long years ago I admit, and not at all in accord with his views of to-day. I will not now place it on 'Hansard.' If I referred to the fact that gentlemen on that side of the House had favoured such views, it was only to show what power there is behind the old silken cord that binds Canada to the motherland, to win such a distinguished gentleman as the Prime Minister of Canada to the views which we are pleased to know he entertains to-day. I could show that the hon. the Postmaster General has also been won around, and that he is to-day among the first to wear the decoration of his sovereign. I have here also a magazine called the 'World's Work,' in which will be found an article from the pen of an hon. member of this House, a young gentleman who is personally one of the greatest favourities I have in the Dominion. I shall not read that article. I do not find any fault with my hon. friend for writing it, I am tolerant enough to let any man in this country hold whatever views he wishes. I hold my own views and I am prepared to meet any man face to face and eye to eye in friendly assertion of those views. I trust that long before another half century rolls around we will find my young friend following in the footsteps of his worthy leader, to become one of the most ardent supporters of imperial federation. But, Sir, when the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) charges me with intolerance, he is not speaking by the card. I presume that the parallels he drew were of subjects nearest his heart. I am not sufficiently at home in the society referred to, to know exactly the kind of professions of virtue to be found among the people to whom he referred ; I am willing to accept him as a competent authority on all such matters. I think the House will agree with me that from first to last I made no profession of my superior patriotism or my superior loyalty.

Therefore the hon. gentleman's remarks fell very flat. I was also very much surprised to hear him stand up in this House and censure his leader. I presume that it was the right hon. the First Minister to whom he evidently referred when he spoke of shouldering rifles ; I was thunderstruck to hear the hon. member for Vancouver stand up and censure the right hon. gentleman for the remark he made about shouldering a musket in 1885 on the banks of the Saskatchewan over a paltry question of land surveys. I think the right hon. First Minister should take the hon. member for Vancouver to task. Times are going hard with the right hon. gentleman to-day, and I think the least the hon. member for Vancouver could have

done would have been to hold his tongue in solemn silence on such an occasion. Another hon. gentleman has endeavoured to make an apology—I do not know where he is from—has told us how he has been for forty years practising medicine. Well, we all know what some of these worthy gentlemen are who go bumping around the country—they think they own it.

An hon. MEMBER. The member for Hants (Mr. Black).

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is that where he comes from ? Long years I used to have a high opinion of the people of Hants. I must say that, unless there has been some misadventure, I shall have to change my opinion of the people there. This gentleman came to the House and undertook to cast a slur on a great many people of this country who happen to be of English descent. We accept the apology which he has made to the House with very bad grace, and I trust that he will not do it again. He has been taught a lesson which may take the bumptiousness out of him. It is said that the Divine architect of the universe stamps on each countenance the type of conscience that lies beneath. I am satisfied that the hon. members who heard the speech of the hon. gentleman on that occasion, and have seen the abject, crawling manner in which he got out of it, will realize that stamped on the hon. gentleman's whole outfit is the framework of the conscience that lies beneath it. I again thank the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau) for his remarks, although, as far as I could glean them, they were not strongly favourable to the views I have presented here to-day. Nevertheless, they were kindly given, and they opened up the discussion of the whole subject. And let me say to my worthy leader (Mr. R. L. Borden) as I say to the First Minister, that long years ago when I had the honour of standing in this House and advocating colonial assistance in imperial wars, I managed for two years in succession to coax a Conservative member of the House, military man at that, to second my resolution. I could not get a seconder except by courtesy. I was told that it was impossible to carry out the scheme, and any who turn up 'Hansard' will find that on those occasions I had to speak alone. I am not very old; it is not very many years since those ideas were first placed before the House, and the motion withdrawn, as I intend to withdraw this motion. My object was to educate the people. I have great faith in the horse sense and sound judgment of the people. My object was then, as it is now, to place the facts before the people, and I am satisfied that the result, ultimately, will be to bring about the aim I have in view. I have lived, and the First Minister has lived, to see my idea of colonial assistance in imperial wars carried out and carried out successfully. The colonies were all represented in the South African war on the identical lines proposed again and again by me ; and which lines were pronounced impracticable by all parties sixteen years ago. I hope that the First Minister and all of us will live to see, perhaps not in the exact form in which I have laid down here to-day, but in some suitable form, the idea of a full partnership between Great Britain and her colonies carried out—a partnership in which all members of the empire will have equal part. I understood my hon. friend from Richelieu to say that Canada would be only a small part of the great imperial concern. Well, Canadians are not noted for taking a back seat, on the contrary, they are noted for being aggressive ; and I feel satisfied that in any such confederation as that which has been spoken of to-day, we shall have the voice not only of Canadian representatives, but representatives from Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. I hope it will be only a year or two before we meet with Great Britain in full partnership parliament and if the motherland insists on the dog wagging his tail, the tail may take the notion to turn around and wag the dog, for the colonies will soon, combined, be more powerful than the motherland. But there would be no question of Motherland vs. Colonies. The lines would be drawn otherwise. I thank the First Minister for his kind words and the leader of the opposition for his kind words, and above all I thank my good friend from Richelieu for the kindly manner in which he has discussed the subject which I have had the honour to lay before the House and the country. I beg Mr. Speaker, to withdraw the motion.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. Mr. Speaker, before this matter is finally disposed of, there are just one or two observations that I desire to make in the absence of my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson). The hon. member for Victoria and Haliberton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) has intimated that my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) is conveniently absent to-night. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am in a position to state that the hon. member for Vancouver has good reasons for being absent, and the insinuation comes with very bad grace from my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) that he has other than good reasons for not being here. But so far as regards the observations addressed by my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) to this House, I have only to say that I endorse every one of them.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Just what I would expect.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. No doubt, and I have no doubt also that that is just what every member of this House would desire

the hon. member for Victoria should think. It ill becomes him to stand up in his place and cast insinuations of disloyalty and pass reflections on the loyalty of hon. members on this side. I might give the hon. gentleman the record of some of his own leaders in the past. When I was young in politics I heard the same old insinuations cast against the loyalty of the Liberal party in this country, but the more I have studied the history of that party the more I am convinced that at all times it has been distinguished by its loyalty to the British empire. In the days when the Liberals were in opposition their loyalty was as strong to the Crown and empire as could possibly be that of the party of which the hon. member for Victoria is so distinguished an ornament. But what do the records of that party show ? Do they not show that the only men in this country who signed manifestos asking for annexation to the United States were men who led the Conservative party, one of whom was the Conservative First Minister in the House of Commons, of whom the hon. member for Victoria was a meek and humble follower ? My hon. friend, however, conveniently forgets that little fact when he is treating this House to his philippics on loyalty. I am not going to take my cue from him and make any insinuations against the quality of his allegiance to the empire, but, like my hon. friend from Vancouver, I am quite prepared to resent any similar imputations from the hon. gentleman or any of those he supports. A few moments ago, when addressing this House, my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) professed that he did not understand the allusions made to rifles by my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson). Well, Mr. Speaker, I propose to give my hon. friend a little enlightenment on that point. If he will turn to the Montreal 'Gazette' of the 27th February last he will find there an explanation of that allusion. He will find there an interview with a gentleman by the name of Sam. Hughes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Read it.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I intend to ; and I think that after I have read it, the House will come to the conclusion that it ill becomes that hon. gentleman to get up here and prate about the unity of the empire. If there is one man in this country who has sought to foster a spirit of disunion in this country, it is the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes). Let there be no mistake about that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. My hon. friends opposite, who are seated around the hon. member for Victoria, may well laugh at him. I do not blame them. They are doing the right thing when they show their opinion of their colleague by laughing at him.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I knew my hon. friend's opposite could not refrain from showing by their laughter the opinion they have of their colleague. The people of this country after all can be trusted for their good judgment in matters of this kind ; and it is comforting to myself, as I am sure it must be to every hon. member on this side, to find that even my hon. friend's own colleagues, the men who sit behind him on his own side, think so little of his professions and declarations in a matter of so much importance that they cannot refrain from laughing at him. It is rather gratifying to us on this side to find that the opinions of this hon. gentleman are regarded as of so little importance even by his own friends. But what does the hon. gentleman say ? He was interviewed in Toronto a short time ago regarding an important question before the people of this country to-day. And let me say here that this is peculiarly a time when men who desire that our people should live in unity, when men occupying responible positions in this country and anxious to see good will prevail among all classes, should speak calmly and preach moderation and tolerance. We are here of different races, different origins, different religions, and it is important that we should live in union, peace and harmony side by side ; and, so far as I am concerned, I am determined that what little I have to do in public life shall be in the direction of bringing about a better union and greater harmony among the various people, races and religions which make up our nationality. But what does my hon. friend from Victoria do, and what are some other hon. gentlemen who occupy front benches on the Conservative side doing ?

Mr. LALOR. How about your own side ?

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Have no fear with regard to my side. Let me say to my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) : You do not find any appeals going out from the front benches of the Liberal party or the back benches of the Liberal party to the people asking them to stir up religious strife throughout this Dominion. But such appeals have gone forth from the front ranks of the Conservative party. They have gone forth from the man who occupies a seat to the right of the hon. gentleman who leads the Conservative party in this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Let me say that I do not for a moment allude to the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Morin), who is just now occupying for a moment the seat of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). I am free to admit that my hon. friend from Dorchester can fill that seat with a dignity equal to that of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), but

the Conservative party do not regard my hon. friend of sufficient importance to give him a place of honour in the front rank, and they have selected to fill that place with this gentleman from whom has gone forth an appeal asking that religious strife be raised in this country.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. A. Johnston) has made a statement with regard to myself, has alleged concerning me a certain fact. I emphatically deny that statement, and I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw it.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the statement I have made is not absolutely in accordance with the facts, I shall be glad to withdraw it. But let me submit to my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) the point whether——

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. I want the statement withdrawn. He has no right to make that statement in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) denies the statement his denial must be accepted and the statement withdrawn.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I cheerfully accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and withdraw the statement I have made concerning my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule). However, I am sure that my hon. friend is not prepared to deny that he sent out a circular to people in this country asking them to interfere in a matter that is now under public discussion, and to interfere in a manner calculated to bring about misunderstanding between the various classes of our citizens. Will he deny that he has at least gone that far? I have made the statement that from the front bench of the Conservative party has gone this appeal to the people asking them to bring about a condition of affairs calculated not to draw the people closer together but to drive them further apart. Is that the lesson we wish the people to be taught? I think not. Yet, those who would teach this lesson are those who come before this House and undertake to read their fellow-members lessons in loyalty. We are not taking any lessons in loyalty from our hon. friends opposite. But I rose chiefly to justify the statement made by my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) this afternoon. If we look at the Montreal 'Gazette,' which is an excellent authority and will be accepted as such by my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton, we find that in its issue of February 27, a despatch which is of interest in this connection. It appears under the startling headings, 'Will be trouble.' 'Separate schools will breed rebellion, says Colonel Hughes.' I do not know whether this Colonel Hughes is the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton, but, report has it that this Colonel Hughes and the hon. member are one and the same person. And here is how the despatch begins :—

> Toronto, February 25.—Colonel Sam. Hughes, interviewed here to-night on the Northwest separate school question, said : Mark my words——

It seems to me these words have an aroma of antiquity about them. But we have not marked his words.

> ——Mark my words, there will be a rebellion in the Northwest if the Dominion parliament forces separate schools on the new provinces.

Is that bringing the people of this country closer together? Is that in harmony with the speech of the hon. member (Mr. Sam Hughes) this afternoon ? I am sure I can safely appeal to my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) who sits immediately alongside of him that these are not desirable words to come from one who, for the time being, occupies the important position of representative of the people in the Canadian parliament. I am sure that many hon. gentlemen on that side, as well as many on this side, will agree that these are not timely words to come from one charged with the responsibility of representing the people of Canada on the floor of parliament. But, what more does he say ?

> The Bill is the most tyrannical piece of legislation ever introduced in Canada.

'Tyrannical.' This is teaching a lesson of unity and harmony indeed.

> It resembles acts of the dark ages.

Let me say to my hon. friend——

Mr. INGRAM. I rise to a point of order. We have legislation before this House which is not under consideration now, and the question the hon. gentleman is discussing is not the question before the House, but legislation that is on the Order Paper.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. If I may be allowed a word, I am discussing the question that has been raised in the discussion precipitated by my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton. The question of loyalty to the mother country has been running through this whole discussion, and I am considering whether we are doing what we ought to do to teach the people of this country to be loyal to the British empire.

Mr. INGRAM. I again raise a point of order. What is before the House is the motion for leave to withdraw a motion.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. My hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) must bear in mind that you, Mr. Speaker have not yet put that question.

Mr. SPEAKER. As I understand, what the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. Johnston) is speaking to is this : The hon. member for

Victoria and Haliburton is his speech made reference in some way to guns——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How do you know that, Mr. Speaker ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Because I heard him. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) had in the same debate, made reference to the same matter. As I understand it, in the opinion of the hon. member (Mr. A. Johnston) who now has the floor, the hon. member for Vancouver was misconstrued, and it is to rectify what he believes to be an error that he is speaking

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. But Mr. Speaker, allow me to point out——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) will not interrupt, but will allow me to finish my ruling. It is in order to rectify a misunderstanding and it is to that point, I understand, that the hon. member (Mr. A. Johnston) is directing his remarks.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I rise to correct you, Mr Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. That is my ruling, and if the hon. gentleman——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I rise to a question of fact——

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) desires to take exception to the ruling he has his remedy, which is to appeal from that ruling.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I take exception to the statement made to the House by you, Mr. Speaker. You made the statement that in my speech I made reference to guns. I made no such reference, directly or indirectly, and therefore your statement is entirely wrong.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I desire to continue the observations I was addressing to the House. I know that hon. gentlemen not only on this side, but on the other side, are anxious to know what my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton had to say in Toronto on the 25th of February, with regard to bringing the people of this country closer together—for that is a question which is ever present to his mind. This is what he said :—

The Bill is the most tyrannical piece of legislation ever introduced into Canada. It resembles acts of the dark ages. Rifles will be used if necessary.

Is that the way to bring about harmony between the various classes of this country and of the British empire ?

Roman Catholics will fight if they are allowed.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Hear, hear.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. 'Hear, hear,' the hon. gentleman says. As one of the Catholic representatives in this House let me tell the hon. gentleman that the Roman Catholics have no desire to fight. When the time comes, should it ever come, when the British empire is in danger, my hon. friend will find the Roman Catholic people of Canada prepared to do their duty to the empire. When it is a question such as the hon. gentleman was discussing, when it is a question of bringing the various classes of our people closer together instead of driving them further apart, my hon. friend will find the Roman Catholic people doing their duty and doing it loyally. He will not find them advising Canadians to take up arms in order to do injustice to others. As one who pretends to know something about what the Roman Catholics of this country are thinking about at this moment, let me contradict my hon. friend's statement that they will fight if they are allowed. I give that statement a most emphatic contradiction. What else does he say ?

Protestants will fight to a man.

The hon. gentleman may know better than I do, but if I know the Protestant people of this country—and I was brought up with them and have lived with them all my life—he does not correctly represent Protestant opinion in Canada when he says that they will fight to a man. We can safely appeal to the Protestant people of this country, and we are not taking any stock in the deliverances of the hon. member from Victoria and Haliburton in his speech at Toronto to the effect that the Protestants of this country were desirous of rushing to arms over this question. What was his purpose in speaking at Toronto ? Was it to bring about union among the people, or was it for the purpose that is, perhaps, more dear to his heart, of tearing them further apart than they are to-day ? It is for him to answer that question. I am bound to say that the language he used in Toronto speaking to the newspapers, language that has been telegraphed over the country, would seem to bear the construction that is put upon it even by some of his own friends. He says :

The Galicians will fight. They came to Canada for liberty.

The Galicians, I want the hon. gentleman to know, will bear testimony to the fact that in Canada they have found liberty, liberty of the highest kind. I want to tell him that in my judgment and in the judgment of men who know the Galicians, they are satisfied with the freedom they have found here. Does the hon. gentleman desire to convey the impression to people abroad that if they come to Canada they will not find freedom here ? He is a member of the Conservative party, perhaps he desires that his words should be

telegraphed to the United States and to European countries in order to create the impression that if people come to Canada they will not find freedom here. There is nothing to justify such a statement from the hon. gentleman. I had hoped that some of his own friends would take him to task for it ; I had hoped that representatives of the Conservative party would correct the impression that might have been made by his statement, occupying as he does the prominent position in that party. I hope they will yet avail themselves of the earliest opportunity to say that so far as they are concerned they are not willing that the impression should go forth that this is the opinion of the Conservative party. That is not the opinion of the Liberal party. Long before the Liberal party came to power in Canada they were striving to bring about freedom of the very best kind, and the best order in this great country. But how is it with the Conservative party ? In their press from end to end of Canada, prominent newspapers have undertaken to preach the same doctrine propounded by the member for Victoria and Haliburton. If he is desirous that peace and harmony should reign in Canada, let him address himself to the newspapers of his own party, and ask them to take the lesson that he attempts to preach to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. There are many other things that have been spoken during the course of this debate that I would like to comment upon, but I will not detain the House longer. I did not intend to say all that I have said. I rose for the sole purpose of doing justice to my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) who spoke before six o'clock, and I have done so. I have now to ask the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton to say if he can that he never authorized this interview with the 'Montreal Gazette,' and if he can say that, he will do much to remove an unfortunate impression that has been caused by that interview.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. A. Johnston) generally contents himself when he rises to ask a question. But to-night he is playing a different role. As a general thing this House recognizes the fact that no man requires information worse than he does, and the House takes him good naturedly and endeavours to satisfy his curiosity. But sometimes he gets beyond bounds, as he has done to-night in attacking my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes). It is not my purpose to defend my hon. friend, he is quite capable of taking care of himself. I would not have risen to speak at all were it not that the hon. member for Cape Breton unnecessarily, unreasonably, improperly, and I was going to say, untruthfully, made a statement with regard to myself that I had endeavoured to arouse passion among the people of this country, that I appealed to a certain class of people.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. Who is the hon. gentleman that said hear, hear ? It is the cigarette smoker. Of course he is entitled to special consideration.. He requires that we give him two kinds of pardon—I will not tell him what they are.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. He does not write circulars to the papers.

Mr. SPROULE. Since the hon. gentleman has come into this House he has received courtesy from this side of the House, though his conduct at times has not invited courtesy ; but if he does not conduct himself with a little more decorum, he will not receive as much in the future as he has done in the past. Now, with regard to the question before the House, the hon. member for Cape Breton says that the member for East Grey has endeavoured to arouse passions and create discord. Upon what authority does he make that statement ? Is it upon the authority of the petition that I sent out to the general community in accordance with the right of every British subject to petition parliament to do a certain thing that he thought was right ? Is that not my right and the right of every British subject under the Crown ? It is recognized in parliament and out of parliament to be the highest right of a British subject. I was availing myself of that right, and I was quite within my right. I shall read the letter so that there may be no mistake as to what it contains, and if the careful examiner finds that I have done a very improper thing I shall be greatly surprised. In view of this important question that was coming up and was likely to create discord—and let me remind the hon. gentleman that it was his leader who brought it into the arena and not mine, and that upon this question one of the most important ministers resigned, and in doing so he was quite within his rights—it was in the endeavour to prevent the calamity and the political trouble that I foresaw that I adopted the measures that I did. What did I do ? I addressed to a society to which I belonged, which is a law-abiding society, no matter what part of the country it is in, composed of tolerant, respectable citizens.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. Tolerant ?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, tolerant. I addressed them in the following language :

Ottawa, February 16th, 1905.

Dear Sir and Brother,—

We believe an effort is about to be made to impose separate schools for all time on the people of the new provinces, now being established in the Northwest Territories. It behooves every lover of liberty, and especially every Orangeman, to lend a helping hand, to prevent this injustice being perpetrated on a liberty-

loving people. Being comparatively weak and helpless, they must largely depend on others to fight their battles for them.

The effort made in 1896 to compel Manitoba to grant separate schools nearly drove the people of that province into rebellion, and had it not been abandoned, would doubtless have resulted in serious consequences. In view of this, is it not little short of criminal folly to attempt to deprive the people of these new provinces of the right to control their own educational affairs as to them seems best. I would suggest that every member of our order lend a helping hand to prevent this outrage by writing or wiring and getting others to do so as well, the member for his constituency to oppose any legislation or enactment for that purpose. If we speak out freely and do our duty no government would dare to disobey our request. Brethren, let us do our duty ; also get accompanying blank petitions signed by all friendly to our cause, giving name and occupation in every case, and forward to me to House of Commons post office, Ottawa, at earliest possible date.

T. S. SPROULE.

And here is the petition that accompanied it :

To the Honourable the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, in parliament assembled:

We, the undersigned electors of the electoral division of do pray that in granting provincial autonomy to the Northwest Territories the Dominion parliament will not by any enactment or otherwise withhold from the newly created provinces full and unrestricted freedom of action in all matters affecting the establishment, maintenance and administration of schools—

Is there anything improper in that ? Is there any appeal to race prejudice, or to passion, or to creed ? Is there anything but the most respectful prayer that could be presented to parliament by any British subject in the country, and that for the purpose of preventing the importing into the political arena of Canada at the present time of one of those vexed questions that would result in arousing a great deal of feeling and doing a great deal of injury ? Was I within my rights or was I doing an improper thing when I did this ? If I was wrong in asking parliament to do that, the Minister of the Interior must have been wrong in resigning. Who induced me to do this, who compelled me ? The very acts of the Prime Minister himself by the introduction of this Bill induced me to do it. Then who is responsible for it ? Is it I who was trying to prevent it being done or the party who was importing the element of discord into this House and into the country at large, that element which had created so much bitter feeling in the past, and which experience has told us we had better avoid if possible in the future ? Which one was doing the proper thing ? In view of that, does the hon. member who has just taken his seat think he was justified in his endeavour to castigate the member for East Grey in the peculiar fish-wife style to which some speakers are so admirably adapted ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. Does he think that he was within his rights and doing the highest type of parliamentary duty when he gave vent to the utterances which we have heard to-night ? If I was wrong in petitioning in the direction I did what has the hon. gentleman to say for himself and his leader and his friends, who have addressed petition to their confrères in Quebec, copies of which are being presented at the present time, some of which were presented to-day, against the very petition I have read ?

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU (Three Rivers). I am glad my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has put the question. I will continue the history of these petitions. There is in Montreal a club called Le Club Jacques Cartier. I think the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) know the place well. In that club was drafted, I understand by a man who has been very notorious of late as being the distributor of the tory corruption fund in the Sault Ste. Marie election, the petitions which I hold in my hand. Le Club Jacques Cartier is the head of the organization of the Tory party in Quebec. This petition which I hold in my hand was sent to the various Catholic organizations in Quebec, or at least in the constituency of Three Rivers, but luckily in my district they were not taken up as the hon. gentlemen expected. Some of them have been sent here to be presented to this House, and I am credibly informed, and have reason to believe, that it is a continuation of the game started by the hon. member for East Grey. In Ontario and the western provinces the cry is : Let us Tories take the lead and not permit this legislation to be carried, it is against provincial autonomy ; but in Quebec we will present the other side of the medal, and we will tell the people to present petitions to the Prime Minister and the House. I notice that these petitions were taken to the Prime Minister and by him sent back to the members for the different ridings in which they were signed. They are worded :

(Translation.) Whereas in the Bill to establish and provide for two new provinces in the Northwest Territories, the following provisions are to be found, namely :

16. The provisions of section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, shall apply to the said province as if, at the date upon which this Act comes into force, the territory comprised therein were already a province, the expression 'the union' in the said section being taken to mean the said date.

2. Subject to the provisions of the said section 93, and in continuance of the principles heretofore sanctioned under the Northwest Territories Act, it is enacted that the legislature of the said province shall pass all necessary laws in respect of education, and that it shall

therein always be provided (a) that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the said province or of any less portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name it is known, may establish such schools therein as they think fit, and make the necessary assessments and collection of rates therefor, and (b) that the minority of the ratepayers therein, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein, and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor, and (c) that in such case the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assessment of such rates as they impose upon themselves with respect thereto.

3. In the appropriation of public moneys by the legislature in aid of education, and in the distribution of any moneys paid to the government of the said province arising from the school fund established by the Dominion Lands Act, there shall be no discrimination between the public schools and the separate schools, and such moneys shall be applied to the support of public and separate schools in equitable shares or proportion.

Whereas in the above mentioned provisions, the vested rights of the minorities in both those provinces are sanctioned and provided for ;

Whereas said provisions are agreeable to the spirit of the constitution which governs the Dominion of Canada ;

Whereas the reasons set forth by the right hon. the Prime Minister, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in support of said provisions, on the 21st of February, 1905, meet with the entire approval of the undersigned petitioners, irrespective of party affiliations ;

Whereas efforts are being put forth to have this legislation amended or withdrawn ;

We, the undersigned petitioners, do emphatically protest against such unfair an attempt, and respectfully beg that the above mentioned provisions be passed into law, during this session and maintained in their whole tenor as they now stand, as a full measure of fair-play and justice.

And we beg the right hon. the Prime Minister to lay down this petition on the table of the House of Commons.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

For the benefit of my colleagues who do not understand the French language, let me state that they are asking that separate schools be established in the Northwest Territories and that we do not legislate otherwise than in that direction. I am an admirer of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) but I certainly do not share his views and especially so when he talks as he did in that Toronto interview.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bureau) says there was one petition distributed in the west, and a different one in Quebec.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Permit me to say that I distributed this petition through the province of Quebec the same as in other provinces, and it has been signed by the electors of that province and I presented several petitions from the province of Quebec to the House.

Mr. BUREAU. I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) who is one of the leaders of the party if any of these petitions which I hold in my hand were distributed in Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. I never saw them before.

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid we are getting perilously near losing sight of the motion in question before the House.

Mr. MONK. I rise to make a personal explanation because my hon. friend (Mr. Bureau) has referred to me by name. For the first time to-night I have heard of these petitions. I have not been to Montreal for quite a time ; I do not think I have been in the Jacques Cartier Club since the beginning of the session, and I know nothing whatever of these petitions. I am sure there is not a member in this House from the province of Quebec who would lend himself for a single moment to the ignoble role which has been suggested by my hon. friend.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). Mr. Speaker, this is the outcome of allowing too much latitude in debate. If members were to confine themselves to the actual question before the House, probably you, Sir, would have less difficulty in controlling the House, and probably it would be more creditable to members on both sides. A good deal has been said about the legality of these petitions, and I take it that probably there are Conservatives throughout the Dominion who are in favour of the legislation as well as those who are opposed to it, and both sides have a right to petition this House so long as as they do so in proper form. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) may have made some statements of a controversial character but I do not think he went to the extent which my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. A. Johnston) charges him with going. If the hon. member (Mr. A. Johnston) wants to evince a disposition to allay strife and ill feeling in this country I can assure him that he has taken the wrong method to-night.

Mr. J. B. MORIN (Dorchester). The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. A. Johnston) referred to the member who was sitting near the leader of the opposition, and I want to know if he alluded to me ?

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Most certainly not.

Mr. MORIN. I am told he mentioned the member for Dorchester.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I made no reference to my hon. friend (Mr. Morin) when I spoke of the gentleman who sat beside the leader of the opposition.

Mr. MORIN. I am told you spoke of the member for Dorchester and if you did I am the man.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker I have just a few remarks to make——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has exhausted his right to speak unless he desires to make an explanation as to matters on which he has been misconceived.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not wish to depart from your ruling, but if necessary I shall have the debate adjourned.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is quite open to the hon. member.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I want to make a personal explanation ; I dont't want to continue this circus any longer.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member must not speak in that manner to the chair. If the debate is to be conducted properly the hon. member must address himself properly to the chair.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville) I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) has gone out of his way to quote some remarks which are attributed to me in a newspaper, I had no idea that the prophecy would be fulfilled so soon; I had no idea that the rebellion would take place in the Liberal party; I did not think they would be in rebellion as they are at the present time over those Bills. I thought it would be confined to the people of the west, but I see I am a prophet before my time. The hon. gentleman said, that it was Conservatives who had signed the petition for annexation to the United States. I do not know who are Conservatives and who are not, but I happen to know a number that are Liberals and here are some names : J. Aumais, A. Archambault, J. Barsalou, L. Boyer, John Cassidy, J. N. Fournier, S. Fournier, L. H. Holton, Achille Hebert, J. J. Lamontaigne, R. Laflamme, A. C. Papineau, and a number more. However that is neither here nor there. I will just point out that the question at that time was not annexation to the United States or no annexation to the United States ; it was immediately following the rebellion of 1837 and it was in response to the passage of a Bill, justly or unjustly passed by the legislature of Canada, to compensate the rebels whose property was destroyed. The cry of loyalists was 'no pay to rebels,' and on the passage of the Bill they were much annoyed and signed in their anger the manifesto. I rose to make that correction, and to ask that my motion be withdrawn.

Motion to adjourn the debate withdrawn.

Motion (Mr. Sam. Hughes) withdrawn.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MORIN.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business may be expected to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. We will consider the resolution in reference to the packing and sale of certain staple commodities, and on which I am told several gentlemen wish to speak. If government business is advanced we will ask the House to go into supply on Public Works estimates.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 14, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

During the presentation of petitions,

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey), after having presented some petitions, said : I present these petitions from the electors of East Assiniboia, because the hon. member for that riding seems to regard it as an insult that petitions should be sent to him.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (East Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. The hon. member for East Grey has stated that I considered it an insult to have petitions from Eastern Assiniboia sent to me for presentation to the House. I just want to say that there is not a man in Eastern Assiniboia who voted against me in the last election for whom I would not be very glad to present a petition.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think there is something before the chair. The hon. gentleman rises, he says, to a question of privilege.

Mr. TURRIFF. I just want to say that if any of my friends, or my opponents, who are also my friends, in Eastern Assiniboia have petitions for presentation to this House, I am quite satisfied that they will send them to me, and I will always present petitions which come to me in anything like the proper form. I presented some petitions which came through the hon. member for East Grey, but I drew attention to the manner in which these petitions were drawn, and the manner in which that gentleman got these petitions sent to him, so that he could get the credit through the west of presenting them.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a question of privilege. I want to say, according to my best information, which I take from the Postal Guide and from the headings on the petitions, that I sent to the hon. gentleman several petitions from his own riding, every

one of which he commented upon adversely when he presented them, intimating that the hon. member for East Grey had done something wrong, and he seemed to regard it as an insult. Therefore, I have availed myself of the opportunity of presenting them to the House to-day.

PACKING AND SALE OF CERTAIN COMMODITIES.

House in committee on the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Act respecting the packing and sale of certain staple commodities, by inserting the following sections after section 4 :—

4a. When apples are packed in Canada for export for sale by the box they shall be packed in good and strong boxes of seasoned wood, the inside dimensions of which shall not be less than ten inches in depth, eleven inches in width, and twenty inches in length, representing as near as possible two thousand two hundred cubic inches.

2. Every person who offers or exposes for sale, or who packs for export, apples by the box otherwise than in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section shall be liable, on summary conviction, to a penalty of twenty-five cents for each box of apples so offered or exposed for sale or packed.

4b. When apples are packed in boxes or barrels having trays or fillers wherein it is intended to have a separate compartment for each apple, then the provisions of section 4 and 4a shall not apply.—Mr. Fisher.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). When the House was last in committee on this resolution the point was raised as to whether subsection 2 would apply to apples for export only. I referred the wording of this section to the Department of Justice, and so as to make it perfectly clear they suggested that the words 'for export' should be transferred from the end of the clause so as to make the section read: 'Every person who for export offiers or exposes for sale, &c.' I propose that the clause be amended so as to read in that way.

Mr. SPROULE. I have some communications regarding this Bill which contain suggestions which might be valuable. A gentleman writing from Montreal says :

With regard to clause 4a in reference to the exporting of apples in boxes, we find that unless the boxes have strong bands nailed tightly at the top of the box at both ends so as to ensure ventilation when loaded on the steamer, the apples suffer considerably from want of ventilation. The bands should be at least one-half inch wide and the same in height. Unless this is done the apples are packed so closely on board the steamers that there is positively no ventilation and the fruit suffers in consequence. With the bands above described the apples cannot be packed and loaded on the steamer in a solid compact mass, as the bands provide a means of ventilation through leaving one-half inch space between them.

I have another letter here from Messrs. Wm. Nivin & Son of Montreal, who write :

With reference to the Bill introduced by the Minister of Agriculture, we think it a sensible one in some respects, particularly so re the idea of having the size of the package uniform. In the case of butter boxes one-half hundredweight, fifty-six pounds, is the box used practically in all large butter producing countries. Apples as a rule are a cheap article and must be packed in as cheap and strong a package as possible. The box package is steadily growing in favour with the shippers, but owing to the season of packing apples being so short we are inclined to think that the box package will not replace the barrel for a long time to come. If apples were packed in a warehouse it might be different, but, when the packing has to be done in the orchard with the elements to work against, the quickest mode of packing will always be the most favoured. If the box package is at all to be used, then we think it should be made uniform in size and one-third of the regular three bushel barrel should be the most convenient. Re the strength of the wood and the penalty clause, we are inclined to think they are too severe, at all events for some little time to come.

I have another here which is as follows :

I am much obliged to you for sending me copy of the clauses of the Bill to fix, by law, the dimensions of the apple boxes to be used for export.

The minister, I know, has taken the action on the recommendations of the different Provincial Fruit-growing Societies ; but I find an interview with him, with reference to the subject a few days ago, and recommended a box twenty-two inches long, similar in dimensions to that box which has been used for some years by the government in packing apples for the European exhibitions, and I notice that the Bill has been altered to read 'shall not be less than, &c.,' which covers the point.

The twenty inch box holds barely one-third of an apple barrel, and most of the fruit growers in this province, who are exporters, prefer the twenty-two inch box as it undoubtedly holds one-third of a barrel, exclusive of excelsior, which must necessarily be used to tighten the package.

Clause 4b of the Bill protects my own compartment case, which is used largely for the exportation of superior fruit.

I think the Bill is necessary and will meet the requirements of the Canadian exporter of apples as well as the English dealers.

Yours very truly,

R. W. SHEPHERD.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend will remember that the consideration of this resolution was postponed in order to permit some members to consult their constituents upon the subject. I have had several communications from the county of Jacques Cartier where there are large orchards and, without taking up the time of the committee in reading these communications, I may say that the gist of the letters is that there is no objection to this Bill. Some of my correspondents stated that it would probably conduce to better conditions in the trade.

In spite of that I still respectfully maintain the attitude I took when this matter first came up for consideration, and I think that the ends of trade and the advancement of trade in this country and in England, to which country most of the shipment of our apples takes place, would be better served by some other way. It does not seem to me, for instance, that the adoption of such a law as this, the carrying out of which must cost us some money, would be of much advantage for instance, in Jacques Cartier, where there are large orchards and where great quantities of apples are produced. Probably that law will remain inoperative in that county. The mere passing of a law specifying the sizes of boxes will tell nothing to most of those apple growers, whereas, as I pointed out to the minister when we first discussed this matter, it seems to me that information conveyed to these apple growers as to the conditions of trade in England and as to the size of box that sells best there, would immediately be far more advantageous. Any expense which might be incurred to furnish to the apple growers and exporters of apples information as to how they can best succeed and make the most money out of their apple trade would be more beneficial. I still persist in that view, although none of the reports which I have received are unfavourable to this law. Of course in most of our counties in Quebec there are many who grow apples in large quantities. These apples are sold on the market in Montreal, sometimes to exporters. Last year in my own county there was an immense crop of apples, and some orchards yielded as much as 2,500 to 3,000 barrels of apples. They packed these apples in barrels and sold them in Montreal to large dealers. The committee will be surprised to hear that last year apples were sold from orchards in my own county at a dollar a barrel. When you take from that dollar the cost of the barrel and the time taken up in conveying the apples to the city of Montreal it will be plain to the committee that the profit is not very considerable. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has read a letter from a gentleman who, as my hon. friend the minister (Mr. Fisher) is aware is probably the best authority on apple growing in Canada, Mr. Shepherd. Mr. Shepherd took a different course with the product of his orchard. He packed them in boxes and sold them in England and his apples netted him, he told me himself, over $5 a barrel, in fact almost $7 a barrel. In Quebec, for instance on the Island of Montreal, and in Saint Hilaire, there are immense orchards. The mountain of St. Hilaire last year produced 30,000 barrels of apples. What they require is not a law, but such information as Mr. Shepherd gave to me as to the conditions of trade in England. If the growers had that information they could fill the requirements of the British market with advantage to themselves. In other words, I do not think that it is by legislation that we should meet a case of this kind, but by information conveyed to interested parties, just as the commercial agents of the United States throughout the world convey information to the government of their country in regard to the conditions, exactions and general trend of trade in the countries where they act as commercial representatives. From these reports the commercial people of the United States derive information which is given from time to time, but not given in the shape of a law, information which enables them to meet these conditions with profit to themselves.

Mr. BLAIN. I also have some correspondence with respect to this matter, both from my own county and from other parts of Ontario. One gentleman whom I regard as an authority on this matter writes saying that in his trade, which is very extensive with the city of Glasgow, he has been exporting his apples in boxes which are 9 x 12 x 18 inches. This was very near the size mentioned in the minister's resolution, but not exactly the size. This gentleman states in his letter that he has on hand at the present time 4,000 boxes of these dimensions, and he is very inquisitive to know whether the minister proposes to bring this Bill into operation this coming season or whether he will give an opportunity for those who have large stocks of boxes such as this gentleman has on hand, to work them off and export them during the coming season. Another point mentioned in one of these letters is that a smaller box should be permitted. He sets forth in his letter that the growing trade of the old country in many sections, particularly in Glasgow, calls for smaller packages and he suggests that a package one-half the size named be permitted in the law that is being introduced by the minister. Those two points I think are worthy of attention, first of all whether it would not be well to allow a smaller size containing one-half the quantity and whether it would not be in the interest of the exporting public to allow one year or possibly more for dealers to work off their old stock of boxes which they may have on hand. Might I suggest to the minister that it would be better to fix the quantity rather than the measurements and to allow a man to make his boxes say 10 x 12 and of a different length, working out his own shape of box so that he could use that which would suit his trade rather than the exact shape that is specified in the Bill.

Mr. MONK. Before the hon. minister rises to answer I would like to supplement the remarks of the hon. member for Peel, (Mr. Blain). I took the trouble to inquire from Mr. Shepherd, who is a large exporter of apples, and he found that this was the size of box required on the other side. He

said it was impossible for him to meet the demand for that class of goods on the English market and he seemed to approve of that size of box. He seemed to think that there was a demand in the English market which would consume all the supply we could send from here. That is why I think that if the apple growers, at least down in Quebec, could have the information that would enable them to conform to the requirements of the English trade it would be better because as my hon. friend must have noticed that there was a great difference between the profit realized by Mr. Shepherd and the prices at which apples were sold last year in Montreal, a dollar a barrel, from which you have to deduct the cost of the barrel and the cost of picking and marketing. Mr. Shepherd told me he has realized as much as $7 a barrel by putting the apples in this kind of package.

Mr. FISHER. These are matters which have been discussed, not only in the department, but in the meetings of the Fruit Growers' Associations over and over again. I appreciate the endorsement of the principle of the Bill which my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier has just given. He thinks however that it would be better to let the result aimed at come about without any Bill. Well, what he proposes has been going on for at least three or four years. The people have been informed on these points and have been working in this direction ; but at the same time these same people have been asking for the passage of a Bill such as the one before the House, because they have found that the law has worked very successfully with regard to barrels, and that law is exactly the same with regard to barrels as the one we are now proposing with regard to boxes. The law with regard to barrels has prevented the making of barrels of a great variety of shapes and sizes, and we propose to do the same with regard to boxes. A variety in shapes and sizes works very unsatisfactorily in the loading and handling. The size we should adopt has been thoroughly discussed by those who make the boxes and those who pack them. Of course there are some who have different views, but the consensus of opinion of the fruit-growers endorses the dimensions indicated in the Bill. Those organizations which hold exhibitions and give prizes for apples packed in boxes, specify that the boxes shall be of the dimensions provided in this measure. My hon. friend has suggested that we should provide for a measure of capacity rather than size in inches. That however would allow differences in shape, which would be objectionable. If a measure of weight were provided, that would not serve the purpose because apples vary considerably in weight, according to the variety. Some weigh as low as 38 pounds to the bushel and others go as high as 43 pounds. Each of these boxes is supposed to contain one bushel weighing 40 pounds. Where the apples are a heavier weight, the boxes would weigh more, and in the reverse case would weigh less. To those who want a measure by capacity, I would say that each of these boxes is one-third the present minimum standard barrel. The trade in boxes is increasing somewhat but it is still very small. I believe that this last season it was not over 2 per cent of the whole export, but a number of people prefer to ship in boxes because they can make more profit that way than by shipping barrels. For many years, however, the bulk of the shipping trade will be in barrels, because the ordinary shipper will not undertake to put apples into boxes as that involves greater trouble and care. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier instanced one gentleman who ships in boxes. I know the gentleman very well and I know that he gets a very large profit from his boxes, but I question whether most people would be equally successful. Mr. Shepherd has a particular clientele in England, reaching from the King downwards, to whom he sends regularly a special and fixed number of boxes every year, and these are boxes which do not come under this Act, but contain pasteboard divisions, each of which contains an apple of particularly careful selection. And of course, very rightly and justly, Mr. Shepherd gets a very high price for that fruit. He sends an extraordinary good article, and he has advertised it well and got it into the hands of the people who are willing to give the highest price for the best article. Consequently he enjoys a great profit from that trade. Other people are aiming in the same direction, but, perhaps, not doing quite so well as Mr. Shepherd—at least, I do not know anybody who is. And these people connected with the trade have advised us that to help on that trade, to bring about an increased box trade, a standard minimum box ought to be fixed; and it is in answer to that appeal that this proposition has been made. I ask the committee to pass it and make it into law.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I would ask the minister if this box, 10 x 11 x 20 inches is the same box that the Fruit Growers' Association of Ontario are using at the present time? And I would also ask the minister again if this standard box is intended for the export trade only? I may say that if that is the intention, I have a letter from a correspondent, who is one of the largest shippers in my constituency—and I come from a large fruit-growing district—who is particularly anxious that the box established shall be uniform throughout the Dominion. He seems fairly well satisfied with the dimensions of the box as proposed by the minister.

Mr. FISHER. I explained to the committee that this clause in the Act will apply

only to the export trade. Some people would like it to apply to the internal fruit trade also. But, as the barrel is fixed only for the export trade, we thought it better, for the present, at any rate, to make the size of the box applicable only to that trade. I have no doubt that when the size is fixed for the export trade, the same box will be used more and more for the internal trade, and, perhaps, in time, it may lead people to ask us to make the same provision for the internal trade.

Mr. HENDERSON. I quite agree with certain features of this Bill. I believe it is a good plan to make provision for the shipment of apples in boxes. Last year great difficulty was experienced throughout the province of Ontario in getting the requisite material for making apple barrels. I have no doubt that great quantities of apples were lost because of the fact that a sufficient quantity of barrel material could not be obtained in time for packing the fruit. The manufacture of boxes is much more simple in itself; it is something the shipper can carry on himself in the winter months when he is not so particularly employed, and, in that way, possibly, a saving can be effected for the producer of the apples. I regret, however, that there is a difference of opinion as to the proper size of the apple box. In the county I have the honour to represent, the county of Halton, there are a considerable number of shippers of apples. Some very fine fruit is grown there. We are adjacent to the Niagara peninsula which is one of the great fruit-producing sections of Ontario. So far as my constituents are concerned, they are not at all suited with the size of box described in this Bill. There in the region of Burlington they have been shipping apples in boxes for some fifteen years. At first they commenced shipping in a larger box. But they found this not so suitable and gradually reduced the size of the box, until now they have discovered a box which they consider very convenient. It is a smaller box than that described in the resolution; instead of holding one-third of a barrel, it will hold one-quarter of a barrel. They give various reasons why this is a more suitable box. I think that if the minister's experts look carefully into the matter, they will find that the box of the dimensions he has given will hold less than one-third of a barrel. The standard barrel is well known, and I think it may be well to adhere to that standard and to have a box that will be some even fraction of a barrel. The cubic contents of a standard apple barrel are 6,600 inches. One third of that would be 2,200 inches, the size of the box set forth in the resolution. The size of box used in my county is 9 x 12 x 18 inches, the cubic contents of which are 1,944 inches, or for four of them 7,776 cubic inches. Yet it is found that the apples that fill four of the boxes will exactly fill the standard barrel, while apples that fill three boxes of the size described in the resolution do not fill a standard barrel. The apple shippers in my district are anxious that the smaller-sized box should be adopted. Now, these men, I am quite sure, are members of the Fruit Growers' Association. They must have been consulted. I scarcely know where the minister has obtained his information, and what association has informed him that a box of the dimensions given in the resolution is the one most approved. The box containing a quarter of a barrel is certainly approved in my section. One reason is, as I have said, because it does contain a quarter of a barrel. Another reason is that a good deal of the sorting and packing of the apples is performed by women, and they complain that where the boxes are large the work is too heavy. They have to carry the boxes from place to place in the preparation of them for market, and they find a smaller box more convenient. Now, this is a very important matter, because, if apple shippers are compelled to employ male labour, instead of female, they may have to pay twice as much for it, so that there would be a considerable enhancement of the cost of sorting and packing the apples. I may tell the minister that I have letters on this subject from several correspondents, one of whom is especially well known to him—Mr. A. W. Peart, of Burlington, who is a fruit expert whose opinion has great weight wherever he is known. This gentleman highly approves of the box containing a quarter of a barrel rather than the box containing a third of a barrel.

As I said, they have been shipping apples from that section of the country in boxes for some fifteen years, and they find it very satisfactory. They have established a market for that size of boxes, and it will injure the prosperity of their trade if they are obliged to abandon the boxes for which they have established a market in the old country, and set to work to establish a market for another kind of boxes. Mr. Peart tells me that last year, notwithstanding the low market price for apples in the old country, he sold King apples 6 shillings per box, four boxes to the barrel, or 24 shillings per barrel, which to my mind is a very good price indeed. Northern Spys sold at 5 shillings per box, which would be equal to 20 shillings per barrel. In a low market these were certainly good prices. Now these people are alarmed, and fear that the trade which they have established with a box of the dimensions I have given, 9 inches in width, by 12 and 18, may be interfered with, and they will have to begin over again and establish another trade in place of one which it has taken them some fifteen years to work up. It is a dangerous

thing at any time to interfere with the trade of the country, and I think considerable time should have been allowed to elapse before that size of a box is adopted, so as to allow the men who are engaged in this business to get their patrons in the old country accustomed to the change. They tell me that there are people who have box material on hand which will last them for two or three years; and as the member for Peel has said, it would be a serious matter to these people to have to throw aside all this box material and purchase other. Therefore, I think this Bill should not be forced upon the people in less than two or three years. Gentlemen in my county ask that the Bill should not go into force until the year 1907. I trust the minister will weigh these matters fully, not only with regard to the size of the box, but with regard to the time when the Bill should come into operation. To my mind the labour question is a matter worthy of consideration, and possibly the minister's attention may not have been drawn to it; but it will affect people not only in the county of Halton but in a good many other sections of the country.

Mr. MACDONELL. I fully approve of the remarks of my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson). I have taken advantage of the delay which has been allowed by the minister since he first brought this measure up for consideration, to consult the apple exporters of the city of Toronto. The minister points out that he has had consultations with the Fruit Growers' Associations, and also with the manufacturers of boxes. I submit with due deference to the minister that the persons who are most concerned in this measure, who are indeed vitally affected by it, are the apple shippers, the apple exporters, not only those who ship their goods from the Niagara peninsula to the city of Toronto where they find a market for them, and where the apples are boxed up for the foreign market, but those who export those apples to the foreign market. I find among that class of people only one opinion, and that is that while endorsing the principle of the Bill, that while there should be a standard size for the boxes, they should also be allowed a smaller size and a larger one. I will read an extract from a letter I have received from Mr. James, of Toronto. Mr. James is one of the most extensive shippers of apples from the Canadian market. This season he has shipped as many as 4,000 cases on one steamer. Mr. James says:

> The different markets require different packages. If we are ever going to get into the French markets, which we can do when European crops are short, we require a small package less than a foot square, and fancy wrapped fruit, only the very choicest.
>
> The South African market wants a larger package, I have been shipping one containing two cubic feet.
>
> The British markets, Liverpool in particular, prefer barrels, and while it has been experimented on time and again it has been clearly proved that the bulk of our apples will net back more money when shipped in barrels than in any other way. There is a limited market in Britain for boxed apples if fruit is fancy, but the traders over there prefer the larger package.

On the 15th of February, Mr. James sent a letter to the hon. the Minister of Agriculture from which I will read this extract:

> I would respectfully submit that the matter be left in abeyance in the meantime, until we can have a Dominion convention and ascertain the exact feeling of those interested in the matter. Of course I am not averse to the proposed Act providing there is a clause permitting the use of other boxes while calling the box you suggest the standard apple box, but where certain markets require a larger or a smaller box I think it would be detrimental to the trade to prohibit their use.

I submit these considerations to the minister, and suggest that while the principle of the Bill is being endorsed, it will meet with wider acceptance if he allows the matter to be worked out according to the best judgment of those who are in the trade, and all the good the measure contemplates will have been accomplished. But I do submit that having regard to the experience of apple exporters, both to the European markets, especially the French market, and to the South African and the English markets, that while the boxes named in the resolution may be called standard boxes, it would be right and proper to permit a smaller box to be used, and that where the trade requires a larger box, that also should be allowed. I think the Fruit Growers' Association are not the only ones who should be primarily considered in this matter, but it is the exporters, those whose business it is to buy the apples from the fruit-growers, they are the people more vitally interested in the question as to the size of the boxes. As to the manufacturers of boxes, their interest is very trifling in comparison, and should not be allowed to weigh in the mind of the minister against the interest of the exporters.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. I wish to say a word with reference to the boxes in which apples are proposed to be placed. Having had a good deal of experience in selling apples for the last thirty-five years, I should know the wants of the retail trade. I think it is a move in the right direction that we should place these apples in boxes instead of in barrels. There are several reasons why boxes are preferable to barrels. In the first place many persons do not care to buy a full barrel of apples; they only want a box. If you buy a barrel of apples and put them in the cellar where it is warm, before that

barrel is used up the apples become shrunken and deteriorate in quality. But where you buy a box of an ordinary size you can easily use them up before they deteriorate. Then in shipping these boxes, they take up less space on the car and are easier handled. Then there is a scarcity of the material for making barrels. The material is getting scarcer and scarcer each year. It requires a certain amount of skilled labour to make those barrels, whereas boxes, as has been truly remarked by my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson), can be made by an ordinary handy man in the winter time when he has nothing else to do, and stored away ready for use when the time comes. Another thing in regard to the size of these boxes. I am confident it does not make much difference what the size is, providing there is a standard size and that you always adhere to that size.

I cannot conceive why it is necessary that the box should be one-fourth or one-third or any other part of a barrel. What the dealer wants to know is the size of the box of apples and how many apples there are in the box. The boxes in which oranges come from California are of uniform size, and on the end of each box is stamped not only the name of the packer, but the number of oranges in the box, so that the retailer knows exactly how he can sell them. The same is the case with prunes. On the end of each standard box of prunes which comes from the growers in California or Oregon, is stamped the number of pounds in the box and the number of prunes to the pound ; so that the retailer knows exactly the size and the number of prunes he is getting. The same rule will apply to apples. The shipper will stamp on the end of the box the number of apples it contains, so that the dealer will know exactly what he is getting. In our section apples are sold by the pound as well as by the piece ; but it is far more convenient, when retailing them, to know exactly the number of apples in the box. If you have too small a box, you cannot face the apples up in the way you could with a fairly large-sized box. The standard that has been adopted is perhaps as good as any other we could have. It is large enough to admit of the apples being faced up properly, and any one can handle it, whether a woman or a man. The retail trade is demanding boxes for apples more than ever. It is only recently that they have come into use, but the more the retailer has them, the more he likes them. I think the sooner this law is put into force, the better it will be for all, the retailer as well as the shipper.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Since this matter was last before the House, I have taken the opportunity of making some inquiries as to the best size of box, and the more I have looked into the matter the more I am convinced that the proposition of the hon. minister is not a good one. It is in the same category as the seed Bill : it is a meddlesome piece of legislation, which is calculated to make trading more difficult than it is at present. That is never a good move. Trading is difficult enough under the best conditions, and it should not be hampered in any way by legislation. The hon. gentleman proposes to make a hard and fast rule as to the size of the box. I do not think he has made it clear to this House that there is any serious demand from either the consumers or the shippers of apples for a box of the particular size proposed. Every one knows that apples are of different sizes. As a rule, they are packed in layers, and large apples, such as the King of Tompkins and the Ribstone Pippin, cannot be packed into the same number of layers as small apples ; so that the hon. gentleman should regulate the size to which apples shall grow before he attemps to regulate the size of the box in which they shall be packed. He has evidently gauged the size of the proposed box from the size of the orange box. There is no comparison between the two. The orange is a fruit which can be compressed and conformed to go into a certain sized hole, and pressure will not hurt it ; but pressure will effectually destroy the apple. I have written to a gentleman connected with a firm which exports more apples from the Dominion of Canada than any other firm. It has connections in Glasgow, Liverpool and London, and exports very many thousands of barrels, sometimes running up into the hundred thousand, per annum. If you are going to interfere with a trade of that class, you are going to injure both the fruit-grower and the shipper. In my own county last autumn I saw lying on the ground thousands of barrels of apples for which no packages could be found ; and they had to be left there to become manure. I regret that we could not realize the price which the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has mentioned, a dollar a barrel. That would be a good price in our neighbourhood. For three-fourths of the apples not more than fifty cents a barrel could be obtained. Every year thousands of tons of apples are waisted on the ground in Ontario for the want of cheap and effective packages. If the hon. gentleman is going to make it more difficult to get suitable packages, he is going to do a serious injury to the farmer and fruit-grower, and to make it still more difficult to deal in apples. The apple is a cheap fruit, and as soon as you make it dear you lessen the consumption. Leave it to the shipper to know and to provide what his trade requires. It is a mistake to make a hard and fast rule with regard to this matter. I have only one short letter with which I am going to weary the House. It is signed by a gentleman connected with a firm which handles three times the quan-

tity of apples handled by any other firm in Canada ; and which has agencies in Liverpool, Glasgow and London :

Brantford, February 13, 1905.

Dear Sir,—While it is desirable to have uniformity in style and size of packages for apples, as a matter of fact no one as yet positively knows what size will be found the most economical and best suited for the purpose. There may be a consensus of opinion, especially from those who have but one view point, but those fully acquainted with the conditions governing the trade from stem to stern would hesitate to name the dimensions of the best box.

The different sizes of the different varieties of apples, makes it difficult to arrive at a size which will fill the greatest number of the needs. Four tiers (layers) of Kings cannot be properly packed in a box that is suited for four tiers of Baldwins, or Greenings.

To penalize a shipper for packing apples in a box differing in size to that named, is preposterous. Mr. Fisher has got his apple cart before his hobby-horse. He should have first brought forward a Bill to compel nature to produce all varieties of apples of the same size, and then he would be justified in compelling apple shippers to use his 10 x 11 x 20 ' thunder ' apple packages (or twenty-five cents box fine.) I think I but voice the sentiment of the trade when I say no such legislation as proposed is desirable or necessary.

Yours truly,
J. M. SHUTTLEWORTH.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT. Does the hon. gentleman contend that these thousands of tons of apples which he says were lying on the ground in his neighbourhood were marketable fruit ?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I have no hesitation in saying that a large proportion of these apples was marketable fruit, many of them were choice fruit. They were not culls, but apples just as they grew on the tree, and they could not be shipped because packages could not be obtained at any price last fall ; apple barrels were then practically unobtainable in the district whence I come.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT. Is it not a fact that the majority of apples found under the trees are wind-falls and worm eaten ?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. That is true of a certain number of apples found on the ground, but the large majority of the apples I refer to were serviceable fruit, and would have been shipped if suitable packages could have been obtained at a reasonable figure.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. I am very glad that this point has been brought out by my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt), because if we had a uniform box for the whole Dominion there would have been no trouble in securing packages for these apples and placing them on the market. At the present time we have to depend on cooperage for barrels, which are becoming scarcer each year, and which will become scarcer still as the years go by. The Fruit Growers' Association demands that we shall have a uniform box. That association represents the apple growers of Canada, and its members ought to know what is in the interest of the apple trade. They declare that the sooner we have a uniform box the better it will be for all concerned. The chief reason in favour of the resolution is that, packed in this way, the apples can be sold for more money, and the farmer wants all the money he can obtain for his products. I am sure that no one in this House would, if he knew the facts, insist upon the apple growers depending upon barrels, which they are unable to obtain at the present time. The boxes can be made during the winter, when labour is cheap, and they can be on hand when they are required for packing the apples. The box will take less space in the railway car and on the steamer, the freight will be cheaper, and the contents will arrive on the market in better condition. This Bill is manifestly in the interests of all the people, and it should pass without a word of opposition.

Mr. TAYLOR. There might be some logic in the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Derbyshire) if there was anything in the law as it existed last year which prevented people from shipping apples in any sized box they wished. I cannot see why the people of Canada who have apples to export should be compelled to pack them in a box of a certain size. Surely the apple exporters should know something about it, and the letter which has been read from one of the largest exporters in the Dominion ought to guide the Minister of Agriculture in coming to a conclusion. The members of the Fruit Growers' Association do not export apples ; it is the shippers who purchase from the farmers of the country who are interested in the export trade, and they can be relied upon to pack the apples in the most convenient and advantageous form. This resolution does not say whether it refers to apples for export to England, or Russia, or Germany, or anywhere else, and if a particular market demands a special kind of packing, this law will prevent the exporter from complying with the requirements of that market. I do not think the fruit-growers of Canada who sell their apples to the exporter care what sized box the apples are shipped in, so long as they get a good price for them. This legislation is on a par with the Fruit Marks Act, which necessitated a staff of inspectors to see it enforced, and which, as shown by a return which I moved for, has cost the country up to date $63,070. Here are some of the expenses of enforcing that Fruit Marks Act : W. A. McKinnon, $1,550 ; Elmer Lick, $849 ; Richard Burke, $999 ; E. H. Wartman, $999 ; P. J. Carey, $999 ; J. F. Scriver, $1,099 ; Alexander McNeill, $1,200 ; G. H. Vroom, $999 ; F. L. Dery, $999 ; A. J. Philp, $1,099 ; Barton Gandy, $850 ; Freeman Fitch, $600 ; Maxwell Smith, $1,040 ; A.

Gifford, $646 ; G. J. Anderson, $125 ; G. R. Sangster, $450 ; R. J. Rutherford, $400 ; Charles Noreau, $493. The salaries of these gentlemen amounted to $41,284 ; their travelling expenses amounted to $21,398, and the cost of prosecutions to $387, making a total of $63,070 of the people's money which goes to a few of the supporters of the Minister of Agriculture. If this resolution passes it means another staff of officials to see that the farmers of Canada pack their apples in a box of a certain size. The resolution is uncalled for by the farmers and fruit-growers ; if any persons should be heard in the matter, it is the exporters.

Mr. BRODEUR. The farmers have no say ?

Mr. TAYLOR. The farmers should have all the say. My hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Derbyshire) is a large handler of cheese, which is our greatest export dairy product, and I presume that next year the Minister of Agriculture will come down with a law that he shall put his cheese in a box of a certain size. It is the producer and the exporter of cheese that have brought this product to its perfection, and the Minister of Agriculture has no business to interfere with them. He has no more right to say that apples shall be exported in a certain kind of box than he has to say that cheese or pork shall be exported in a particular form of package. When the farmers and fruit-growers of this country find they have to pay $63.000 for the enforcement of this law, as in the case of the Fruit Marks Act, they will come to the conclusion that it would have been better to leave it off the statute-books. In place of enhancing the price of the fruit for the people of this country, this law will have a contrary effect, and in place of half of the apples lying on the ground, as last year, the whole crop practically will be in that condition. At the present time we can export apples in boxes or in anything else, but now they will have to export them in a particular package, and the export will be surrounded with more difficulty. The reason the apples were left on the ground last year was because there were too many apples for the demand, and it paid better to leave them on the ground than to pay labour for gathering them and barrelling them up and shipping them out of the country. Certainly if it is passed it should not be brought into force until we have an opportunity of hearing from the fruit-growers of this country and from the exporters, because it is not the Fruit Growers' Association that have anything, or more than a very little, to do with the export of apples ; it is the purchasers who buy the product of the orchards and pack and export them. I do not think the minister has stated to-day that he has a word from these exporters in reference to the approval or disapproval of this box.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. member seems to have inspectors on the brain. He sees here looming up a staff of inspectors who are going to enforce this law. The hon member is perhaps not aware, although it is on the statute-book, and although as a member of this House of long standing he ought to be aware, he helped to pass the law, he was present when the laws were passed——

Mr. TAYLOR. And he opposed it.

Mr. FISHER. Did he ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes he did.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to see what he opposed ; I have not yet said what the laws are, I have no doubt that——

Mr. TAYLOR. I thought the hon. member was referring to the Fruit Marks Act.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend cannot get away from the Fruit Marks Act ; he has that on the brain as well as inspection.

Mr. TAYLOR. You have something else on the brain.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, I have. I can quite understand that if the motion for the law in question was proposed by the present government the hon. gentleman is quite right in saying that he opposed it. He is always quite ready to jump up and say that a law is bad simply because it was proposed on this side of the House, without knowing what the law is. I can quite understand that because it is of a piece with his conduct in this House ever since the present government came into power. The hon. gentleman says that this is of a piece with the Fruit Marks Act, a continuation of the same policy. I accept the compliment; nothing was ever passed by this House which has served better the interests of the people of Canada than the Fruit Marks Act has served the interests of the fruit-growers of Canada. I accept his compliment and ask the House if for no other reason than that to pass the legislation. But the hon. gentleman says it is simply for the purpose of establishing a new corps of inspectors. We have had the Staple Commodities Act, which this amends, on the statute-book for many years. We have in that Act a provision as to the capacity and the details of size of the apple barrels. There has not been an inspector appointed to enforce that law, not one. The hon. gentleman sees inspectors looming up before his fevered imagination all the time. But it is only his imagination that brings these inspectors into existence ; they do not exist in the flesh and if this amendment is passed there will not be any more inspectors than there are to-day although I suppose his imagination will multiply ten fold and he will dream of them and have the nightmare over them night after night and week after week. The hon. gentleman says that the growers are the people to be considered, the farmers are to be considered. I am proposing this legislation at the request and suggestion of the growers of

fruit. The hon. gentleman is very solicitous in respct of the farmers and the fruit-growers, but before he sat down he forgot that; he changed his position and said that it was shippers and packers who were to be considered and whose interest and views are to shape the legislation of this House and not those of the farmers. The hon. gentleman's views seem to change even within one speech, but as long as he can oppose what is proposed by the present government or any member of the present government he is satisfied. Whether he changes his standpoint or his views or his expressions, it is all one to him, so long as he can oppose what we propose. Mr. Chairman, I need not deal any further with the hon. gentleman and I will not.

Several other questions have been brought forward which I will be glad indeed to deal with. Their propositions were reasonable in their character and were advanced, I believe, in the interest of certain people connected with this trade. They are therefore deserving of every consideration and courtesy at my hands, and I am glad to pay them that. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) read to us the representations of constituents of his. I have had similar representations made by that firm, and I have considered them very fully. I appreciate that this law may, and probably will, to a certain extent, if it go into force at once, somewhat interfere with and disarrange the trade of that particular firm. I did not propose when I introduced the Bill founded on this resolution to have the Bill go into force for this season's trade, I proposed to have it come into force for the trade of next year, I proposed to have it in force for the trade for the year 1906 but not for the trade of 1905. I think that is a reasonable concession to those who have boxes or who have material for the making of boxes on hand. I would say however to my hon. friend from Halton with regard to the size of box indicated, that just the condition of affairs which he describes is what this proposal is aimed at preventing. One of the reasons why the standard was asked for is that people have been using smaller and smaller boxes. Individuals quite rightly under the present law, quite properly if they think it is in the interest of their particular trade have been trying to sell a little less and a little less all the time to the purchasers, and the people who are largely interested in the export trade of Canada have found that just that kind of thing has been injuring the trade in those countries to which we ship, because the people there who buy boxes of Canadian apples do not know how many apples or what quantity of apples they are getting. Purchasers in the old country have complained and it is because of that kind of complaint that the fruit-growers of Canada, who in the last resort are after all, the people interested in this trade, have asked that there shall be a standard box. When they wanted that standard box they took steps to see what the standard ought to be, and after very careful consultation, extending over several years, the Fruit Growers' Association in every province in the Dominion commencing in the west at British Columbia, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, the maritime provinces generally have all agreed upon this particular size and shape of box as being the best compromise of all the existing interests, and the best for the future development of the trade in apples packed in boxes for shipment from Canada. Under these circumstances, not because we wanted to introduce legislation, not because my colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce under whose department this legislation comes, wanted to introduce it, or wanted in any way to interfere with anybody, but because the people who are interested in this trade and in this product of our country have asked that their trade should be helped by this arrangement. I would say to the hon. member for Halton that when a compromise of this kind is come to and an agreement made, it is very likely that one or other individual may suffer a little. That is almost necessary from the nature of a compromise, but if we did not provide a minimum box we could not tell how far down the box would go in size and capacity, and the people who are buying Canadian apples in boxes would never be assured of the quantity of apples they were going to get. That was the reason for the specifying of the dimensions of the Canadian apple barrel; and now that the trade in boxes is beginning to develop, the people who are interested ask that the shape and size should be specified. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) read a letter from Mr. James, as representing the packers and handlers of fruit in that city. Well, I have had a letter from Mr. James in which he says that so far as the English market is concerned, this particular box is quite suitable.

Mr. BRODER. Is this used by any other country?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, by Tasmania which is our chief rival in the English market in the apple trade.

Mr. TAYLOR. At a different season of the year?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, and they adopted that size because they found it the best package for the English market. The only objection taken by Mr. James is that foreign countries think that a different box might be better. As a matter of fact our apple trade in those foreign countries is practically very small indeed at present; and if it is to increase, it will increase more quickly if we use a distinctive Canadian package than an indefinite one.

Mr. MACDONELL. The exporters do not agree with that view.

Mr. FISHER. This proposition has been before the House about six weeks. We allowed it to stand over so that hon. members might communicate with their constituents and get their opinions. It has been before the trade for three years. It was in 1902, that the first resolutions were discussed in the Ontario Fruit Growers' Association. My hon. friend says that these associations do not represent the packers. I think my hon. friend in that is wrong. Large packers, such as Mr. Shepherd and Mr. Shuttleworth, belong to these associations. Mr. Shuttleworth was one of a committee of the Ontario Fruit Growers' Association which first discussed the proposition and recommended the adoption of a standard box, and I have never heard that he dissented from the decision of that committee. A similar committee of the same association next year took up the question and recommended as a standard the box stipulated in this measure. Mr. Shuttleworth is a member of that association, but I am not sure if Mr. James belongs to it. A number of the handlers are, however, members of the association and they all adopted the report of the committee recommending this particular sized and shaped box. My hon. friend from Halton spoke of a particular firm. Well, some of the members of that firm are members of the Fruit Growers' Association. If these people represented at the meetings of that association their views, their views evidently did not meet those of the majority, because the majority decided that a box of this particular size and shape should be recommended as a standard. In fact the fruit growers and packers in all the provinces are in favour of this Bill, and I am proposing it at the request of the representative bodies engaged in fruit growing and packing. My hon. friend says he represents the fruit packers of the city of Toronto. I would have supposed that they would have made representations to me if they had any objection to make.

Mr. MACDONELL. Mr. James says he did.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, but he is the only man in Toronto who did. There may have been representations made to other people, but not to me. My hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) and my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) read each a letter which rather endorses the shape and size of these boxes. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier also said that his people endorsed their shape and size, but the only question to them was the advisability of passing a law with regard to the box. This law, Sir, goes not nearly so far as many people have asked that it should go. Many have asked that this should be a special box and that no other kind should be allowed, but the Bill only goes so far as to provide that no smaller box shall be allowed, and the reason of that is to assure purchasers that when they buy a Canadian box of apples they buy a bushel, which is one-third of the barrel they have been accustomed to buy.

Mr. MONK. What is the administration of this law going to cost?

Mr. FISHER. Nothing more than the administration of staples costs to-day. I am not aware that there is any cost of administration at all. The law is put on the statutes and those who break the law are liable to a penalty if prosecuted. I do not think that under this Staple Commodities Act, there is a single officer appointed by any department of the government for the enforcement of that law. I may say that the law is administered under the Department of Trade and Commerce and not under my own department.

Mr. MONK. Surely, my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) made the contrary assumption the last time this matter was under consideration.

Mr. FISHER. Never.

Mr. MONK. Surely it is not possible to carry out this law, to see to it that these boxes shipped to Europe are all of dimensions not contrary to the law without expenditure? If there is no expenditure, the law will be a dead letter.

Mr. FISHER. It has been done for the last five or six years in regard to the barrels without such expenditure as my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) hints at.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister devoted about thirty minutes to your humble servant and stated that he has had inspectors and expense on the brain. I do not wonder that any taxpayer in this country should object to expense when we find that a few years ago, the Conservative government ran the experimental farms and all the offices in connection with the Department of Agriculture for half the amount now expended and did more and better work. My hon. friend poses as a good representative of the farmer. All through this country our best farmers have on their buildings a wind-mill, a very useful article. When the Prime Minister formed his government he took my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) in as a representative farmer, but, I think more for the purpose of illustrating the usefulness of the article I have referred to, than for any good he could do as a practical farmer. He has been spoken of by the Prime Minister and other members of the cabinet as a practical farmer, a horny-handed son of toil. Naturally, every one was anxious to see him. At his first visit down to Quebec when he was introduced as a practical farmer, one of the farmers thought he would take the minister

out and show him his crops. Among other things they saw a field of tobacco. Is not that a beautiful crop of tobacco ?' asked the farmer. And the minister agreed with him, but asked: 'When is it going to plug out?' He is such a practical farmer that he thought that the plugs of tobacco would grow on the stalks in the farmer's field. Shortly after that, he thought he would teach the farmers how to fatten chickens; and he, or somebody else for him, invented a squirt-gun to pump food into the chickens. When he tried the first batch he burst all their crops. Then he invented a chicken-food made of pea-meal and saw-dust, so as to teach the farmers how to economize in feeding their fowls. The hens that took the feed laid eggs, and when the farmers to whom they were sent had those eggs hatched out, they found that all the chickens had wooden legs. This is the man who poses as a practical farmer and thinks he has the right to lecture a member of the House because that member criticises wasteful extravagance in the use of the people's money. He tells my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that the inspection under this law would cost nothing. But he said that there would be no expenditure for the enforcement of the Fruit Marks Act, and now the farmers find that they have to pay $63,000 under this head for the benefit of some political supporters of the hon. gentleman. The fact is the Conservative government ran the country more efficiently at an expenditure of $38,000,000 than the present government can at an expenditure of $68,000,000. With all their great expenditure what does the country receive? Have these gentlemen built a Canadian Pacific Railway or any other work of importance? Just as this $63,000 I have referred to is frittered away on political friends under the excuse of enforcing the Fruit Marks Act, so another $63,000 will be spent on useless officials engaged in measuring these boxes. The hon. minister says that this Bill fixes a minimum size of box—that people can make larger but not smaller boxes. Then, what is the use of a subsection like this?

4a. When apples are packed in Canada for export for sale by the box they shall be packed in good and strong boxes of seasoned wood, the inside dimensions of which shall not be less than ten inches in depth, eleven inches in width, and twenty inches in length, representing as near as possible two thousand two hundred cubic inches.

If a person makes a larger box he does not make one 'representing as near as possible two thousand and two hundred cubic inches.' And he is liable to the penalty if he makes it half an inch larger than the proportions laid down in the resolution. If the minister means that this is to fix a minimum size, then let him strike out that last line, for with that line in it any man who makes even a larger box for exporting apples will be liable to a fine if brought before the magistrate. Now, I hope my hon. friend will make up his mind to leave the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) alone, and allow him to express his opinion as to the cost of enforcing this Act, or as to any other Bill introduced by the government which, as in this case, seems to have as its principal object the creating of offices for hon. gentlemen opposite to fill.

Mr. FISHER. I suppose I ought to apologize to the committee, if not to the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) for having wasted time upon a reference to him. The burlesque he has indulged in in his reply dictates that I should have been right to leave him unnoticed.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would not have risen again to say a word had it not been that the minister seemed to pass a reflection upon certain gentlemen referred to by me who have been shipping apples in the county of Halton——

Mr. FISHER. I did not intend to cast the slightest reflection.

Mr. HENDERSON—as he seems to insinuate that their preference for the smaller box was based upon the hope of taking advantage of their customers in the old country by getting a larger price for a smaller quantity of goods. I was careful to give the reason why the gentlemen desired the smaller box, and I think the minister has neither answered that question nor given any reason why it should not be considered. I still think that the argument I advanced was a good one. I may say that I did not represent only the views of the gentleman whose name I mentioned, Mr. A. W. Peart, but also the views of a very important organization, the Burlington Horticultural Society. I can tell the hon. minister that the gentleman who writes on their behalf was amongst the first to export apples in boxes, and has been shipping apples in boxes for ten or twelve years, using a box smaller than that adopted by the Minister of Agriculture. The Horticultural Society of Burlington covers a very important fruit district, one that produces large quantities of apples. And the people there favour the smaller box. I have given one very strong reason why the smaller box should be adopted and I would like to hear what the minister has to say about that. These people say that they will be handicapped by the adoption of this larger box, inasmuch as it will increase the cost of sorting and packing. That argument, to my mind, is a very strong one, especially in the present condition of the labour market. I think it a great pity that we should be compelled to adopt legislation here that interferes so materially with trade in this country. The minister seems determined to have a stand-

ard box for the packing of apples. I do not suppose that anything we can say in this House will convince him, no argument will show him, that he is making a mistake. So, we might as well abandon that feature of the case. But I do appeal to him, that if there is to be a standard box—and I assume there will be—it should be of the smaller dimensions I have referred to. I still contend that a quarter-barrel is sufficiently large, and that it will be better than the one-third barrel which the minister proposes.

Mr. FISHER. I hope my words cannot be construed to mean any reflection upon the gentleman to whom the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) referred. I had no such idea in mind. I was dealing generally with one of the reasons why the apple packers and shippers had found it necessary to fix a minimum box, that reason being that the market on the other side wished to know that they always got at least so much when they bought a Canadian box of apples. I did not allow myself for a moment to make any reflection upon such a firm or body of men as have been referred to. As to the labour question involved, I think that particular phase of it was brought forward in the Fruit Growers' Association, and they discussed it on various occasions, and thought that a box of the size indicated by the resolution was one that could be properly and easily handled by the people engaged in this work.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. I had not intended to speak on this question as I spoke some weeks ago when the subject was before the House. I then expressed my approval of the Bill except on one point, and, that I understand, has been a compromise. There really has been some difference of opinion among the shippers as to the size of the box to be used. But I wish to correct some wrong impressions that seem to prevail in the House. In the first place some have the idea that it is intended that the boxes should be used supplanting barrels. That is not the idea. Barrels have been used more largely than boxes, and will continue to be used more largely than boxes so long as the material can be got to make the barrels at a reasonable price—at least that is our impression. Another opinion that seems to be held is that the shippers themselves are against the use of the box. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has intimated that the growers desire to have the box, but that this is not desired by the shippers.

I am speaking as a shipper of apples. I have been engaged in the business for a great many years, indeed I may say that I commenced as a boy in 1880, about twenty-five years ago, in the business of exporting apples, and I have continued in it ever since. Two years ago we shipped over 12,000 boxes, so we have had some experience in the matter of boxes. Besides, we also shipped apples in barrels to a very large extent, some 25,000 barrels, the same season, and we only used boxes because we could not get a sufficient number of barrels that season. I think the shippers are desirous of using a uniform size of box, as proposed in this Bill. I have been in communication with some of the largest apple shippers in the province, since the Bill was introduced, and I may say that in every case, so far as I have been able to learn, there is a desire for a uniform box, of some form. There are different views as to the size, some would prefer a trifle larger, some would prefer the exact size mentioned in the Bill, and some would prefer possibly a trifle smaller. As the minister has intimated, the size proposed seems to be a compromise, and a compromise so satisfactory that I do not think there will be much objection urged against it by the shippers. Then there is another point I might emphasize, and that is the desirability of having a standard for the minimum box. You know the tendency would be in shipping to European markets that if one shipper uses a large box for which the price is fixed, and the trade begins to accept that size, the man who ships in a smaller sized box would in a measure partake of the benefit that accrues to the trade from the price of the larger box. But when you fix the minimum size, they are not permitted to use a smaller box, and that is one of the strong points in support of the position taken by the minister in compelling the use of a minimum size. It is I think desirable to have a box at least as large as is suggested, for this reason, that when the goods are landed on the dock at Liverpool, Glasgow or Hamburg, the rates fixed for handling, that is the dockage charges, the landing charges, and incidental charges of that kind, are based upon the package. It is therefore desirable to have the box of a uniform size, and then those in the trade can make their statement with more force to the authorities on the other side who fix their charges in proportion to the size of the package. That is one of the difficulties we have to-day in shipping boxes to the European markets. The landing charges are exorbitant, they are out of all proportion to the charges that are made for barrels ; but if we have a uniform size then the trade can go to the authorities who fix the landing charges, with a stronger case, if we can show that the boxes used will all be of the standard size, and no smaller. We know however that the tendency will be on this side, not to make it any larger, but to come as near as possible to the size that is fixed by the law. So I think these arguments all tend to confirm the desirability of having a standard box, one that we can all agree upon as nearly as possible. Possibly there may continue to be some difference of opin-

ion, both as to the size of the box and as to the quantity the box should contain, but the differences will be slight. Now, Sir, I want to say again, as I said when this question was up before, that I think the minister is deserving of commendation for the success with which his Fruit Marks Act, put upon the statute-book a few years ago, has been working. I believe the Bill now before the House is likewise calculated to advance the interests of the grower, to advance the interests of the shipper, and to advance the interests of the country generally, because our interests are identical. I am both a grower and a shipper, and therefore can speak for both classes. I think it is just as much to the interest of the grower as it is to the interest of the shipper that these matters should be put upon a basis that will be followed by the trade generally. For my part I can see no reason why any member of the House should hesitate a moment to support this Bill.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The question before the House is one of great importance to the fruit industry of our country. I was sorry, though, to see the Minister of Agriculture deal with the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) in the manner in which he did. It is not the first time this session that I have noticed how some of the ministers of the Crown have tried to browbeat members of parliament on this side of the House when they are doing their best to obtain information from the ministers. However, Mr. Chairman, I think the Bill before us is in the right direction. I agree with the minster in his efforts to fix the size of the box, and to make it a uniform size. But I would like to impress upon the minister what I believe is of more importance to the fruit industry of this country than merely the size of the box and its dimensions, and that is the fact the transportation of fruit in this country deserves a great deal more consideration than the minister has been giving it. In the discussion that took place last session on the subject of transportation of fruit across the ocean and the ventilation of the steamers carrying the same, he will remember that the strongest kind of condemnation was visited upon the administration for the manner in which fruit was transported to the markets of Europe. I hope the minister has remedied to some extent the transportation facilities for perishable fruit. As he is aware, we are subsidizing ships to the extent of $100,000 a year in order to obtain cold storage and ventilation on those ships carrying fruit across the Atlantic.

The minister admitted at last session of parliament that he had practically no control over that cold storage. He admitted that he had entered into a contract some years ago and had granted a subsidy of $100,000 to those vessels ; and yet the department of which he is the head has no control over them. If he will look at the records, he will find that thousands of barrels of apples that are sent across the Atlantic reach the shores of Great Britain in a decayed condition and not fit for the market, simply because the transportation facilities are not what they ought to be. The minister may tell us that the shippers have the privilege of using the cold storage on the boats ; but it is almost impossible to ask the shippers to pay the extra charge placed on the packages put into the cold storage, especially when the thermograph records show that he has no control over the cold storage arrangements. I sincerely hope that the minister will take this matter into his consideration, and give us some legislation that will improve the transportation facilities very materially.

Mr. FISHER. What the hon. gentleman refers to has nothing whatever to do with the subject before the House. I will deal with that when we have some motion before the House that refers to it.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I understand, from what the minister says, that he does not provide in the Bill that the box shall be of a certain size. In my argument I was proceeding on the basis that the boxes would be uniform in size, which I understood the hon. minister to argue would be more convenient for the shipper. Now, I understand him to say that the boxes are not necessarily to be uniform in size, but that they are to be not less than the dimensions specified in the fourth section. That did not seem to be the intention of the section, but if it is, a good deal of my objection is overcome, I admit. But in section 2 it is provided that only apples packed as provided in section 4 shall pass as being properly packed. If the dimensions referred to are not part of the consideration, then I think the hon. gentleman is correct ; but if the dimensions specified in section 4 are those to which we must conform, then I think the hon. gentleman's argument does not well hang together. Another point, which has not yet come out—and perhaps the minister will pardon me for making reference to a subject that he may consider foreign, though it is relevant—is that it is not provided what kinds of apples are included in these provisions. There are produced in Ontario large quantities of dried or evaporated apples, and also of canned apples ; but it is not stated in the Bill whether it is to apply to these or only to apples as they come from the tree. I presume that the intention of the minister is that the Bill shall apply to apples as they come from the tree ; but he does not make that evident in his argument, and the Bill is not conclusive on that point.

Mr. FISHER. In reply to the hon. gentleman's question, I may say that the Bill

applies only to what are called green or whole apples. It does not apply to evaporated, canned or any other kind.

Mr. WILLIAM JACKSON. We are here this afternoon discussing whether or not we shall have a standard box for the shipping of one of our Canadian products. It has been said this afternoon that if the farmers of the province of Ontario had been allowed during last fall to use boxes, they would have saved an enormous quantity of their apples. In answer to that, I would say that if we had left more apples on the ground, some of us would be better off than we are to-day. I do not think that they were destroyed because we had not boxes to put them in, but because apples were not a very desirable commercial commodity last fall. With regard to the argument that if we had the privilege of using standard boxes, they could be made in the winter, the same thing applies to barrels. It does not require any great amount of skill to set up an apple barrel; but I do not think it would be advisable for the ordinary farmer to start in either the box-making or the barrel-making business; he had better leave that to some one else. In regard to the statement that the same quantity of apples sent to Great Britain in three or four boxes would bring three or four times as much as if sent in barrels, that is misleading, because the apples sent in boxes are often of better quality than those sent in barrels. We know that during the last three or four years the price of apple barrels has almost doubled. That is why we are trying to get something else in which to ship our apples to the old country. If we could make a little barrel as cheaply as a box, the apples shipped in it would bring as good a price, and they would go in better condition than in a box. At present, we have a standard barrel, the size of which is, fixed by statute, and if we are going to commence shipping apples in boxes to the old country, we must have a box of a standard size. If we are going to have two sizes of cases, they should be specified. Anything sold by the box should be shipped in boxes of uniform size. In regard to anything sold by the pound, it makes no difference.

As to the size of the boxes, it is my belief that these boxes are small enough. In fact, this Bill does not go far enough in reference to the specifications of the boxes, for it only provides for a certain inside measurement, while, in my opinion, more is necessary. You allow one manufacturer of boxes to put in a certain dimension of material on the outside and another manufacturer to put in different sized material, and so your box will lack uniformity. These regulations should go further, and state what the size of the material in the boxes should be. If you are going to place them in cold storage or on a steamship, you must have the boxes uniform in size outside as well as inside. I believe that this box is plenty small enough; indeed, I would like to sell my apples to the Minister of Agriculture on the principle that the full of one of these boxes is a bushel, because I have an idea I would get the long end of the deal. I do not believe that the minister could get a bushel of apples into one of these boxes; I do not think it is possible he could put a barrel of apples into three of these boxes. I repeat that if we are going to send apples to the old country in cases, we should have a case which is really uniform.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I wish to place before the Minister of Agriculture certain suggestions, the value of which I do not at all know, but which have been communicated to me in a letter written by a gentleman who has a good deal of experience in the shipping of apples. He says:

> I suppose that the Bill merely gives the minimum size and that it is not intended to insist that there shall be but one sized box. The imperial bushel is equal to 2,218·19 cubic inches and the dimensions in the Bill only give 2,000 cubic inches. We cannot offer it as a bushel box; we might be brought up for fraud. If we offered it as a bushel we would be deceiving the public. Moreover, if we wrapped up the apples and put a layer of pulp board between the rows there would be considerable less than a bushel. Instead, therefore, of a box of the dimensions in the Bill, I suggest one 2 x 12 x 9¼ inches which will give 2,220 cubic inches and allow space for packing material, and at the same time give our English customers an honest English bushel. Some of our competitors put up their apples in boxes going as high as 2,418 cubic inches. They will be sure to point out the superiority of their boxes. But if we can show that ours holds a full imperial bushel we need not fear rivalry. We should keep clear of any chance of a charge of deception.

I do not know what value these suggestions have; they come from a gentleman who has some experience in the business, and therefore I thought it my duty to submit them to the Minister of Agriculture for his consideration.

Mr. FISHER. The dimensions stated in the letter have been discussed at the meetings at which the dimensions as printed in the resolution were adopted. The dimensions as printed in the resolution are of the nature of a compromise, and they have been adopted as being on the whole the most feasible and most practicable. One strong reason for the adoption of these dimensions is that the size is very easily made and easily described; the box-makers as well as the packers have an objection to the dimensions of a box which involves the small fraction of an inch. It is true that the dimensions in the resolution are less than the cubic contents of a bushel by, I think, 12 cubic inches.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Eighteen inches according to this.

Mr. FISHER. Perhaps so, but I have understood from those who have considered the matter thoroughly that this was such a slight difference that they did not think it worth while to consider it. I appreciate what the hon. gentleman has said, and I can only say that the question raised in that letter has been thoroughly discussed.

Mr. BLAIN. The resolution states that the package shall be a good and strong box of seasoned wood. Would it not be possible to allow the box being made of other material than wood ? Lumber is now very scarce in some parts of Canada, and they are substituting light sheet steel for it in the manufacture of many articles. Many years ago flour was altogether put up in barrels, but the minister is well aware that linen sacks have been substituted to some extent, and very often flour is sold in paper bags. I think it would be important if the minister provided that the box should be of seasoned wood or of some other suitable material.

Mr. FISHER. I think myself that the substitution of any other material in this country to-day would be so much more expensive than wood that there is no danger of any one wanting to put up apples in a package not made of that material. We have had a few papier maché barrels made, but they have never been practically used. If in the future any such necessity arose, we might amend the clause just as under similar circumstances it would be necessary to amend the section with regard to barrels. But for a long time to come there is no likelihood that any material but wood will be used.

Amendment (Mr. Fisher) agreed to.

Resolution, as amended, reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. FISHER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 121) to amend chapter 26, 1901, respecting the packing and sale of certain staple commodities.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER. I do not see the Minister of Finance in his seat, but I would ask the First Minister whether the Finance Minister has come to any conclusion as to when he will deliver the budget speech.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot give the information now, but if my hon. friend will renew the question, say on Thursday, I think I will be able to tell him.

BANKING ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to inquire also whether the government have under consideration the desirability of making an amendment to the Banking Act, so that there shall be some inspection on behalf of the government of the banks of the country. The right hon. gentleman knows that there has been a recent bank failure in Nova Scotia which has attracted some attention in financial circles, and that failure has renewed discussion with regard to this matter which was somewhat to the fore two or three years ago. I have had an inquiry from one source as to whether it was probable that the government, in view of this failure, would take up the matter again, announce some policy upon it and perhaps amend the Banking Act accordingly. I know of course the objections that have been raised to this proposal before ; I think the principal objection urged by the Minister of Finance was that there might be a certain moral obligation on the government if they carry on an inspection of banks—no more than a moral obligation but one which might give any government trouble —an obligation to compensate persons who had invested money in a bank which had then failed and who might think it would be only fair-play on the part of the country to make good any loss thus sustained. I am not rising for the purpose of advocating any particular form of inspection, but of ascertaining whether the government has this matter under consideration and as possibly it may not be convenient for the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to give an answer in the absence of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) I would be very glad if the next time we go into supply that answer would be given if the Prime Minister cannot now give it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I could not give an answer to the query which my hon. friend makes but I shall consult the Minister of Finance on it. My hon. friend has anticipated I think the views which would be expressed. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) knows that this subject has been discussed more than once; it has been discussed every time we have had the Banking Act under revision, and the feeling has invariably been that there was not much to be done beyond what we are now doing. On the whole I think the Banking Act which we have is about as perfect as we can make it. It may be that there are modifications which might be made, but so far as I know the Minister of Finance has not considered the matter on the lines suggested, but I shall advise with him about it.

Motion (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Department of Marine and Fisheries—contingencies, notwithstanding any in the Civil Service Act, $20,000.

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The last time we were in committee this item, in which there is an increase of $3,500 was allowed to stand. It is explained in the following manner :

For civil government contingencies in 1904-5 the following amounts were spent :

Clerical and other assistance including the payment of $2.25 per day to M. Lamouche, and $650 to W. L. Charbonneau, messenger, and $550 to Henry O'Brien, messenger, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act..	$ 3,000 00
Printing and stationery.	7,000 00
Sundries..	6,500 00
Total..	$16,500 00

The first of these items remains the same for 1905-6. There is an increase in the appropriation for printing and stationery of $3,000 making the vote $10,000 and in the item for sundries of $500 making the vote for this year $20,000 an increase of $3,500. The vote for 1903-4 was $14,500 and the expenditure was as follows :

Clerical assistance... ..	$ 1,323 50
Printing and stationery.	8,029 22
Sundries..	4,239 93
	$13,592 65
Overdraft from 1902-3..	991 53
	$14,584 18
Less refunds.. ..	18 22
	$14,565 96

The amounts charged for clerical assistance are made up as follows :

M. Lamouche, 1 year's salary..	$823 50	
L. Charbonneau, 1 year's salary.... ..	500 00	
		$1,323 50

Mrs. Lamouche's salary is at the rate of $2.25 a day.

The department has been carrying an overdraft from year to year since 1900-1901. Carrying the overdraft in this way has crippled the department and in order to avoid this in the future we are asking for the amount which is now mentioned.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an increase in these contingencies of $3,500.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes. That is what I have been trying to explain. I will give a statement showing how this matter has been standing since 1901. Since that year there has always been an amount standing over to be charged to the following year. In 1901, there was an overdraft of $205.34. In 1902-3, for part of which I was responsible, there was an overdraft of $1,074.47. In 1903-4, the overdraft amounted to $991.53. In 1904-5, to the 31st of January, 1905, there was an overdraft of $7,032.06. The amount spent in 1901-2, was $10,137.57, and only $10,000 voted. In 1902-3 the amount expended was $12,391.53. In 1903-4 it was $21,616.24, and in 1904-5 to the 31st January, 1905, it was $16,656.23, and only $14,000 voted. Next year we shall require $20,000 to carry on the work of the department. I might mention that the work has trebled since 1886. For instance, in 1886, 12,800 letters were received, in 1891, 15,300, and in 1904, 32,184. I could enumerate the different branches to show what have been the increases since 1886, but I do not think it is necessary to do so at present. According as each branch comes up, I can show how much the work has increased. So that really the amount of $3,500 is not excessive in view of these facts. It is necessary in order to put the books in such a condition that there will be no more overdrafts.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a good policy not to have overdrafts though it may not be the best argument for an increase of the vote. However, as the hon. minister promises better things for the future and to keep within his appropriation, I am not disposed to be very stringent in my remarks, but I would suggest that his officers should be a little more careful about the contingencies of his department. There is always a tendency, especially when a minister is good hearted, to stretch a point as regards contingencies. For instance the hon. gentleman might tell me why three copies of 'Canadian Annual Review' should be required for the work of his department. I have not a sufficient fertile imagination to imagine what particularly useful service these works could be in the running of lighthouses and shipping buoys. Then I find that he has purchased several copies of 'Canadian politics.' What help will the officers of the department find in this work ? Not satisfied with that, he has purchased a whole set of the Encyclopœdia Britannica. That is no doubt a fine standard work and a very good thing for a general library ; but one would think that what would be required in the hon. gentleman's department would be special works on special subjects. No doubt, it was as an admirer of old English Liberalism, that my hon. friend has bought a life or two of Gladstone. He has also acquired 'the Speaker's decisions of the House of Commons.' Perhaps these may be necessary in the work of his department, but I am at a loss to know how they can possibly be of any use there. Then, I find that the minister is rather costly in his travelling expenses. He and his secretary have spent a round thousand or a little more on those expenses.

Mr. COCHRANE. Special cars ?

Mr. FOSTER. Expenses, and cab-hire at Ottawa. My hon. friend has run up $150 on

cab-hires. But I should think that he is of that peculiar build which would benefit by walking exercise. Of course, subscriptions to newspapers are absolutely necessary. It would be impossible to run the 'Lady Laurier, the 'Neptune' and those other vessels unless they had in the department the 'Athabaskaville Union' at $6 and the 'Charlottetown Patriot' at $4 and the 'Canada' at $4.50. No doubt these furnish motive power. With the subscription to 'The Sportman's Review,' I have no fault to find. Probably the minister takes that in lieu of exercise. If he cannot get exercise in his department, he can read about it.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The travelling expenses in Ottawa can be very easily explained. I have to go to Montreal every Saturday and sometimes twice a week, which involves my taking my valise and my secretary doing the same. I suppose we are not bound to carry them ourselves and we drive to the station. But I must say that I have never made use in the city of Ottawa of a cab or sleigh at the expense of the government just for the pleasure of having a drive. Whenever I have had that pleasure I have paid for it. Whenever. I have had friends visiting Ottawa and we have driven about, I have always paid out of my own pocket. Whatever I have paid in cab-hire in Ottawa has been spent as I have described. Representing a large district in the city of Montreal, and having a marine agency in Montreal and many large corporations to meet, I am obliged to travel in the way I have stated. But I do not think I have ever been extravagant in that line. As to subscriptions to newspapers, of course, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has been a minister, and he knows that the officers of the departments must keep up with public events, and, to be able to do this, they must have the papers to consult. And you must have them in the department, where they will be at hand, for you cannot send for them to the reading room or the library. I do not think that account has increased in any extraordinary way. As regards the purchasing of books, I have not been very long in charge of the department, and when I became minister there was not even a copy of the statutes there. I found empty book-cases.

Mr. FOSTER. Who was the hon. gentleman's predecessor ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was himself minister of that department and knows the course of things perfectly well. I understand, from information given me by the deputy, that it has been the custom, when a minister changes from one department to another, that he takes whatever books he thinks proper to his new department. After there have been four or five changes of ministers, it will readily be understood, there are no more books and the latest comer must buy what are needed. I invite the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) to visit my room in the department. I will receive him as politely as I can, and will show him that there is yet a great deal of room in that book-case. But, little by little, I am securing for the use of the department the books that I think necessary. Some of them will be more or less necessary. But the hon. gentleman understands that point perfectly well—he has been long enough in the business to understand.

Mr. FOSTER. That raises a very interesting question. In view of the minister's explanation, I think we have every reason to be glad that the book-cases were left ; I almost wonder that they had not disappeared as well as the books. Has it become the fashion that an incoming minister finds only empty book-cases because the books have all been taken ? For instance, when a minister changes from one department to another, does he take all the special books that he used in the administering of the department he is leaving. Really this is a significant statement that the minister has made. But I shall not go into it now. I imagine it extends much beyond this department. Where all the pins and needles go has long been an unanswered conundrum. And where the furniture and furnishings and books, for which immense sums of money are paid by all these departments from Government House to the Speaker's chamber—where they go at each migration is a thing that no one has yet been able to find out. But go they do—there is not the least shadow of a doubt about that ? But the minister has not told me what he wanted with $40 worth of 'The Siege of Quebec.' Was that for a private library ? Have we come to the point where a minister has a right to use the tax-payers' money in buying books that are not necessary for the administration of his department ? If the minister wants to stock a private library, that is his own business. He is paid a salary, and can use his own money for his own purposes. But he has no right to use the tax-payers' money to make a private library, and then run off with it when he leaves the department. I do not think that ought to be condoned as a practice, I care not which government may practice it. I can sympathize with the late Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) if he has to carry around all the books that belonged to the library of the department he has just left. If he has taken them away, I am going to inquire about it. And when the next man comes in, if the government ever makes up its mind to put in another man, if that other man brings in a vote to furnish the empty bookshelves, I think it will be criticised in this House. I doubt very much if that is the rule, and I doubt if the ex-Minister of the Interior has emptied the bookshelves of his former office of the books that he used in

carrying on the work of his department. I hope the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) will renounce the heresy he has formulated——

Mr. SIFTON. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) be kind enough to particularize in the statement he made in reference to myself ? I am not sure that I understood him.

Mr. FOSTER. It came to this : that I pitied the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) if he undertook to carry off with him all the books of reference that were in his department while he was Minister of the Interior. That was the first point. The second was that I did not believe the hon. gentleman had done so. The third was that if the hon. gentleman had taken away these books and an item appeared in the estimates to refurnish the bookshelves I thought it would receive criticism in this committee. Well, it is not the universal practice. Even if it obtains in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, I take it that it does not in the Department of the Interior.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was there. I suppose it was his practice.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was there. He took no books out of the Marine Department. And the hon. gentleman, I may say, should not have to replenish empty shelves when he went there. That was not one of the traditions of that department at that time.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I understand that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has a considerable amount charged to travelling expenses. I understand also that he made a trip to Cape Tormentine a year or two ago and has viewed the situation there. I would like to know, for the benefit of my constituents, what his idea is as to the situation at Cape Tormentine. To-day we have between two thousand and three thousand bags of mail matter lying at Sackville ready to be taken to Prince Edward Island and no means of taking it across the Straits of Northumberland. I understand that the minister has viewed the situation and is satisfied that a ferry can be made there suitable for carrying mails and passengers. I think that, as the minister has taken the money out of the public treasury to spend for a visit to the Capes Ferry, I have a right to ask him why it is that he has not furnished the needed means to carry mails and passengers ; for in doing this, he would confer a great boon upon the people of Prince Edward Island. I wish to remind the minister that the terms of confederation with Prince Edward Island distinctly declares that the Dominion shall provide continuous steam communication winter and summer for mails and passengers.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. When the item for ferries in Prince Edward Island comes before the committee for consideration, I will be prepared to give the hon. gentleman all the information I possess. As it is now six o'clock, I may inform the committee that after recess I propose to take up the item concerning the ship canal, a very large item of $588,000.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Harbours and rivers, Quebec—River St. Lawrence channel (Marine Department), $588,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the hon. minister will give a statement as to the present condition of this channel ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This item of $588,000 is the same amount as was voted last year to continue the work of improving the ship channel between Montreal and Quebec. In 1899 a general plan was made of the improvements which were contemplated in the channel between Montreal and Quebec, which plan was laid before the House. This work has been going on according to this plan during a number of years preceding my tenure of office. By Order in Council of March 11th, 1904, on a report from the right hon. the President of the Privy Council, with a view to systematizing and facilitating the work, the hydrographic surveys, the management and control of the river St. Lawrence ship channel, together with the dredging and ship building plant, were transferred at the close of the fiscal year to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, so as to place the supervision of the improvements to navigation on the St. Lawrence route under the department directly responsible for the pilotage and aids to navigation. This vote of $588,000 is to make provision for the following in accordance with the subjoined detailed estimate transmitted by the superintending engineer of the St. Lawrence ship channel :

1. Working expenses of a dredging fleet of six elevator dredges and one hydraulic or suction dredge, with their necessary plants, which it is proposed to keep at work at various points on the St. Lawrence below Montreal, deepening and otherwise improving the channel, including the sweeping and general supervision.

2. Maintenance of Sorel shipyard establishment, inclusive of supplies, charges of management, office expenses, stores, buildings, shops and machinery.

3. Towards construction of additional dredging plant at Sorel, improvement of shipyard facilities, including wharf and dock accommodation.

4. For the completion of the construction of a powerful ice-breaking and sweeping tug.

Detailed estimate of requirements for 1905-6 :

1. Dredging operations—

Working expenses of six elevator dredges, operating day and night, with their accessory plants of tugs, scows, &c., including fuel, wages, board, stores, repairs and office expenses as well as the supervision and sweeping of the

ship channel, for a season of about eight months.

Six elevator dredges at $40,000 each	$240,000
Working expenses of one hydraulic dredge, operating day and night, including plant and superintendence for a season of about six months	60,000
Working expenses of two stone lifters	10,000
	310,000

2. Shipyard supplies, buildings and new plant—

Coal for shipyard, 2,200 tons at $4.50	$9,900
Smith coal, 800 tons at $6	4,800
New sawmill and woodworking shop, including machinery for sawmill	21,000
Tools for new woodworking shop	4,000
Tools for new machine shop	15,000
Sterilizing chamber and other buildings	5,000
Slip-way in yard	10,000
Furnishing wharf No. 4	5,000
Purchase of land on which shipyard now stands	25,000
Installing galvanizing apparatus	5,000
New plant and machinery	7,300

3. New dredging plant and improvements to fleet of ship channel—

Two new dump scows of 200 cubic yards capacity each	$30,000
Tug to replace St. Francis	17,000
Equipment of floating machine shops	3,000
Flat scow	6,000
To finish new set of buckets for dredge 'Lafontaine'	10,000
	$178,000

4. Ice-breaking and sweeping tug for above and below Quebec—

For the completion of the construction of a new powerful ice-breaking and sweeping tug designed for prolonging navigation, sweeping above and below Quebec, aiding belated vessels from Montreal to Quebec and general towing of dredging plant, especially for Cap à la Roche	100,000
Total estimate of requirements for fiscal year 1905-6	588,000

This is a resumé of the whole amount which we are asking the House to appropriate for the next season. I must state at once that the amount is not included in the main estimates for erecting certain piers on Lake St. Peter in order to aid navigation during the latter part of the season. It is an impossibility to maintain the ordinary floating lights on Lake St. Peter after the ice begins to form, so that in order to make this part of the channel perfectly safe it has been decided to erect a series of piers. Four or five of them will be constructed in due time as far as our appropriation goes, so as to make this part of the channel perfectly safe even after the ice is formed and after the floating buoys are taken away. We think that by erecting these piers and having fixed lights we can maintain navigation on the St. Lawrence later than the 25th November, the time at which the insurance risks expire. This work is not new. It is following out the plan of improvement which was adopted at the demand of the Shipping Federation, the Board of Trade of Montreal and the Boards of Trade at Quebec and elsewhere, in order to make the bed of the St. Lawrence as safe and as advantageous as it is possible to make it. This plan is not mine at all. It is a plan which was laid before the House in 1899 by a former Minister of Public Works who had studied the question specially, and who had this plan sanctioned by the House as far back as the year I have mentioned. The work is under the same engineer.

Mr. MONK. Last year, in this vote of $588,000 was included $60,000 on account of the construction of a new, powerful ice breaking and sweeping tug designed for prolonging navigation. What success has been obtained by the expenditure of this money, and what has been the record of the ss. 'Montcalm' as an ice breaker in the vicinity of Quebec?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The $60,000 voted last year has not been expended, but we intend to do so before the first day of July, in order to commence the construction of the ice-breaker and sweeping tug. This tug is intended to aid vessels at the latter end of the season to get as far as Lake St. Peter or perhaps as far as Quebec where they will be taken in charge by the 'Montcalm.' The ice breaking tug will complete the system for keeping navigation open as late as possible between Montreal and Quebec. During the summer she will be in the service of the department. Applications are frequently made to assist vessels leaving Montreal late in the fall; tugs not properly strengthened have to be used and they are in danger of being damaged or lost. The shipping federation of Canada and the pilots have urged the necessity of sweeping the Cape à la Roche channel and other parts of the River St. Lawrence immediately after the ice leaves in the spring, and there are more urgent demands every year for sweeping the channel below Quebec. I may mention that a reef was discovered last fall opposite Murray bay, where a depth of 20 feet was found and where the chart showed 75 feet of water. It was the intention to build this tug at Sorel, but in view of the special features of construction and the absolute necessity of having the steamer in Canada next autumn it has been considered advisable to give the contract to one of the two British firms which has most experience in such work. As to the work of the ice breaker 'Montcalm' at Cap Rouge this winter, it has been a complete success in this way: that although the winter has been among the severest known for the last fifty years, the 'Montcalm' has been able to break the ice as far up as it is necessary in order to have a channel open early in the spring. Some days the

ice was twenty feet thick, but she worked her way through it so that as soon as the weather becomes warmer and no new ice is forming, she will, we hope, be, able to open the channel higher up than Cap Rouge and make her way as far as Three Rivers or at least to Portneuf. There is no doubt she can get through the ice and do what she was built for. The 'Montcalm' unfortunately lost six blades of her propellers, and as we had only a small number of blades to spare we cabled for a further supply which have now arrived and the 'Montcalm' will be ready again shortly. We are perfectly satisfied with what that steamer has accomplished. The ss. 'Champlain' has attempted with more or less success. I should say with fair success, the winter navigation between Murray bay and the Intercolonial Railway at St. Denis. She was delayed for a few days on account of the ice being piled up on the south shore. The 'Champlain' is smaller and not so strong as the 'Montcalm,' but she has done very good work and we are quite satisfied that the experiment has been successful.

Mr. MONK. This is such a very interesting matter that I would like to know whether there is in the possession of the department a detailed report from those in charge of the 'Montcalm' and 'Champlain,' showing exactly the work of these steamers from day to day during the winter ?

The steamer is a costly one, it costs us $150 a day, I understand, and it would be interesting to know exactly what work she is doing.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The latest report I have about the work of the 'Montcalm' is dated January 11, 1905. I have no objection at all to giving it to the House as I have received it from Captain Koenig, who is an experienced seaman who has been employed by the department for many years. He was formerly employed on the 'Druid.' This report is as follows :

Col. F. Gourdeau,
Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Sir,—According to instructions received from you, that I have to make a statement from the time the Dominion government steamer 'Montcalm,' has started ice-breaking until to-day, I beg to report that I arrived from Scotland on the 3rd of December last, and from that date until the 22nd of the same month, I had to do some alterations, in the piping arrangements to prepare the ship for winter work.

December 22nd.—Left Quebec at 9 a.m., and proceeded up towards Cap Rouge up the river ; met some accumulated ice of about three feet thick. Ice running down the river freely. Heavy snowstorm with a strong breeze from the north east. Returned to Quebec.

From this date until 29th the ice running freely in the river. Men working at the piping arrangement.

December 29th.—Weather cold, ice making fast, but running freely in the river. Prepare the ship to go out in the morning.

December 30th.—Received telephone message from Cap Rouge that the river was clear of ice. It is also clear of ice abreast of the city.

December 31st.—Snowing, calm ; left wharf at 6.20 a.m.; proceeded up as far as Confederation Point ; found some ice between the bridge, steamed through to break it and also broke away some batture ice, to make the channel wider and returned to Quebec at one p.m., having also broken some batture ice off Beauport.

January 1st, 1905.—Received a telephone message from Cap Rouge that there was little ice on the river and it was running freely ; no necessity to go out to-day.

January 2nd.—The same weather and condition of ice as yesterday.

January 3rd.—Received a telephone message from Cap Rouge that there was very little ice in the river, and it was not necessary to go out.

January 4th.—Snowing, easterly wind. Received a telephone message from Cap Rouge that there was no ice on the river, and no danger of ice taking.

January 5th.—At 8 a.m. left Pointe-à-Carcy wharf and proceeded up the river ; at 8.40 a.m. I met some heavy packed ice between Sillery Point and extended as far as I could see. Worked in the ice until dark, 4.30 p.m., when the ice started to run down the river with the tide.

January 6th.—Left Pointe-à-Carcy wharf at 8 a.m. ; weather cold and very thick vapour rising from the water, met some heavy packed ice. I steamed through it to break it. At noon the ice running freely, I returned to the wharf.

January 7th.—Strong easterly wind, with blinding snowstorm. Having received a telephone message from Cap Rouge that the ice was not making, I did not proceed up the river. I steamed through the ice in the harbour to break it. I returned to the wharf at 5.30 p.m.

January 8th.—Heavy loose ice in the harbour running freely.

January 9th.—Nine a.m. proceeded up as far as the bridge. I found the ice stationary. Worked in it until 4 p.m., but did not succeed to break the jam, the ice being packed from ten to thirty feet thick. Could not work any longer on account of the flood tide making.

January 10th.—Left Quebec at 9 a.m., being high water, I found the ice still stationary in the narrowest part of the river between the piers of the new bridge ; worked in it all the ebb tide, seven hours, succeeded to break three-quarters of a mile in the key of the jam. Impossible to work any longer on account of flood tide making. I returned to Quebec.

January 11th.—Left Pointe-à-Carcy wharf at high water, 11 a.m.; found the ice in the narrowest part of the river still stationary. I worked at it until 5 p.m., the beginning of the flood tide, and in seven hours I only broke a distance of one-third of a mile. This ice being packed to an unknown depth. I have seen pieces breaking away of twenty and thirty feet thick.

All this jammed and packed ice is due to the strong current running down in this narrow part of the river, which extends from below the piers of the new bridge to some distance above Cap Rouge, from four to five miles.

It appears by the work done to try to force the 'Montcalm' in it, that the ice is so tightly

jammed and packed together, that no ice-breaker can break it away.

I am, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Signed) CHAS. KOENIG,
Master.

Dominion government steamer 'Montcalm,'
Quebec, January 11, 1905.

I may say that the key of the jam is now broken so that there will be no difficulty whatever in clearing that part of the jam.

I have a copy of a letter which I received on January 23, from the government engineer at Montreal who happened to be down in Quebec and who took a trip on the 'Montcalm' on January 17, after the date last mentioned in the report of Captain Koenig. That letter reads as follows :—

Montreal, Jan. 20, 1905.

Honourable R. Prefontaine,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Sir,—On Tuesday, January 17th, 1905, I visited the steamer "Montcalm" at Quebec at 6.30 a.m., and with the kind permission of Captain Koenig, under your instructions, was able to see the working of the ice-breaker 'Montcalm.'

We left the wharf at 6.30 in the morning, going up to Cap Rouge about ¼ mile above the Quebec bridge. The ice was very thick, ranging I should judge between 15 and 20 feet thick, piled up very strongly and forming a very strong barrier. The way in which the Captain handled his ship on approaching the ice was very masterly as he did not overstrain his ship in charging the ice too directly.

The work being done by the steamer is marvellous, considering the immense thickness of the ice and the enormous power to contend against. I feel confident that the captain is doing all in his power to break the ice, and will by constant work this winter, if nothing happens to his ship prevent the ice jam from forming in the spring. By breaking daily up the ice which has formed very strongly since the ice began to form this winter, the ship will be able to hold her own. Work can only be done during the ebb tide, so that a small portion of the day can be used. If I may suggest anything I would recommend that after this season, that another steamer be used in conjunction with the 'Montcalm' so that two steamers could work jointly together, one either side of the channel, which would more than double the work.

As to the steamer herself, she is a beauty, strength and power combined. Her build is very strong and the engines and boilers are perfect. the reversing gear of the engine is astonishing and a marvel of rapidity in movement. The pumping power should be increased and the feed pipes rearranged. All of which no doubt your captain has told you of. I can only add that this experiment of endeavouring to keep the River St. Lawrence at Cap Rouge open, is the keynote of the situation, and if effective, which no doubt appears to be certain, provided the vessel meets with no unforeseen mishaps will be accomplished. But you must bear in mind that the task is a difficult one and requires constant attention and goodwill to make it a success, which I am sure your captain has in view. I hope that you will allow me to visit her again, as the experience I have already had on board of her is a most instructive lesson, and anything I know about ice formation on the St. Lawrence river will be gladly given if it may be of any use to you.

I remain, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Signed) PERCIVAL W. ST. GEORGE.

Here is a letter from Mr. Weller, manager of the Babcock & Wilcox, Limited :

Babcock and Wilcox, Limited,
Water Tube Steam Boilers, and Accessories.
Montreal, February, 9th, 1905.

Hon. Raymond Prefontaine,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—As the writer spent Monday and Tuesday last in Quebec, looking over your new ice-breaker, the 'Montcalm,' I thought you would probably like to have a few lines from me in regard to same.

The writer spent Tuesday out on the ice bridge with her, and she did splendid work. She handled very well indeed, and had no difficulties in breaking down the ice, although it was of very considerable thickness. She was labouring under considerable disadvantage, owing to the loss of a number of the blades of the propellers, which reduced her power very considerably, and she also suffered from the soft ice getting in the injection pipes of the condensers, and putting them out of business temporarily. The chief engineer intends to make certain changes, which will remedy this.

I went over the boilers very carefully, and found them an exceptionally fine installation, and under Mr. Pettit's care, they handled the vessel in good shape.

I must also compliment you on the general arrangement of the ship, and her substantial build, practically no vibration or shock being discernible when running into the heavy ice, and I think that she should prove a great success in opening up navigation at an early date.

I was glad to find that you had secured the services of Mr. Pettit as chief engineer, as he has been known to us for a long time as a thoroughly capable officer, and we hope you will be able to retain his services in your department, and have supervision over any installation of our boilers which you may purchase, as he is thoroughly familiar with them, and will be able to train the firemen properly, so that you can obtain the most economical results.

Trusting that when you have any further business in our line you will not fail to give us an opportunity to figure on same, I am,

Very truly yours,
(Signed) H. W. WELLER.

I have nothing to add to this certificate, and I am quite sure that within the next two or three days when the blades that have been broken have been replaced and when the ship will have made her trip down to Seven Islands—because the boat was also intended to give some winter service to Seven Islands below Quebec and her trip down there will take five or six days—she will again be at work, and I hope that all that was expected of her, although it

has been a most extraordinary winter, will be fully realized. Her trip down there will take five or six days, and I hope that despite this very rigorous winter the work done by her will be fully up to expectations.

Mr. TAYLOR. We are now on the item of the St. Lawrence ship channel, and I find in the Auditor General's Report that all sorts of expenses are charged against this work. For instance on page V—28 I find: paid Mr. H. C. Beaulieu, Sorel, for one No. 4 sewing machine, $50; paid F. X. Bellefeuille & Frère, Three Rivers, second-hand wool picker, $50. Then on V—31 I find paid Dr. A. F. Fleury, Sorel, vaccinating 190 men at fifty cents. Also paid Henry Hains, Ottawa, evidence taken at inquiry into explosion of boiler of 'J. I. Tarte,' November 1903, 65,500 words at 16 cents per hundred and three copies, 196,500 words at 2½ cents per hundred.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Was not that allowed by the Auditor General?

Mr. TAYLOR. I presume he allowed it because it was certified to by the minister as just and correct, but you could get the whole thing done by any typewriter at 3 cents per hundred words, whereas this cost 23½ cents per hundred words. Further down I find that Hudon & Orsali were paid for four cases Radnor water at $9, one case of Appolinaris, $10.50, English soda and ginger ale, four dozen each at $1.35—all charged to the ship channel at Montreal. Then a little further down I find this item charged: Pierre Paul, Sorel, funeral expenses of Joseph Paul, killed in accident to dredge 'Israel Tarte,' $40. Also paid A. V. Roy, Curé, St. Ann de Sorel, burial service of Joseph Paul, $26. In our county, if we have a funeral, the minister has to officiate free, but here is $26 paid for burying Mr. Paul. I see another poor fellow was killed at the same time, Thomas Brunelle, but nothing was paid for burying him. All through the report I find items like these, and we should have an explanation. What have they to do with the deepening of the ship channel east of Montreal?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In the shipyard, we have to employ people in making sheets and bedding, and for that purpose had to get a sewing machine. As regards the soda water and Radnor water and ginger ale, I do not think my hon. friend, if he had to receive the Shipping Federation or the representatives of large bodies, coming from England or any part of the Dominion, and was showing them around the ship channel, he would be satisfied to treat them only to cold water. I do not think we were extravagant when we made this little expenditure on a few bottles of soda water, ginger ale and Radnor, especially the Radnor which is pure Canadian beverage and which my hon. friend ought to patronize. As regards the funeral expenses, an accident happened to the boilers of the dredge 'J. I. Tarte,' which resulted in the death of two of the employees, and of course we had to look after their burial expenses and will no doubt have to pay a pretty large sum to their families as compensation. One of these employees we had to bury especially at our own expense, but the other one had a brother who paid the expenses.

Mr. TAYLOR. They were both buried at the expense of the government, according to the Auditor General's Report. Thomas Brunelle, killed in accident to dredge 'J. I. Tarte,' $34; paid general hospital services two days and two nights, $6; mortuary habit, $25.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. As to these services, I must state that under our creed we believe in these services and believe they should be paid for to whoever performs them. We thought it would not be fair to allow the family of the poor fellow who lost his life in an accident to pay these funeral expenses. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) will bear me out in saying that if he had had the information I am now giving him, he would not have brought this matter up in the committee. These people were employed in the work of the ship channel, and I think that what was done by the former Minister of Public Works in regard to these matters—small matters after all—was rightly done. Had I been in his place, I would have done the same thing.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend (Mr. Préfontaine) did not explain the expenditure of $153.92 for the typewriter in preparing 65,500 words.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That explains itself. There was an investigation to show who was responsible for the accident. This investigation was held at the suggestion of the government, and was in addition to the coroner's investigation to determine whether there was a criminal liability. A stenographer was employed to take the evidence. I understand that the rate he charged was the ordinary rate, and he was sworn in the ordinary way, and I have no doubt the account would not have been passed by the Auditor General if there had been an overcharge.

Mr. BENNETT. Was a government dredge built at Toronto last year; and, if so, what was her name?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Not for the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Such a dredge may have been built for the Department of Public Works.

Mr. BENNETT. Perhaps I may refresh the minister's memory. Was not a dredge constructed in Toronto and was lost on Lake Ontario while en route to Montreal?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That was for a contractor named Poupore, and had nothing to do with the department. I happen to

know about it, because the fact was given to me by Mr. Poupore.

Mr. MONK. A large number of small items go to make up this expenditure of half a million dollars referred to by my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor). I would ask the minister who has charge of the purchasing of these items ? This is not the first year that we have found most extraordinary items charged to the St. Lawrence ship channel. Last year the Auditor General's Report showed fine, expensive carpets bought at Hamilton and charged to the ship channel. There are charges for scented soap, unscented soap, Pears' soap, towels and pillows, and a multitude of things, all charged up at considerable prices. There must be somebody prepared to certify these accounts, and I would like to know who it is. There is a charge for snowshoes purchased in Ottawa, and many other things that one would imagine that would not be necessary for the deepening or maintenance of the channel. Who does the ordering for the department and is prepared to be responsible for the prices charged for these articles ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Mr. George E. Desbarats is engineer in charge of the shipyard in Sorel. He controls the purchases and must certify to every account. I cannot speak for the system formerly in use, as I do not know about it. But since 1st July last, during which time I have had control of the ship channel, I have given special instructions that all orders for whatever amount must be sent to Ottawa and approved by the deputy minister or myself. The prices are looked into, and the orders go back to the director of the shipyard who orders the goods. He has to see to it that they are delivered in the condition mentioned in the order and must send back the accounts to the department here. They are entered in the regular way in the books of the department and paid as demand may be made upon the department. I may say that when I took over this important work I sent a chartered accountant to Sorel to examine the books and ascertain how the business was conducted, and also to make a regular inventory of the stock in store. And it was after I received the report from this accountant and his assistants that I gave the special instructions which I have just referred to. As to the variety of articles ordered, the extent of the work must be considered. We have ten tugs under our control as well as seven dredges. These dredges including the 'J. I. Tarte,' have a capacity of 1,000,000 cubic yards a month. This, of course means very large crews. The tugs also require many men, who must be housed and boarded by those in charge. As to the tugs, some of them are of pretty good size. Two of them, the 'Eureka' and the 'Frontenac,' are used by the officers of the department. The 'Frontenac' was built three years ago, before I was in the department. She is a fine little cruiser, and well equipped in every way. The fact is she wts built in the expectation that the Prince of Wales would take a cruise in her down the St. Lawrence. She is for the special use of the superintending engineer of the ship channel, Mr. Cowie, who is in charge under me, as he was under my predecessors before the present government came into power. So I think we have simply continuel the system that existed before, except that where improvements were to be made we have made them. I have tried to put the yard in a better business condition than it was before. I have not wasted any money. But things will improve as time goes on, and as we acquire more experience. It is not given to everybody to run a shipyard properly without loss of something or other. I know that Mr. Desbarats is considered one of the most energetic and painstaking engineers in the country, I do not think he could be replaced with advantage. I do not know which side of politics he belongs to, there are no politics whatever in the shipyard ; everything is conducted as much as possible on business principles. Of course, there may be some items that look strange. I cannot tell why the snowshoes, for instance, were bought. Probably somebody was sent out into the bush to look up timber, that we might have a supply in the spring. Besides, there is a staff of men working near Lake St. Peter taking soundings, and it stands to reason that when the snow is deep the engineers are obliged to use snowshoes—perhaps skates, or other articles of that kind. But I am quite convinced that Mr. Desbarats would never order anything which was not needed for the use of the men on the channel. It would have been dishonest for him to do so, but I do not think he is a man who would do anything of the sort.

Mr. MONK. What I wanted to elicit from my hon. friend was the name of the party responsible for these purchases.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I said Mr. Desbarats.

Mr. MONK. I understand my hon. friend has modified his answer since then, and now he says that everything has been sent up to Ottawa to be authorized by the minister. So these purchases which appear to us to be abnormal we now understand were made on the responsibility of the minister and of Mr. Desbarats. Now I want to remind the minister that last year when he brought down his estimates, he gave a detailed statement of this sum of $588,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. If the hon. gentleman will allow me—the item was not submitted to the House by me, though of course I am ready to assume responsibility for it.

Mr. MONK. Yes, it was my hon. friend himself who submitted the item last year. But he submitted it in several portions, and I think if the hon. gentleman followed the same course this year it would enable us to get through the item much more readily. Now out of this sum of over half a million dollars last year, the first part of the item was for dredging expenses, for working expenses on six elevator dredges and one hydraulic suction dredge, with their accessory plants, which it was proposed to keep at work at various points on the St. Lawrence below Montreal, deepening and otherwise improving the ship channel. I think it was with that item the hon. gentleman began this evening. Those expenses last year were set down at $60,000, which sum we understood was to be expended in dredging and deepening the channel. The item for dredging last year was $240,000, and there was added to that an extra for the working expenses of one hydraulic dredge, operating day and night, including plant, and superintendence for a season of about six months, $60,000. So that last year there was an estimate of $300,000 for dredging. Now the question I would like to ask my hon. friend is this: What was done with that $60,000 last year? What dredging was accomplished, and how is it proposed to spend the sum this year which is included in that estimate for dredging? What are the results obtained? How much have we deepened the channel, where have we deepened it and what is the field of operations for this year?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have here a full statement in detail of every sum that has been expended for the year ending June 30, 1904. It was on that statement that the sum of $588,000 was voted. The cost of dredging in 1904 was $276,958.59; expenditure for plant, ships, &c., $308,766.44. Now if hon. gentlemen want the details I can give them but they are very long.

Mr. MONK. I desire to know what has been the result of last year's dredging. We expended $276,000. What has been the result and what is the plan of operation for the coming year?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Continuing the work that was begun in 1899, I will read a resumé of the work of each dredge. The dredge 'Lady Aberdeen,' with the tug 'Cartier,' did 649,400 yards at a cost of 5·51 cents per yard in clay and stones. The work was done near Contrecœur and St. Ours. The dredge 'Lady Minto' did 306,340 yards, at 12·07 cents per yard, in blue clay and stone at Contrecœur Traverse. The dredge 'Laurier' did 317,950 at a cost of 11·28 cents. The first part was done in clay and sand, and the other in clay and stone, one at Point aux Trembles (en haut) and the other at Sorel to Ile de Grace. The dredge 'Laval' worked to Ile de Grace. The dredge 'Laval' worked in clay and stone taking out 31,500 cubic yards at Champlain at 22¾ cents and 184,750 yards at 14·77 cents, clay and stone, at Pointe aux Trembles. The dredge 'Lafontaine' took up 86,100 yards at 3·6 cents at Contrecœur and Belmouth Curve, 248,550 yards at 4 cents at Contrecœur Traverse and 90,000 yards at 3·38 cents at Petite Traverse. The dredge 'Baldwin' took up 271,000 yards at 10·73 cents in clay and stone at Pointe aux Trembles, and 49,800 cubic yards at Contrecœur, and the 'J. Israel Tarte' with the tugs 'Lac St. Pierre' and 'Montcalm' took out 2,055,140 yards at 3·04 cents, soft blue clay, in Lake St. Peter. There are two stone lifters, Nos. 2 and 3; they also did part of the work. There were the steamers 'Frontenac,' 'Eureka' and 'James Howden' and the hydraulic survey steamer 'De Lévis.' If the hon. gentleman wants more details I can give the fuel, wages, board, classes of material, &c.

Mr. MONK. I did not ask for these details. I merely wanted to know what results had been obtained from last year's dredging? How many miles have we deepened the channel? What is the depth in Lake St. Peter now and what are your plans for next year? There is no use giving the number of cubic yards.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. How can you know the result if you do not know the number of cubic yards?

Mr. MONK. You can give the result in much less scientific language than that.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is no science at all in that, but if we want to get a channel 30 feet deep and 450 feet wide, we have to take out a certain amount of material and that can be calculated.

Mr. MONK. How many miles have you dredged?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There were completed to the end of the last fiscal year, 42 miles out of 62½ miles requiring dredging. Now there remain 20 miles between Quebec and Montreal to complete, and this we expect to do during next season and the following seasons.

Mr. MONK. I merely want to ask my hon. friend what deepening the channel has had with this $300,000 that we have expended, how much remains to be done, and how much he expects to do this year?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There have been completed 42 miles of the channel between Montreal and Quebec, 30 feet deep at the lowest water and 450 feet wide. The bends in this 42 miles have been straightened so that any large vessels that navigate the St. Lawrence are perfectly safe day and night within those 42 miles. There remain to be completed between Montreal and Quebec 20 miles. I have just stated the amount

voted this year will not complete this 20 miles because we have a very hard proposition to meet. These Cap à la Roche shoals which are composed mostly of shale rock are pretty hard to dredge, and that is why we will ask, probably, in the supplementary estimates, for an amount to fit up some of the dredges in such a way as to enable them to work in that hard stuff. An offer was made to us to give this work out by contract and to arrange for the use of chisels and other very expensive machinery. We thought it was not necessary to do that and that we can do the work with our plant improved somewhat. That is what we intend to do during the next season. The work will not be completed to tide water until some time in the season of 1906.

Mr. AMES. The hon. minister knows from his report that the first 21 miles are completed, that there are 4¾ miles yet to be completed in the second division, 6¾ miles in the third division and 9 miles in the fourth division. The fourth division is the part that feels the tide and therefore it is not so important as the other divisions. The hon. minister knows also that they have completed about 5 miles within the last season. How long does he expect it to take to finish divisions 2 and 3 leaving division No. 4 possibly for the next season? Will it be possible to complete divisions 2 and 3 and give a ship channel from Montreal to Cap à la Roche 30 feet in depth and 450 feet in width in the course of the next season?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I am informed by the engineer in charge that he expects to complete to Batiscan this year, about 10 miles. I was anticipating too much. The rest cannot be done in less than the next two seasons. That will carry the work to 1907.

Mr. AMES. Then, do I understand it will take two seasons more, or three seasons more?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Three seasons more.

Mr. AMES. That it will be completed to Batiscan this year, from Batiscan to within 5 miles of Quebec next year, and the remainder in the third year? I would like to ask the hon. minister if he can explain for the benefit of the committee a statement which appears at page 267 of the reports of the chief engineer of Public Works in reference to the cost of dredging up to date. We are quite aware that the cost of dredging varies very much with the different soils that have to be dug. We know that from looking at the reports of the various dredges where it costs per yard all the way from 21 cents a yard to 4 and a fraction cents a yard. But as a rule, if you have a series of dredges working at points on the river the general charge for the entire season will be about the same. I notice that in 1902 and 1903 the cost of dredging and the expenditure for plants and shops was charged at $533,000 and that the quantity of dredging was 6,500,000 yards. In 1903-04 while the sum spent was $585,000—slightly more than the previous season—the net results were only 4,619,260 cubic yards, showing a diminution of about one third on the previous year's work. In the first year the average price of the dredging was 4 cents per cubic yard and in the latter year the average price was 6 cents. I can understand how there might be a variation, but it is difficult to see how that variation can amount to 50 per cent in the work of a dredging fleet one year as compared with another.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. One explanation is that the dredge 'J. I. Tarte' met with an accident and worked only a part of that year. This dredge takes out more material than any other and does it at a smaller cost. The engineer also tells me that as you dredge deeper the stuff gets harder and the cost increases. Then, in 1903-4 there was the beginning of an increase in the salaries of the crews which culminated in an increase of nearly 25 per cent during the last season. On account of this increase of wages which has now taken full effect, it will be found in future statements that the cost has proportionately increased. We cannot afford to pay less to our men than is paid by outside employers. If we pass regulations controlling the employment of workmen by general contractors, it is only reasonable that the government shall apply these regulations to its own workmen. Even although we have made these increases we are every day losing captains, mates, engineers, and men, who are getting better pay outside. There was plenty of work all over for the men last year and we had to increase their pay to retain them.

Mr. AMES. The salaries in the shipyard were apparently increased, because this statement shows the shipyard wages, to end of July $16,247, end of August $18,149, end of September $16,817, end of October $18,721. It is a little remarkable that October should have been the heaviest month, and it is also remarkable that there should be a falling off immediately afterwards. There is also a peculiar feature about the purchase of supplies. This same return shows: for the month of August $48,682 worth of supplies, for the month of September $21,047, for the month of October only $2,775, but for the month of November it was $65,508. Can the minister tell us how it happened that $65,000 worth of supplies were purchased in November?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. What report are you reading from?

Mr. AMES. It is the return brought down at the request of Mr. Monk. I will send it

to the minister. This increased expenditure for wages and supplies in the months of October and November demand an explantion.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This is for the year 1904, and as I have said there is an increase on account of the increased wages paid.

Mr. AMES. Did the advance in wages occur about September and October ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not know exactly, but it was about that time.

Mr. BERGERON. I am a little curious for information with respect to the dredge 'J. I. Tarte.' I find in the Auditor General's Report (V—28) the two following items, which I do not understand :

Bertram, John & Sons, estimate one on $18,400 contract for two boilers for dredge 'J. I. Tarte,' no public advertisement, contract price same as that of John Inglis & Company, $18,400, less drawback, $1,840, $16,560.

Inglis, John & Company, estimate one on $18,400 contract for two boilers for dredge 'J. I. Tarte,' public advertisement, lowest tender, $18,400, less drawback, $1,840, $16,560.

Here are two items identically the same. There would seem to be an error ; can the minister explain ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This occurred before I was in charge of the department. When one of the boilers of the 'J. I. Tarte' exploded it was decided to replace the entire four boilers because it was ascertained by the engineer who had superintended the operations of that dredge that they were not quite strong enough for the engine, and the replacing of the boilers was ordered by the Department of Public Works at the time. It took some time before this was decided, and as the season was advancing, there was no alternative but to offer the work to the firms that it was thought would best do it. I know as a fact that one of the firms to which it was offered, namely the Poison Iron Works, would not touch it at any price, because the time was too short. Then the work was divided between the John Inglis Company and the John Bertram Company, who undertook to furnish the engines and boilers in time. On account of urgency there was no time to ask for tenders, and the engineer was instructed to get the work done on the best possible terms. Although the contractors undertook to furnish the engines at a particular date there was some little delay. I interviewed a member of one of these firms in Toronto and he said it was quite impossible for any engine builders to deliver the work within the short time allowed. I think that really the department did the best that could be done under the circumstances in order not to have the dredge lose the whole season of 1904. We were delayed and during the last season she did not run more than about two months, and I must state in justice to my predecessors and those who had charge of the work that it was certified by all the best authorities that the price was fair and reasonable. That was all explained when the Order in Council was passed ordering the boat.

Mr. BERGERON. Would my hon. friend give me the name of the engineer who made such a report, because if my information was correct there was a mistake.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. James Howden.

Mr. BERGERON. Is he an engineer ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. He was superintendent of the shipyard for a great many years and of the dredging fleet for forty years.

Mr. BERGERON. I know Mr. Howden ; he is a very able man, but I did not know that he was an engineer.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. He is a mechanical engineer.

Mr. BERGERON. But that is not the report upon which my hon. friend based his assertion ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I am informed by the superintendent of the ship channel that it was Mr. Howden who did make the report.

Mr. BERGERON. Was there any other report?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. And Mr. G. Desbarats, who is looking after the shipyard. I may state that Mr. Howden is now in charge of the dredging of the Department of Public Works. He was never under my control.

Mr. BERGERON. Would my hon. friend tell me how long the dredge 'Tarte' had been in operation when this accident occurred?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The accident occurred in the fall of 1903.

Mr. BERGERON. How long had the dredge been in operation at that time?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Two seasons of five months each.

Mr. BERGERON. And do I understand that the boilers which were first made for that dredge were declared by Mr. Howden to be bad, and that it was necessary to replace them entirely?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. He declared that when we had to replace one boiler it was better to replace the four because he was afraid the other three would not be strong enough and that sooner or later an accident might happen. The other three boilers could not be used. One had blown up and it was evident that there was something wrong.

Mr. BERGERON. The others might have been put in better condition.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No, there was some technical reason because at the time they were forced on account of the heavy work of the engines to be worked at their fullest capacity; in fact they were taxed too much, and although the accident might have been avoided with a great deal of care, I have heard from one of the best mechanical engineers, Mr. Désy, that when he was working the dredge to its fullest capacity he was afraid to remain on board.

Mr. BERGERON. That seems to be a reflection on the contractor; there must have been a test made of these engines before they were delivered to the government and paid for.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There was no fault on the part of the contractor at all. They had been built according to the specifications, but in an immense machine like the 'J. Israel Tarte,' it is difficult, from the information I have gathered, to be quite exact. There was a good deal of discussion, for instance, as to where the boilers should be put in the dredge. Some engineers thought that the boilers should be higher than the deck. It was decided after a good deal of consultation to put them below the first deck and they were made small. The new boilers have been placed as it was originally thought they should be placed, that is to say they have been built larger and higher than the first deck so as to give more space for the steam and therefore more working capacity. They are larger boilers than the others.

Mr. BERGERON. But there were four at first?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, there are four still.

Mr. BERGERON. I see here only two in the Auditor General's Report?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Well, that must be a mistake. There were two supplied by the Inglis Company, and two by the Bertrams.

Mr. BERGERON. Was an investigation made into that accident by the department of my hon. friend or the Public Works Department?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There was an investigation as I have stated by the Department of Public Works. A very thorough investigation took place under the direction of Mr. Gobeil, the Deputy Minister of Public Works. The results have not been made public because there are some cases pending at the present moment. Two, I think, have been settled and the others are pending.

Mr. BERGERON. Of course I understand the reason given by my hon. friend but it is a pity that we cannot get that report here. There was at that time, so far as my memory can serve me, a report that some officers on board, either engineers or others in charge of these engines or boilers had been very careless, and that although they were first-class boilers they had been left dry and as any one knows any boiler left in that condition is likely, even if it is the best in the world, to burst.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I am informed that the verdict of the coroner's inquest was that no blame was attached to any one, that it was a mere accident. That is the report I got from the superintending engineer of the department at the time, that there was no blame to be attached to any one. This private investigation was held after the coroner's investigation, as the Department of Public Works thought it was a good way of obtaining full information as to the facts and the cause of the accident. I may say at once that from the information obtained at that inquiry, the Department of Justice has recommended a settlement, and on their recommendation arrangements have been made for the settlement of some of the cases. The matter will come before the House before the end of the session, because a sum will be asked for to compensate the families of those who will be crippled for life.

Mr. BERGERON. Was that report of Mr. Howden, stating that these boilers were not good and had to be replaced, made in writing ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I cannot say. It was not made to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, because the orders for these boilers were not given by that department. When this portion of the Department of Public Works was handed over to me, the contract had been given to Inglis & Bertram and the boilers were being delivered.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But where certain works, which were formerly under the Department of Public Works, are now under the jurisdiction of the Department of Marine, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is bound to give the committee all the information which the committee would be entitled to expect from the head of the Department of Public Works had these works remained in that department. The bursting of the boilers might have been due to some defects in construction or some carelessness. I am informed that Mr. Howden reports they were improperly constructed.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They were unsuitable—not strong enough.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then they were improperly constructed.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It might have been the fault of the designer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. These boilers were built under the supervision of Mr. Howden ; was he not on hand to see that they were built properly ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They were built under the supervision of Mr. Robinson, who had designed them. It was a new type of dredge which Mr. Robinson had designed specially for that work. He designed all the machinery ; it was an immense piece of work ; and he took years to carry it out.

Mr. MONK. Did the same men who had charge of the boilers before remain in charge afterwards ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Two of them could not, because they were killed, but Mr. Désy is still in charge.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who superintended the construction of the new boilers ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They were designed by the boiler inspector at Quebec, Mr. Samson, and he superintended the construction.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did not Mr. Howden examine the boilers before they were accepted by the government ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The dredge was accepted by Mr. Robinson, as representing the Department of Public Works.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is not an answer. I understand they were built under the supervision of Mr. Robinson.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They were designed by him and built under his supervision along with the rest of the machinery.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Were they not examined by Mr. Howden in order to see whether they were complete and perfect and in accordance with the contract ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That could not be done, because Mr. Howden is not a boiler inspector. The boilers must have been examined by a boiler inspector under the supervision of Mr. Robinson, who designed them and passed them as complete according to his designs and plans. Mr. Howden may have looked over them, but he was not called upon to report.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister suggests that Mr. Howden is not competent to examine these boilers, because he says that, not being a boiler inspector, he could not have done it.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. He could not have done it officially.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If that means anything, it means that he was not competent to examine the boilers for the purpose of having them accepted.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Although we may have a mechanical engineer in the department and be satisfied with his examination, we would not be justified in accepting his examination as official without the inspection of a regular boiler inspector.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. While the minister fixes the responsibility for the loss which took place upon the report of this gentleman, he apparently thinks that this same gentleman would not be capable of making the necessary examination in order to have the boilers accepted. Surely the minister ought to be able to place in the hands of this committee the report of the evidence regarding the accident. Surely you must have had at least as high an authority to determine the causes of this accident as would have been required to determine whether the boilers were fit for acceptance or not. But that is something we do not seem to have. Reference has been made to the coroner's inquest, but that was probably not a very scientific investigation, and the minister speaks of some other investigation.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The report of the investigation held by the Department of Public Works has not been made public, because there are some cases pending before the courts, and we are trying to bring them to a settlement. When these claims have been adjudged upon and settled, we will be in a position to lay this investigation before the House, but it would not be judicious to do so now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There are two answers to that plea. In the first place, I understood from the minister that the claims have been practically settled. In the second place, the question whether this report should be made public is a legal question which the Department of Justice should decide and not my hon. friend. If the Department of Justice should report that on account of the pending litigations it would not be in the public interest to publish this report, no one would demur. But in the absence of any report to that effect from the Department of Justice, I do not see that my hon. friend has any justification for withholding the evidence.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not try to justify anything. I give the information I have received from the Department of Public Works, and I give it frankly and honestly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister is the Department of Public Works, so far as this matter is concerned, for he has taken over this part of their jurisdiction.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It did not happen under my administration. How should I be held responsible and obliged to justify an act of Mr. Gobeil, of Mr. Howden, or any other officer ? What am I supposed to know about it ? When an item is brought before the House for a settlement, if there should be a settlement, that will be the proper time for the furnishing of the documents connected with the case. Up to this time I have nothing to do with it. I volunteered the information that I possessed in the matter. I am not asking the House for

money to indemnify the families of these people, or to reimburse the Department of Marine and Fisheries on account of the cost incurred in installing new boilers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. minister has a very different idea of his responsibility from that which I entertain. Even if the Department of Public Works had not been divided and a portion of its jurisdiction attached to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Préfontaine), he is responsible as a member of the administration for everything done by every department. Surely that is only the A B C of constitutional doctrine. And, surely he understands that, as he has taken over this jurisdiction, he is as fully responsible in respect to it as if it had always belonged to the department. He says he does not offer this explanation because he is obliged to do so. I must dissent from that. I think it is a legitimate subject of inquiry. If we had a report from the Department of Justice against producing the report of this investigation, that would be enough; but, in the absence of such a report from the Department of Justice, I think the minister should bring down the report of the investigation. It is entirely a question of law, upon which the House should be advised by the Department of Justice, before such an excuse as that offered by the minister is accepted.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have not offered any excuse. I said the matter was in the hands of the Department of Public Works and they were conducting an investigation. They decided not to bring in the evidence because they were engaged in making a settlement under the advice, as I understand, of the Department of Justice. I have offered no excuse, and have none to offer.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand the difficulty in which my hon. friend (Mr. Préfontaine) finds himself in having to deal with a matter which, so far as it is covered by the repart of the Auditor General, is in a different department than his own. But we are entitled to an explanation. Does the hon. minister know whether the Polsons held an investigation? They had to make themselves right in case the government might have an action against them. Does the hon. minister know whether they made that investigation and found out the cause of the accident?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Not that I am aware of any. They were satisfied, so far as my information goes, that they had built the boilers according to designs made by Mr. A. Robertson, and Mr. Robertson had accepted them as perfect. And the boiler inspector, whoever he was, passed them. So, that being the case, they felt free.

Mr. BERGERON. I am going to make a reasonable demand on my hon. friend. Would he be kind enough to find out the information concerning that accident whether he gets it from the Department of Public Works or anywhere else? The information I have is different from that which the hon. minister has received. I am informed that the designs of the dredge were made by a very competent engineer who came from New York purposely to design the new dredge—for it is probably one of the newest on the continent. The work was carried out by the very important house of Polson & Co. Mr. Howden, whose name has been mentioned here was three months in Toronto to superintend the construction of the dredge boilers, engines and everything else. And, when the dredge was finished it was accepted as perfectly well built and by Mr. Robertson who, my hon. friend will find made a report in writing which is now probably in the Department of Public Works stating that everything was in perfect order.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Otherwise it would not have been paid for.

Mr. BERGERON. That dredge was sent to Lake St. Pierre and worked for the whole season giving great satisfaction to the engineers in charge and doing the best work of any dredge employed.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. She did not give satisfaction. She did enormous work when she was in operation, but was often stopped.

Mr. BERGERON. My information is that she gave great satisfaction. I am informed also that after the accident the Polson Company made an investigation, when it was proven that the men in charge were the cause of the accident—that the dredge was badly managed, the boilers being left dry.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They got a very severe punishment, then, for they were killed?

Mr. BERGERON. I am asking the minister if he will be kind enough to find out if this information is correct. We will have another evening on these estimates, and it will be no difficulty for him to give orders to have this information prepared. Do I understand that the families of some of these men will be indemnified?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That is under consideration.

Mr. BERGERON. Has anything been done in that sense already?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. My information is that nobody has been paid. The matter is under consideration by the Department of Justice.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There are claims filed in the Department of Justice, and two petitions of right have been granted. But I do

not think there has been any settlement—only pourparlers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We have got the Minister of Public Works and the Solicitor General (Mr. Lemieux). Now I want to serve notice on the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that we are to have that report brought down to which he has referred, unless he produces the opinion of the Department of Justice that its production in parliament will be prejudicial to the interest of the Crown in the cases to which reference has been made. If that is produced, I will say no more, for the Department of Justice is the absolute judge as to that matter. But in the absence of such an opinion we are entitled to that document, whether it is in the Department of Public Works, or in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or any other. It is not enough for the minister to tell us that the report is in some other department. We are entitled, if necessary, to have every minister here and ready to furnish information on every item in these estimates. And in reality that is the theory—that they are all here to furnish such information. I want to put myself plainly on record with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in that regard, that this document must be produced, we must have the information afforded by it, unless we have an opinion from the Department of Justice that its production might be prejudicial to the interests of the Crown.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. As the hon. gentleman wants to put himself on record as asking for these documents, I also desire to put myself on record as stating here that I was not in possession of this information, and that I understood this report was not to be submitted to the House at present because the Department of Justice was considering whether they would settle these cases or not. That is as far as I can go. Now if the sums claimed by the families of these poor people are to be paid, or if a certain indemnity is to be paid to them, it stands to reason that in order to justify it an investigation would have to be held, and a report made to the House, giving such information as will justify the voting of these amounts—I think in one case $5,000, and in the other case $6,000. I understand that one case has been recommended for payment, but the money cannot be paid until it is voted by the House; this will come down in the supplementary estimates, either in my department or in the Public Works Department, and then no doubt ample information will be furnished. I have never denied the right of any member of this House to ask and obtain that information, and I have always admitted that the government would give the information at the proper time. As regards the other information asked for by my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), I shall certainly have the greatest pleasure in communicating with the Department of Public Works to ascertain whether Mr. James Howden made a report in writing before receiving the dredge, or whether Mr. Desbarats did, who was in charge of the shipyard at the time, or whether whoever accepted the dredge 'J. I. Tarte' found it built according to specifications. If there exists such a report in writing, I will procure it. As regards the condemnation of the other boilers that remained intact after the accident, I have no doubt there must be a report in writing, either from the boiler inspector, Mr. Samson, or a competent engineer, stating that it was necessary to replace one of the boilers that exploded. I will undertake to procure any information that exists, I cannot do more.

Mr. BERGERON. We are not blaming my hon. friend. If this had been done under his administration it would be a different thing, in fact his officers would be acquainted with the circumstances. Since we are on the ship channel item, it would have been better for him to have had here some of the employees of the Public Works Department who know something about this matter, and then we could have obtained from them all the information we are asking for.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They might have given more verbal information but they could not give any more information in writing than I have given myself. But I will procure any information that is in writing and lay it on the table of the House as soon as I can.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman will see that we should have here exactly such information as would have been here if the department had never been divided. All these reports would have been here then, the officials of the Department of Public Works would have been in attendance for the purpose of producing them; but the difficulty is that none are here.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I come here with all the information I have in my possession.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I know, but the trouble is that he has not the required information in his possession because the department has been divided. I do not seem to be able to make myself clear to the hon. gentleman. The department is divided; some of the information regarding these estimates he is placing before the committee, is in the possession of another department. The officers of that department should be at his elbow for the purpose of assisting him in giving that information to the committee which we have a right to demand. My hon. friend from Beauharnois has kindly suggested that the acting Minister of Public Works had better send over for his staff at once.

Mr. HYMAN. The matter is a very simple one, it hinges on a report. When the department was divided, all the papers re-

lating to the ship channel were supposed to have been sent over from the Public Works Department. If there are any reports that are not in the Marine Department, they must of necessity be in the Public Works Department. But there is just that question which the Minister of Marine has stated as to whether they could properly be made public at the present time. Aside however from that question, there is no objection in the world to bringing down the report.

Mr. BERGERON. That is what we are asking for. Those papers may or may not be in the Department of Marine and Fisheries ; but if they are in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, I am convinced that the employees of that department who are here do not know anything about the affair, whilst employees of the Department of Public Works could tell us whether these particular papers were sent down to the Marine Department or not.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I know for a fact that they were not sent down, because I found that the matter was still in their hands for settlement and they had been negotiating with the Department of Justice in the matter. I can have whatever reports the Department of Justice may furnish without prejudice to the Crown.

Mr. BERGERON. That is only one report. My hon. friend must know, I am sure, all the documents necessary to facilitate the passing of these estimates concerning the ship channel, and which are in the Department of Public Works. There are no reasons why they should not be sent from one department to the other.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We are merely playing on words. There is not a cent of money to be voted here and now on account of that accident. As I have said, it will be time enough when the committee is asked to vote an indemnity to the families of these men, to produce the reasons why a settlement is recommended.

Mr. BERGERON. We have been talking about many other things.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Let us dispose of this one first. Does the hon. gentleman not admit that it would be improper to produce the report of this investigation before the government has decided that they will entertain the claim ?

Mr. BERGERON. We decided that a moment ago, it is in the hands of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. As regards the report of Mr. Howden, or of Mr. Desbarats, or of Mr. Samson, concerning the construction of those boilers, I said that I had not the report in my hand, it was not in my department, but that if there was a report in writing I would procure it.

Mr. BERGERON. That is what we wanted. More than that, would the hon. gentleman be kind enough to say whether there was an investigation made by the Polson Company, and if so, would he bring down the report if there are no public reasons to prevent him from doing so?

Mr. MONK. I cannot agree with the minister that we have to wait until we are called upon to vote an indemnity to the parties aggrieved by this accident before we can get all the information relating to the accident itself.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman, either.

Mr. MONK. When we are asked to vote $588,000 for the St. Lawrence ship channel we have a right to know everything connected with the incident that has resulted in the bursting of the boiler of one of the dredges used in that channel. I submit that as a proposition of law. I can bear out what the hon. minister says about there being a case pending, because I acted for the lawyers in Sorel who represented one of these families, and I had to deal at the time with Mr. Gobeil.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. You know more about it then than I do.

Mr. MONK. I do not know about that, but I am able to affirm that Mr. Gobeil seemed to be in charge at that time of the settlement. What was the cost of these four boilers that were replaced ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. BERGERON. No ; we have only two in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Their cost was $18,500 each pair.

Mr. BERGERON. $18,500 is the cost of each one ?

Mr. MONK. Why are only two of them put in there ?

Mr. HYMAN. I think the reason is that possibly the other boilers were delivered and paid for out of the present year's vote.

Mr. MONK. Can the hon. minister say for what time these boilers have been in use, and what is the ordinary life of a boiler of that kind ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They were in use a little over two years. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the report of the Department of Public Works for 1904, page 272, he will see the following :

The power for the main pump is derived from a triple expansion marine engine. The boilers, of which four were originally put in, were of the locomotive type. From the commencement of the work difficulty was had with the boilers. Finally in November, 1903, one of them exploded, resulting in loss of life and dis-

abling the dredge for nearly eleven months. Four new marine boilers were put in, and have proved their efficiency and capacity.

Mr. MONK. I am asking the hon. minister two questions—how long they have been in use and what is the ordinary life of these boilers ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They were only used two years, and the ordinary life of a boiler should be about twenty-five years, unless an accident happens as did in this case.

Mr. BERGERON. I said a few moments ago it would be better to have the employees of the Department of the Public Works here, because they might know some things which the officers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries do not know. Now, I want to ask the hon. minister how the provisions and supplies intended for use in connection with this ship channel are procured ? Is it done by tender ? I find that purchases to large amounts have been made. If these purchases are not made by tender, it is a very dangerous system to pursue unless the hon. minister is very sure of his buyer. I see that supplies were purchased from The Edward Cavanagh Company, Montreal, to the amount of $11,575 ; from Caverhill, Learmont & Company, Montreal, to the amount of $11,648, and from Andrew Baile, of Montreal, to the amount of $22,541. If I remember rightly, the hon. minister has no right to buy anything exceeding in cost $5,000 without calling for tenders.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. These are small items.

Mr. BERGERON. I find an item as high as $42,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. These supplies were not all bought without tender.

Mr. BERGERON. That is for coal.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That is all bought by public tender.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, it has been bought for the last few years from the same firm, the T. F. Moore Company, Montreal, and for the same amount.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Last year it was divided, and not purchased from that firm at all.

Mr. BERGERON. I see that coal was also purchased from Andrew Baile, Montreal.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. For the ship channel ?

Mr. BERGERON. Yes.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Well, he was probably the lowest tenderer.

Mr. BERGERON. Andrew Baile, of Montreal, received for coal $22,541, and the T. F. Moore Company, of Montreal, $42,337.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. All this was done through public tenders, and these tenders were advertised in the papers.

Mr. BERGERON. Will my hon. friend be kind enough to bring down some of these tenders ?

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he has decided yet as to the advisability of giving Captain Leslie a bonus for keeping his wrecking plant in the lower St. Lawrence ? The matter was discused a while ago.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The matter does not appertain to my department. It appertains to the Department of Trade and Commerce. There are two propositions before the government at the present moment—one from Captain Leslie, of Kingston, and one from Mr. Farquhar. It has been proposed to establish a wrecking plant at Sydney or North Sydney. The matter is the subject of negotiation now. It is in the hands of my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is the wrecking plant at Quebec under the Department of Marine and Fisheries ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No ; it is under the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is there any very good reason why it is under the Department of Trade and Commerce ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I suppose the reason is that they have been trying to grab everything, and therefore I did not ask for it.

Mr. INGRAM. It is rather a strange thing that the correspondence from the Boards of Trade of Montreal and Kingston has been directed to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They thought probably that it belonged to that department, but all the correspondence has been transferred to the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. INGRAM. A statement was made in this House a short time ago that very materially affects the wrecking plant owned by parties in Kingston. A statement was made that Captain Leslie had not done any wrecking east of Montreal. I find here a statement to this effect :

> Part of our plant as described in our letter to The Shipping Federation has been stationed at St. John's, Newfoundland, for the past three years, but we cannot afford to continue the service unless we get some assistance from the government ; hence our petition that they should bonus us for placing the plant at North Sydney the coming year.

Our salvage plant is the most efficient in the Dominion, consisting of pumping and diving outfits equal to any, and in addition our cylindrical steel pontoon plant and compressed air plant are the only ones on the continent, the compressed air system being an application of my own of that system to salvage operations, and only used by myself, and has been proved efficient by the salvage of the steamers 'Gallia' and 'Scottish King,' the former near Sorel, and the latter at Newfoundland, both steamers having been declared total losses and not recoverable by all other salvage companies, including the Davie plant owned at Quebec.

I simply put this on record to show that the statement made the other evening by the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), to the effect that this plant had not done any wrecking east of Montreal, is contradicted; and, secondly, to show that his statement that no plant in Canada was equal to the Davie plant is not correct. I want to put the statement on record to show that this is a superior plant; and that, therefore, there is nothing in the argument to the effect that this plant was not judged competent to do wrecking even in the St. Lawrence. I hope the government will do justice to this company, who seem to be prepared, and who are quite capable and competent, to do good wrecking work, either in the St. Lawrence or anywhere else.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This question of wreckage plants will come up when we consider the items connected with the Department of Trade and Commerce. My hon. friend is not stating the facts correctly, no doubt due to mistake or lack of memory. The other day, when this question was up for consideration, I said that this plant was used once on the Newfoundland coast and that I thought it was in connection with the salvage of the steamer 'Scottish King.' That is the statement I made the other day and I think that statement is borne out by the letter that my hon. friend has just read to the committee. I am not personally competent to judge of the relative merits of the two plants any more than is my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram), but the Board of Trade of Montreal and the Underwriters' Association of the Dominion have pronounced on the subject and they have asked for a subsidy for the Davie plant; they have not asked for a subsidy for any other, and they are the parties interested in the St. Lawrence shipping. If others want something to be done for Captain Leslie there is no possible objection to that; but let the question of merit be decided by those competent to judge. So far as I am concerned I appeal to the Board of Trade of Montreal and to the Underwriters' Association.

Mr. INGRAM. To be fair to the Minister of Justice, I shall put on record the statement he made, because neither he nor I are competent to judge of wrecking plants. The hon. gentleman chose to criticise the plant of Captain Leslie. I read from 'Hansard' the statement in reply to him, as follows:

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In what respect did he enter into competition with Leslie? We all know that there have been wrecks in the St. Lawrence from time immemorial. I venture to say that during the past twenty years Captain Leslie had never gone down beyond Montreal except once, when he went to Newfoundland, and I think he has regretted that trip ever since.

Mr. INGRAM. A vessel man made the statement in this House that Captain Leslie did wrecking in the St. Lawrence, and very successfully, and I prefer taking the word of a vessel man even to that of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If my hon. friend will take the responsibility of making that statement of course I accept it, but I make the statement with some knowledge of Quebec—and I have been connected with the mercantile life of Quebec for many years—I make the statement that Captain Leslie has never gone below Montreal to the assistance of a wreck except in one instance when he went to Newfoundland, and we all know what occurred then.

Mr. INGRAM. I am very glad that the minister made that statement. Possibly in a few days we shall see whether the statement of a vessel owner in this House or that of the Minister of Justice is correct.

I wrote this letter to Kingston:

Owing to a debate the other evening in the House on the subject of wrecking in the St. Lawrence, and in which the names of George Davie & Company and Captain Leslie figured (the latter I believe was a former resident of Kingston), and to the fact that a statement was made by the Minister of Justice that Captain Leslie did not do any wrecking in the St. Lawrence east of Montreal, to which I gave an emphatic contradiction, I should be very glad if you would kindly furnish me with all the information you can with respect to the plant of Captain Leslie. I should be very glad, as well, to know Captain Leslie's present address.

These gentlemen are responsible for the statement they make in their letter; they made the same statement to the Marine Department, they made the same statement to the Montreal Board of Trade, and they undoubtedly have done wrecking east of Montreal and in the St. Lawrence.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In how many instances?

Mr. INGRAM. That does not make any difference. I have proven the truth of my statement that they have done wrecking successfully east of Montreal.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In how many cases?

Mr. J. D. REID. They assisted at many wrecks.

Mr. INGRAM. We have here the statement that they were successful in cases where even the Davie wrecking plant gave the job up. I have proven that the Leslie's

plant is not so inefficient as the Minister of Justice would make out.

Mr. AMES. There is another feature of the case which possibly the Minister of Justice will allow me to draw his attention to. I know the Minister of Justice is great on chronological sequence, and the fact I wish to draw the attenion to is that the resolutions from the Board of Trade and the other bodies were passed after the debate had occurred in this House ; after these bodies had come to the conclusion that it was the Davie Company or nothing at all, and after they were under the impression that there was no other company but the Davie Company that could do the work. Surely, if it was necessary to have a wrecking company down in the gulf to look after salvage, they most naturally trusted that the Dominion government would insist that the company should be capable to do the work. I am quite sure that it makes no difference to the Board of Trade and to the other bodies who gets the indemnity provided there is an efficient service.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I can tell my hon. friend that on three different occasions, namely in 1900, 1901 and 1903 the Board of Trade asked for this.

Mr. AMES. Mentioning the Davie Company ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, mentioning the Davie Company. Not only that, but a deputation from the Montreal Board of Trade waited on the Minister of Marine at the Windsor hotel in 1900 or 1901 to ask specially that Mr. Davie should be induced to put his wrecking plant at the disposal of the government—a little knowledge in connection with these matters is not bad.

Mr. AMES. Being a member of the Board of Trade council during the last few years, I know something about the discussion that took place, and I think the impression is that the Davie Company is the only company that does wrecking there.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Let us get at the facts first and we will deal with impressions afterwards.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Minister of Justice has been most unfair to the Leslie Wrecking Company, a company that has been in existence for years on the upper lakes. In making this House believe that the Leslies have not a wrecking plant sufficient for the gulf the Minister of Justice was unfair. The Davie wrecking plant has been in existence for years at Quebec, but they never asked for a bonus until Mr. Leslie went to all the expense and trouble of taking his whole fleet down there. Then the government gave a bonus to the Davie Company and the Leslie firm were in consequence unable to compete. If the Minister of Justice inquires he will find that the Leslie Wrecking Company has done good service in saving lives and property at wrecks, and in view of the small amount that would be given to this company it would repay the government twice over.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am not disputing the right of these gentlemen to a subsidy. The only issue with me is, the justification of the subsidy paid to Mr. George T. Davie. My hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Reid) is perhaps not as often in the House as some of us, and therefore he does not know all that has occurred. He is evidently not aware that the point in dispute was as to whether or not the Leslie plant had gone east of Montreal. I do not know whether or not they have done wrecking on the upper lakes ; I am dealing with the lower St. Lawrence and I know something about that. I said that the Leslies wrecking plant went below Quebec only once and then in connection with the salvage of the 'Scottish King' on the shores of Newfoundland, and my statement is borne out by the letter that has been read, and which states that they had gone below Quebec for that one vessel—they did not mention any others.

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, the steamer 'Galilee.'

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Where ?

Mr. INGRAM. The 'Galilee' ran on the shore at Sorel.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What became of her ?

Mr. INGRAM. She was raised by this wrecking company.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The 'Galilee' ran out of the channel into a bank and she was simply dredged out. I know something about the case of the 'Scottish King' because I was in some way connected with it. I may tell my hon. friend that the statement I made with respect to the operations on this boat, the 'Scottish King,' are absolutely correct, and I am quite sure that if Mr. Lister would tell us all he knows about it, he would repeat what I said here, that he has regretted from the day he ever sent to the 'Scottish King' to the present that he ever took the job.

Mr. INGRAM. I would say——

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. A. Johnston). The minister has stated that this is an item entirely apart from his department, and we have allowed the discussion to go on in order to permit various members to make statements. I think we might now come back to the item under discussion. I make the suggestion but of course it may not be acceded to.

Mr. INGRAM. The suggestion is a good one, but we are discussing a matter in connection with the St. Lawrence, and I wish

to point out to the Minister of Justice that the point the other night when his discussion was up was not so much as to whether wrecking had been done; the point was simply that Davie had a plant unequalled by any other in the Dominion.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, there is.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not among those who know anything about it

Mr. INGRAM. Personally I admit that I do not know, but I am quoting the statement made by this company who ought to know. The Minister of Justice talks about this steamer being on shore and so forth. This steamer according to the statement here was given up even by the Davie Company.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Which one ?

Mr. INGRAM. These two vessels I am speaking of now.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In the case of the 'Scottish King' the Davie Company would not take the job at the price.

Mr. INGRAM. The steamers were declared total losses and not recoverable by all the other salvage companies including the Davie Company at Quebec, and this company were successful at least in raising it and making a success of the salvage. The other night when the discussion was up I for one objected to the statement made to the effect that the Davie Company was the only one in Canada that could do this work. I have no interest in the Kingston Wrecking Company any more than in any other company, but it is a serious matter for a company with a large amount of money invested to have a statement made in this House that might affect their business.

Mr. MONK. I was present when the discussion took place the other night, and I know that the point made was simply this : We give $10,000 a year to the Davie Company because it is the only company that can do the wrecking work. That was the allegation of the Minister of Justice. There is no doubt whatever, it seems to me, that we have to-day proof before us that there are other wrecking companies competent to do the work. We have proof too that the Davie Company began to get this subsidy the moment the other company arrived on the field of action.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In what year was that, will my hon. friend say?

Mr. MONK. I take the allegation of my friend here. There is no question whatever; does the Minister of Justice deny it?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. When was the 'Scottish King' raised?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In 1901.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is about the time that the bonus was given to the Davie Company

Mr. MONK. That was the conclusion I arrived at. It was not the exact day that the other company arrived, but very soon after. It seems to me that we do an absolute injustice in not getting tenders from these two companies as to which will accept the lowest retainer to stay there. There is no doubt in my mind about that. We have abundant proof that this wrecking company is competent. There is no doubt about it. It does wrecking on the lakes, it went down there and is a well known company. Why should we bonus one company and deprive the other of the advantage of being on the field of action at all ? It seems to me it is a great injustice. The plainest course for us would be to find out which company would accept the lowest money, because it is simply a retainer for being down there and being ready to assist in wrecks. The action of the Board of Trade and of these bodies is not surprising. They wish to have one company down there ready to do the work when the necessity arises, but that does not justify us in bonusing one company and refusing any assistance to another. The thing ought to be done by tender. It seems to be a matter of favour and nothing else.

Mr. AMES. To return to the discussion of the St. Lawrence channel, did I understand the minister, an hour or so ago, to state that this year he expected to have the channel deepened to the extent of 30 feet and widened to the extent of 450 feet all the way from Montreal to Batiscan ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. AMES. That will be all done this year?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I hope so, during the coming fiscal year.

Mr. AMES. Between now and the end of navigation?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The fiscal year lasts from the 1st of July, 1905 to the 1st of July, 1906. It will be before the 1st of July, 1906.

Mr. AMES. The reason I return to this question is of course that it is one of the most important with which we have to deal, and because all the shipping interests of Montreal are anxious to know how soon they can count on a 30-foot channel all the way to the sea and how soon they can count on having a full width. They know of course that for the last nine miles, where the tide has some influence, it is not so

important. The minister is aware that there remains according to his report upwards of eleven miles to complete in the fiscal year. During last year something under five miles were completed and he intends to do eleven miles, more than double that amount, between now and the end of the next fiscal year. I see the minister is only asking the same amount of money as before, and I suppose naturally that only the same result will be obtained as from the money previously asked.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The hon. gentleman must remember that there are three months yet of the fiscal year ending July, 1905.

Mr. AMES. You have three months more and then twelve months, fifteen months in all, in which to do eleven miles and you have taken nine months to do less than five miles.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We hope the 'Tarte' will work all this year.

Mr. AMES. That she will be good.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. She has only worked two months this season.

Mr. AMES. I trust the minister will take care that a sufficient sum is voted in the estimates, if necessary in the supplementaries, to make this promise good, because so much depends on it to the shipping of Montreal and the Dominion. We consider this to be a promise, not a hope but a genuine declaration.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is a promise provided circumstances will allow us. If some of our dredges break down or something of that kind occurs we may be delayed, but we are asking the money for a new dredge in order to be sure that the work during the season of 1906 will be pushed forward with more celerity than during the past season.

Mr. AMES. I would ask another question with reference to the method in which this dredging is carried out. We already have, of course, a narrow channel of 27½ feet through the inland portion of it and part of the work of the dredging is to deepen the existing channel, part of it is to widen the existing channel. I would like to ask whether the dredges in widening the existing channel work up and down, so as to give the benefit of full channel first and to gradually widen that channel or do they work across the river, giving the full width of the required depth, but only leaving 27½ feet in the balance. My reason for asking this is that I believe the shipping people would prefer having a narrow channel made the full depth as soon as possible rather than to have the full depth for a portion of it and have the remainder of it without the necessary depth. I think the minister will understand just what I mean, that I think the shipping interests will prefer to have the channel narrow but of the proper depth in order that vessels by proper navigation may come up, rather than have the proper width for a portion of the distance but not a proper depth for the balance.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. My engineer informs me that it depends on the material and the character of the work. Sometimes they work up and down and sometimes across the channel.

Mr. AMES. As a general principle, my hon. friend will admit that it is very advisable this work should be completed as soon as possible. It is very advisable that in as short as possible delay vessels drawing 30 feet may be able to come to Montreal in the lowest water.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In Lake St. Peter they are not working crosswise but up and down, but in other parts we are working up and down and also crosswise according as the work can be done most advantageously.

Mr. AMES. I wish more especially to impress on the hon. gentleman the great importance to our shipping interests of having a deep channel to the sea, in the shortest possible delay, even if it be a narrow channel. The hon. minister has spoken of his department endeavouring to put the Sorel shops on a thorough business footing, and he told us that an inventory has been taken.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It was taken early in September or August and finished in January. There were two accountants to post up the books and make a special inventory.

Mr. AMES. I supppose the actual stock taking was done very rapidly, in the course of a week or so ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It took more than that. There had been books kept in the store but they had not been carefully entered up, and the storekeeper was not able to give a satisfactory account. No dishonesty was suspected and I do not think that any members of the staff were guilty of anything wrong, but the store was not kept according to modern methods, and we appointed a more capable man to manage it and gave him special instructions as regards the entries to be made. Now we can ascertain every week what there is in stock which we could not do under the other system.

Mr. AMES. The hon. minister is introducing what is evidently a new system, and one which will furnish us material for future discussion. He is giving us an excellent mile post from which to start. In adopting the system of taking inventories, I sup-

pose he will have a general inventory made once every year ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. AMES. And he has a competent stock-keeper who keeps a check of all the goods received and handed out ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, and his instructions are to charge against every steamer what is expended on it.

Mr. AMES. Does the minister have what might be called a factory or workshop account to which he charges all his wages, supplies and expenses of superintending ? And then does he charge against each piece of work, whether it be a new piece or repairs, what he considers to be the amount of wages and supplies that go into it ? Does he then make up what each piece of work actually cost, and at the end of the year make his computation to see whether the goods turned out from the factory give an adequate return for the wages and supplies that have been expended on them, and so balance his account? Every well organized business, which has a factory and sales shop side by side, keeps a straight factory account, charging that account with all supplies, wages and superintendence and a certain proportion of the rental and other incidental expenses, and credits it with all completed goods. Then at the end of the year they are able to see whether they have lost or made money. I trust the hon minister will be able to submit to the House a similar statement every year.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I think that I shall be able in a year hence to give my hon. friend entire satisfaction.

Mr. AMES. Then to-night I shall content myself with establishing the principle, and I hope that at the end of the year we will be in a position to go carefully through the estimates carried out on these lines. What is the custom in the department regarding employees who are temporarily absent ? Are they charged for their absence or given half pay ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Those who work by the day, lose their day's pay, if they are absent the whole day. If they are absent less than a day, only a fair proportion of their day's wage is deducted. In the case of employees engaged by the month, they are charged proportionately for their absences unless they are absent on leave or with good reason.

Mr. AMES. When we asked how it was that the expenses this year are greater than last year in the Sorel shops, we were told that wages had been advanced, but my hon. friend neglected to state the date when the general advance took place in those shops.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There was a redistribution of the wages of the men, and I think that took effect in the beginning or the middle of October. I had been working at it since the 1st of July. I went down three times myself to see about it and got Mr. Desbarats, the director of the yard, to make up the list. Then it was revised. That took a little time and at the same time I was having this inventory made. There were other changes made so that the redistribution did not take effect untid about the middle of October. Of course we did not increase the wage materially but we are looking into the whole matter to see what we will do for the next season.

Mr. AMES. Will the hon. minister explain the manner in which the supplies for the Sorel workshops and his dredges are purchased, are public tenders asked for or only private circulars sent out ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Some are bought from day to day. We ask prices from different merchants for the different classes of articles, and we take the lowest who is able to furnish in proper form and quantity this kind of goods. The request is made by Mr. Desbarats, and he generally gives us a list of merchants from whom he has asked prices. The order is examined and checked ; and if it is approved by the minister, or by the deputy minister in my absence, it goes and the article is bought. Staple articles, of which we know we shall require a quantity, are purchased by tender after advertisement in the newspapers. For instance, coal for the fleet is bought in that way, and so is lumber when we require a large quantity and are not obliged to use it immediately. Since I entered the department I have consulted the managers of large concerns, like the Allans and the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, who buy in large quantities, and have found that the system that we use is the one which their experience has proven to be the best.

Mr. AMES. When tenders are called for by advertisement in the newspapers, how are the offers opened, and by whom ? And who decides the awarding of the contract ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They are generally opened by the deputy minister, or by the engineer, or by Mr. Desbarats, in charge of the work at Sorel. The offers are in regular form, with security. The minister is responsible for his approval, on the recommendation of the officer in charge.

Mr. AMES. Is the lowest tender always accepted ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Always, except in special circumstances, and then a special Order in Council must be obtained.

Mr. AMES. The minister has spoken of a list sent to Mr. Desbarats of the firms from whom purchases shall be made of articles that are not bought by public tender.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. He prepares a list of what he wants and asks for prices from reliable firms.

Mr. AMES. I suppose he has a list of firms from whom he shall ask prices ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I suppose so.

Mr. AMES. By whom is that list prepared ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not know. I found a list in the department, and I follow it. Sometimes I have added to it, when I thought that they were buying from firms that were not first-hand dealers. To save all profits and commissions we must deal at first hand.

Mr. AMES. On the principle of a new broom sweeping clean, we look to the hon. minister (Mr. Préfontaine) to improve on his predecessors, not necessarily to accept the system that he found in use.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That is why I made inquiries of the managers of large concerns as to their system.

Mr. MONK. As to the list of those from whom the department purchases, can the minister, the next time his estimates are under consideration, lay that information on the table ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) will find it in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. MONK. We have there a list of those who have sold to the department, but not of all those who have endeavoured to sell. If there is a regular list, we are entitled to see it, of course.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is no regular list. Mr. Desbarats makes his list himself, consulting, of course, the officials of the department as to the reliability of the firms. Where he finds that he does not get bottom prices he tries elsewhere. Of course, we try to purchase from Canadian firms wherever possible. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) has a list to suggest, I am sure he will take it into consideration.

Mr. MONK. I do not complain of the names, but wished to know if there was a regular list. If the list in the Auditor General's Report is the only one——

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There are some on the list of the director who have never succeeded in selling five dollars' worth to the department.

Mr. AMES. I hope the hon. minister can assure us that there exists no preferential list, for I have received a communication from a leading firm in my own city in which they state that they are not on the privileged list and do not supply anything to the department. If I can assure them that there is no such list——

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have known parties to complain that they made no sales to the department, and, on looking up their names, have found that they were supplying more than any other.

Mr. LALOR. I understood the minister to say that he found a list in the department, and had since added names to it.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The engineer sent me a list, for approval, of people from whom he asked tenders, and I suggested some other firms in addition to that list. I suppose he has added those names.

Mr. LALOR. I understand that the question asked by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) was whether the list would be brought down.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I did not say there was a list in my department. I understood that the director of the works in Sorel had a list before him. In making such large purchases of supplies, where you have an expenditure of $200,000 or $300,000 a year, it stands to reason that the director will have a list of firms from whom prices would be asked. Of course he must have some knowledge of the dealers, and be in a position to ask them for prices.

Mr. HENDERSON. What are the special qualifications for getting on to this list?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. To be an honest and straightforward merchant.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then are we to understand that all those merchants in Montreal whose names are not on the list are dishonest ? I hope the gentleman does not mean to insinuate that those whose names are not on that list cannot qualify.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There are other qualifications.

Mr. MONK. I would like to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to page 274 of the Public Works Report where there is an analysis of a new construction under way during that year. I understood from his remarks a moment ago that next year this new construction account will be more complete, and that we will have credited to each dredge and each tug the expenses for that particular construction.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The hon. gentleman is not a manufacturer, he does not know bookkeeping as well as his neighbour (Mr. Henderson). There will be in the books of the department at Sorel entries made to justify the expenditure on every dredge, whatever it may be. But it would be improper to put all those details in a report.

Mr. MONK. Then we will be able to get a separate account for each construction ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. You will be able to get it by asking for it. But I would not undertake to publish it in the departmental report, for it would make a more bulky report than that of the Auditor General.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he was building an eighth dredge, he has seven now. Has that been completed ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No, it is being designed.

Mr. LALOR. Has the minister any knowledge as to a comparison of the work done by dredges owned by the government and the work done by contractors' dredges paid by the hour ? Which is the cheapest? Is it profitable for the government to use their own dredges ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The information I gather from my officials is that it is a great deal cheaper to own our dredges and work them ourselves. We do better work with our own dredges, and do it cheaper. Naval engineers and men of experience from every country have visited the works going on this year, and they admit that we have one of the finest plants in the world, and that we are doing the work very successfully indeed.

Mr. LALOR. I am glad to hear the minister make that statement, and I hope the government will increase the number of their dredges so as to dispense entirely with the necessity of engaging the dredges of private contractors by the hour. In my experience, and I have seen them at work, the government is being imposed upon by private contractors, and are losing a great deal of money.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In my department I have not a single contractor's dredge at present working by the hour. Last summer when the work was not going on as fast as we desired, and some one spoke about hiring other dredges, my engineer said that it would be better to do the work more slowly by our own dredges than to hire any contractor's dredges.

Some resolutions reported.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. What business will be taken up to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. We will continue on the estimates we are leaving this evening, those of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries Department. I think there are no Bills coming on to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11 p.m.

80½

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 15, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PETITIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must call the attention of hon. members to the rule which requires that the petition shall be endorsed with the name of the member presenting it. Many of these petitions have no endorsation.

L'UNION ST. JOSEPH OF OTTAWA.

Hon. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa). I beg to present a petition praying for incorporation. The shortest explanation is to read the petition itself, which is as follows :

To the Honourable the House of Commons of Canada, in parliament assembled.

The petition of the undersigned L'Union St. Joseph de la cite d'Ottawa, humbly showeth :

That your petitioners prior to the commencement of the present session of your honourable House, became desirous of applying to your honourable House, at the present session thereof, for an Act of incorporation to entitle your petitioners to carry out the objects of your petitioners society, which are of a provident and benevolent nature, under the name of L'Union St. Joseph du Canada.

That your petitioners caused inquiries to be made as to whether or not it was probable that an Act of incorporation might be obtained from your honourable House authorizing them to enter into contracts of life and sickness insurance with members of the society in accordance with the methods of insurance in this regard now used by your petitioners, and some doubt as to this having arisen in the minds of the officers of the society, the matter was under discussion at various times, both with your petioners' solicitors and with the Superintendent of Insurance.

That considerable time was occupied in the consideration of this subject, and it was not until the present time that your petitioners became satisfied that they were in a position to apply to your honourable House for an Act to incorporate your petitioners under the above name, with the likelihood of your petitioners application in this regard being favourably entertained by your honourable House.

That your petitioners are extremely anxious to obtain such an Act of incorporation at the present session of your honourable House, in order that no time may be lost in putting your petitioners in the more favourable position which they have reason to believe they will attain by becoming incorporated by Act of your honourable House.

That your petitioners' society is of an entirely provident and benevolent nature, and is carried on entirely for the benefit of the members of the society, who for the most part are persons of small means who are enabled through the methods of the society to make provision for themselves and their families in case of death or sickness.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your honourable House may be pleased to authorize your petitioners to present a petition for an Act to incorporate your petitioners for

the purpose above mentioned at the present session of your honourable House.

And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

Dated this 14th day of March, A.D. 1905.

V. DUROCHER,
President General.
ALFRED DOSTALER,
Greffier General.

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Mr. GRANT presented the twelfth report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders, recommending that that part of the 49th rule which limits the time for receiving petitions for private Bills be suspended in reference to the petition praying for an Act to incorporate the Crown Casualty Company of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. This does not seem to me to be a case of emergency where there would be a justification for suspending a rule which we have already made in this House. It is now about three weeks past the time when petitions could be presented for that purpose, and no great interest would suffer provided it lay over for another year. I quite understand that there are many things that might require that a Bill should be introduced during the present session, but this is one case where I do not think there is a justification for suspending the rule.

L'UNION ST. JOSEPH.

Mr. BELCOURT moved :

That the petition of L'Union St. Joseph de la cité d'Ottawa presented this day praying to be permitted to lay before this House petition for the passing of an Act to incorporate L'Union St. Joseph du Canada, notwithstanding the expiration of the time for presenting petitions for private Bills, may be read and received forthwith and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw attention to the fact that this is another case of the same kind, where it does not seem that there is any urgency whatever. The petition asks for the right to incorporate a benevolent society about three weeks after the expiration of the time for receiving petitions. I draw attention to this because I think the government are more interested than we are in keeping the House, in a moderate degree at least, close to the rules, and after calling attention to this I have nothing more to say.

Motion (Mr. Belcourt) agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

ASHCROFT WATER AND LIGHT COMPANY.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. How much pastoral land lying to the north of the Thompson river has been applied for to lease by Ashcroft Water and Light Company ?

2. Were there any other applicants for this land ?

3. Has this company been granted a lease for these lands ?

4. Have the conditions set out in the lease been fulfilled ?

5. Has this company applied for lease in the Hat Creek country ?

6. How many acres has this company applied for to lease ?

7. How many acres have been granted by lease to this company ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

1. 59,000 acres, more or less.

2. Yes, for some of the land.

3. The company was granted a lease for 3,437 acres of the 59,000 acres applied for.

4. The records show that the company has paid the rental, but there is no information in the department to show that it has complied with the other provisions.

5. The lands referred to are partly in the Hat Creek country; they are in one block, and lie south of Hat Creek and north of the Thompson river.

6. Answered by No. 1.

7. Answered by No. 3.

OLD AGE PENSIONS—INTERCOLONIAL.

Mr. MACDONELL asked :

1. Does the government intend to introduce at this session the Bill respecting old age pensions, that the Minister of Railways and Canals promised last year to introduce ?

2. If so, when ? If not, why not ?

3. Are members of the Civil Service during their employment by the government allowed to take other employment than that for which they are paid by the government ?

4. Has any order been issued by the government forbidding members of the Civil Service to compete with citizens in the outside labour market ?

5. If not, does the government intend to do anything to prevent such unfair competition ?

6. If such order has been issued, when was it so issued ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance):

1 and 2. The question of pension for the Intercolonial Railway workmen is under consideration.

3. Officers generally in the civil service are expected to place their whole time if required at the service of the department in which they are employed. There may be exceptional cases where the circumstances are such that the taking of additional employment is objectionable.

4. The government are not aware that the members of the civil service are competing with citizens in the outside labour market.

5. Answered by No. 4.

6. Answered by No. 4.

GODERICH MAIL CONTRACT.

Mr. GUNN asked :

1. Who has the contract for the carrying of mails between the railway station and the post office in the town of Goderich ?

2. When was said contract let, and when will it expire ?

3. Have tenders been asked for ? If so, how many were received ?

4. Has the contract been awarded to the lowest tenderer ?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General):

1. Thomas Gundry.

2. The contract was let covering the period from the 1st April, 1901, to the 31st March, 1905. On the 24th January last, in order to substitute a new surety for one of the former sureties, a substitute contract was executed for the unexpired period covered by the original contract on the same terms and conditions as in the original contract.

3. (a) Yes. (b) Two.

4. Yes.

SUPPLY—PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES.

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

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair, I wish to bring an important question to the attention of the House. I had intended to have brought to the attention of the House yesterday, the matter which I am about to mention, but it was not very convenient for the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) so I have let the matter stand over until to-day. The subject on which I wish to speak for a few moments concerns certain passages in a letter which the Prime Minister of the Northwest Territories has recently addressed to the right hon. gentleman who leads this House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). In proposing to discuss certain passages in that letter I do not for one moment forget that it is not open for me to-day to discuss the measures which the letter relates and therefore I am touching the letter of Mr. Haultain in so far only as it is concerned with the manner and circumstances in which and under which this Bill was introduced in this House. I assume that Mr. Haultain's letter will be brought down with any other additional correspondence and laid upon the table of the House by the government in due course. In the meantime, however, it has been made public in the press of the country and, without going over what I have already brought to the attention of the government on two occasions last week, may I be permitted at least to say this, that the situation which has developed between the month of October last and the present time is certainly a very peculiar one. We had this subject, the granting of provincial autonomy to the Northwest Territories discussed to some extent in the year 1901, again in 1902, and again in 1903. On the last occasion I moved a formal resolution in this House in which after setting out resolutions of the legislature of the Northwest Territories to the effect that provincial status should be granted to these Territories. I had submitted to the House that that request should be taken into immediate consideration by the government of this country and should be acted upon forthwith. I pointed out at that time that even if my motion passed, if the government was disposed at once to accept the suggestion which I then made, it would take a considerable time to arrange the details. It was not a matter, as I admitted, to be lightly undertaken or to be disposed of in haste, and it was for that reason that I urged upon the government the immediate consideration of the question, in the month of October, 1903, saying as I did at that time, that if the matter were taken up by the government at once the population of the Northwest Territories of Canada would probably be 500,000 before the details could be arranged and the measure brought down for the consideration of the House and of the country.

Not one member of the administration made any answer to the motion which I brought before the House on that occasion. My hon. friend who now represents the constituency of Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) spoke on that motion. He would not support the resolution for the granting of provincial institutions to the Northwest Territories unless he knew exactly the terms upon which autonomy would be granted. Let me quote his own expressive words :

> I, as a representative of the Northwest Territories, do not propose to go into a sort of blind pool, not knowing how we are going to come out when the conclusion has been reached on this very momentous question.

And the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) spoke on the same subject. If I remember his attitude correctly, on one occasion at least, he was not prepared to have this matter discussed or even considered in the House of Commons unless his leader the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) were present for the purpose of guiding the discussion, as he thought that hon. gentleman's guidance necessary for the protection of the rights of the people of the Northwest Territories. No member of the administration spoke in answer to the motion. The gentlemen to whom I have referred answered for the government ; then the division was taken, and the members of the administration stood up and voted solemnly one after the other that the request of the people of the Northwest Territories for provincial status—a request expressed un-

animously on the two occasions, I believe by the legislature of the Northwest Territories—should not be considered nor acted upon in the immediate future. My motion demanded that the question should be considered and acted upon as promptly as circumstances permitted. Parliament was dissolved. Then, in the month of October, 1904, the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) suddenly awoke to the gravity of the situation in the midst of an election campaign. He then, for the first time, recollected that letters written to him by the Prime Minister of the Northwest Territories in the month of May previous had not been answered; and, in all the stress and hurry of that campaign—no doubt, upon advice communicated to him by his friends in the Northwest Territories,—suddenly he came to the conclusion, notwithstanding the arguments put forward on his behalf, and indeed by himself in previous sessions of parliament, that the matter must be taken up without the slightest delay. So, he wrote to the Prime Minister of the Northwest Territories as follows:

You will have learned, prior to the receipt of this letter, that parliament has been dissolved. The new House of Commons will contain not four but ten representatives of the Northwest Territories, who, coming fresh from the people, will be entitled to speak with confidence as to the views and requirements of those whom they represent. Should my government be sustained, we will be prepared, immediately after the election, to enter upon negotiations for the purpose of arriving at a settlement of the various questions involved in the granting of provincial autonomy, with a view to dealing with the question at the next session of parliament.

That was a very much balder proposition, I think, than the opposition had presented to parliament by motion and by speech in this House. We had at least defined our position with regard to the lands in the Northwest Territories which are owned by the government of Canada, and we had defined our position with regard to the tax exemption of lands patented, or about to be patented, by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and not one of these matters was mentioned by the Prime Minister. And, although my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) was not willing to enter a 'blind pool' when it was proposed by the opposition, I understand he gleefully accepted the proposition of the government, although in that case the pool was very much 'blinder' than that to which he had objected. Now, certainly, the terms of the government's proposal might properly and indeed should properly have been discussed before and considered by the people of the Northwest Territories in that campaign. And so the ex-Minister of the Interior, my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) was asked about the terms. I do not know whether he was asked about the terms at the instigation of the hon. member from Edmonton or not. The Prime Minister of the Northwest Territories, who spoke during the course of that campaign, asked the Minister of the Interior of that day (Mr. Sifton) to define the terms. The request was much along the line which had been suggested by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). No satisfaction was given by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), then Minister of the Interior. His answer to the Prime Minister of the Northwest Territories, who desired that the terms might be discussed during the progress of that election campaign, was that that hon. gentleman was a mischiefmaker in even suggesting that terms should be discussed. Speaking at Regina, about the 19th or 20th of October, 1904, he said:

Any man of ordinary intelligence in public life, and Mr. Haultain is a man of more than ordinary intelligence, knows full well that one member of a government consisting of fourteen members would not come here, and, without consulting his colleagues, undertake to bind them and the parliament of Canada on questions of such importance. Therefore, the suggestion is made in a spirit of mischief.

And again he said:

But I want to say that the man who gets up in the heat of a political contest and makes his strongest endeavour to bring that question into political discussion is not a friend of the Territories in any way, sense or shape.

Differing very much from my hon. friend from Edmonton, who said that the question ought not to be discussed as a matter of practical politics in this House or in the country, until the terms upon which these Territories were to enter the Canadian confederation as provinces should be absolutely defined and made known to the people of the Territories. My hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) continued:

He is endeavouring to do a thing which might bring very serious results to the people of the Territories.

For what reason pray? Were not the people of the Territories entitled to have the hon. member for Brandon, then Minister of the Interior, discuss that question before them? Were they not entitled to have the views of the Prime Minister of Canada and his colleagues as to this matter which was precipitated into the political arena by the Prime Minister himself in the midst of an election campaign?

I have no authority whatever to say anything with regard to the subjects Mr. Haultain has mentioned, but we shall be in the position of having not four but ten members from the Territories in the next parliament, and we will get their views; and while we do not say that their views will prevail—for the entry of the Territories into confederation is a matter of contract with the other provinces—and while the terms we will be able to give you will be those we can get the other provinces to agree to, yet I can say for myself that I will do my best to get the most liberal term possible, and I will leave you to judge me by my past record.

The Prime Minister seems in the end to have given my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton)—if I may use a common expression—a dose of his own medicine. For the hon. member for Brandon thought that this matter should be settled by the government without giving any opportunity to the people of the Northwest Territories to consider the terms of the proposed Bill, and the Prime Minister, carrying that idea a little farther thought that the matter should be discussed and the Bill brought down to parliament without giving even the ex-Minister of the Interior an opportunity to consider or even to see it.

I would remark to my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) that the manner in which this Bill was introduced—introduced on the eve of the return of the ex-Minister of the Interior, who was then still a minister (Mr. Sifton) and on the eve of the return of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding)—affords an excellent specimen of the way in which a 'blind pool' was offered those gentlemen. Let us revert for one moment to the debates of 1902 and to the speech which the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) then made with all the authority of a member of the administration. The ex-minister spoke then for the Prime Minister of this country, for his colleague the Minister of Finance, and for my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock.) He was endeavouring to show good reason for postponing the introduction and consideration of a Bill of this kind, and what did he say :

> Last year it was arranged that a discussion should take place, and our friends of the territorial government did urge that it should take place earlier. But the Minister of Finance was obliged to go to England immediately after the session, and a discussion in his absence would of course have been impossible, he being one of the members of the government whose presence would be absolutely necessary in addition to the Prime Minister and myself. So that until the return of the Finance Minister from England, it was impossible altogether to arrive at any arrangement as to when the conference should take place.

I am not reading this as simply the language of the Minister of the Interior, but as a declaration by the present administration, whose mouthpiece that hon. gentleman then was, that the consideration of this question could not possibly be proceeded with in the absence of these ministers. But to-day, not much more than two years later, we find the Prime Minister of this country, in the absence of his Minister of the Interior and his Minister of Finance—the presence of both of whom this government had declared absolutely necessary in order that this question might be considered and a decision arrived at—we find the Prime Minister bringing down to the House on the 21st of February this important measure in the absence of these two ministers. And we find further that notwithstanding that extraordinary—I might even say, in view of all the circumstances, that indecent haste—not one single step has since been taken to press this Bill through. And when we asked the right hon. gentleman why it was that, without regard for constitutional usage, in absolute contempt of all constitutional precedent, he not only did that which I have just mentioned but brought this Bill down, as the Act of the government and the result of the collective wisdom of the government, without the assent of his two colleagues,—who above all others should have been consulted—when we ask him why he took that extraordinary course, he vouchsafes to the House not one word in explanation. I ventured to suggest some days ago that it was due, not only to the House and the country but to the right hon. gentleman himself, that some explanation should be given. I am still of that opinion. What was the reason, when the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) was expected in Ottawa within two days, that this Bill was rushed into the House of Commons before his arrival, while not one step has been taken to forward it through any of its stages for three weeks afterwards ? Why was it, when the Minister of Finance was on his way home from England and expected to arrive, as he did arrive, in Ottawa within four or five days, that the Prime Minister rushed in feverish haste to the House with this measure, and has not since sought to advance it one single stage ? Was it because some of the right hon. gentleman's colleagues were wavering and he dreaded the result of the influence of two such strong members of his cabinet as the ex-Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Finance upon those who were hesitating to indorse the course the right hon. gentleman purposed to pursue. Was there any idea in the mind of the First Minister that these gentlemen might not be so ready to hesitate or to retreat once this measure had been brought down as a government measure. Was there anything of that kind in the mind of the right hon. gentleman ? I do not know. I cannot tell what was in his mind, but we at least are able to conclude that something very extraordinary must have impelled him to take the course he did.

But a still more extraordinary condition of affairs seems to have existed with regard to the representatives of the Northwest Territories. The right hon. gentleman, when I brought up this matter in 1902 and again in 1903, took the ground that the Northwest Territories already had a very considerable degree of responsible government. They had a legislature of their own, a cabinet of their own, and he pointed out that with the exception of the right to incur debt and one or two other matters, they were already invested with the powers of responsible government. Well, Sir, the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), in the speech to which I alluded a moment

ago—a speech delivered at Regina about the 19th or 20th of March last—told us that this Bill must be in the nature of a contract between the Northwest Territories and the rest of this country—a contract made, as the premier of the Northwest Territories has pointed out, between the great majority of the people of this country and the minority who live in the Territories ; an agreement to be made between five and one half millions of the people of Canada residing in the seven existing provinces and the half million people who reside in the Northwest Territories. These 500,000 people have a government. That government was summoned here to Ottawa for the purpose of conferring with a special committee of the Privy Council in regard to the terms of this measure. It was to be a matter of contract, so the ex-Minister of the Interior told us. Well, one would suppose that, under these conditions, at least the representatives of the Northwest Territories would have been consulted about all the important provisions of this Bill. Does my right hon. friend remember how he swelled with indignation in 1896 when he charged Sir Charles Tupper across the floor of this House with having trampled upon the liberties of the people of Nova Scotia in passing through a moribund legislature the resolutions relating to confederation ? Does he remember how he advocated the rights of the people at that time ? Does he forget how he accused Sir Charles Tupper of having trampled upon the dignity of a proud people who would never forget that treatment ? But at least this can be said in favour of the measure which Sir Charles Tupper caused to be passed at that time, that it went before the representatives of the people and was considered by them in parliament, even if it were a moribund parliament. But, the Prime Minister, if we are to believe the statements contained in the letter of Mr. Haultain, has seen fit to bring down to the parliament of Canada certain provisions in this measure without even deigning for one moment to consult the representatives of the people in those territories. We see the constitutional advocate of the liberties of the people of ten years ago changed into the—may I say—tyrant of to-day ? What are the words of Mr. Haultain ?

> I must take strong exception to the way in which the subject of education has been treated both in the conferences and in the Bills. I must remind you of the fact that your proposition was not laid before my colleague or myself until noon of the day upon which you introduced the Bills. Up to that time the question had not received any attention beyond a casual reference to it on the previous Friday, and I certainly believe that we should have had an opportunity of discussing your proposals before twelve o'clock on the day the Bills received their first reading. No such opportunity, however, was afforded, as unfortunately, you were not able to be present at the session when this section was submitted ; neither was Sir William Mulock.

The same day ! The same day !

> I feel sure that you will acquit me of any feeling in the matter other than that such an important subject should have been fully discussed before any definite conclusion was arrived at by the government and before the Bills dealing with it were laid before parliament.

Now, can any hon. gentleman on either side of the House, looking at the situation as I have endeavoured to present it to the House in a few words, say in his heart that the declaration made by Mr. Haultain in the sentences I have just read is an unreasonable one ? He is here as the Prime Minister of the Northwest Territories, having behind him the entire people of the Northwest Territories as voiced by their representatives in parliament and he is called here to confer about this Bill. It is handed to him, in so far as this provision is concerned, two or three hours before the right hon. gentleman presents the measure to parliament and handed to him without any opportunity of discussion with the Prime Minister, without any opportunity of discussion with the Postmaster General and without apparently any opportunity of discussion except with one or two members of the administration for a few moments and a few moments only.

Well, I do not know what my right hon. friend will make of all this. He did not consult the hon. ex-Minister of Interior who specially represents the people of the Northwest Territories ; he did not consult the Minister of Finance who is especially concerned with the financial features of this Bill ; he did not consult, in so far as this part of the measure is concerned, the Prime Minister of the Northwest Territories and his colleagues. The question naturally arises : Whom did he consult ? I can only answer that question in one way. It seems to me that he must have consulted the seven gentlemen from the Northwest Territories who are elected as Liberals and these provisions are the result of their collective and united wisdom. He postponed this measure in order that he might have the benefit of the wisdom of ten gentlemen from the Northwest Territories. He did not get as many as he thought he would get ; he got seven and I presume that the educational provisions of the measure which has been brought down are the result of the advice and assistance of the seven gentlemen who sit on that side of the House for the moment. Assuming that to be the case—and we must assume that it is the case in the silence of these gentlemen—is it good constitutional practice after all, to put to one side the Minister of the Interior when he is about to return, to put to one side the Minister of Finance, to put to one side the Prime Minister of the Northwest Territories and his colleagues and to follow altogether the advice of these seven gentlemen who have evidently drafted the educational clauses

of the Bill ? I yield to no one in appreciation of the great abilities of these gentlemen and of the experience of some of them, but while conceding everything that can be conceded in that regard, it was hardly fair to pass over the ex-Minister of the Interior, the Minister of Finance and the representatives of the people of the Northwest Territories and to follow solely the advice of these gentlemen and to seek solely their assistance.

I have no more to say at present. I trust that my right hon. friend will recede a little from the position which he took the other day, and that he will give us some reason for the very extraordinary course which he has pursued in the introduction of this Bill, that he will perhaps be good enough to advise us, although he has not seen fit to do so up to the present time, whether or not any amendments to the Bill have been under the consideration of the government. Whenever I have asked that question before, my right hon. friend has told me with a great air of wisdom that amendments can be made to any Bill. Nearly all of us on this side of the House were aware of that before the right hon. gentleman told us. There may have been one or two hon. gentlemen to whom that came as a refreshing piece of news, but nearly all of us were aware of it before. That was not the question I asked. The question I asked and to which I have a right to get an answer is this : Has the government under consideration at the present time any amendments to the Bill which was brought down in such extraordinary haste three weeks ago and in the progress of which not one step has been taken since ? In addition to that perhaps my right hon. friend will be good enough to enlighten the House as to the personnel of the members of the administration who constituted the committee of council which was appointed to deal with this question. We have nothing official before the House in so far as I am aware with regard to it. I understand from the documents that my right hon. friend was a member, that the hon. Postmaster General was a member, and I would gather also that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice must have been a member, because it would be absolutely indispensable to have the assistance of his very great legal ability and experience. Were there any other members of this sub-committee and if so, who were they ? Was there any gentleman specially appointed to represent the interests of the people of the Northwest Territories ? Was there any gentleman appointed to consider this question from the standpoint of the maritime provinces, because, as the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior has well pointed out, this is a matter which must be considered not only from the standpoint of the interests of the people of the Northwest Territories but from the standpoint of the interests of the entire country ? Now this would appear not an unreasonable demand, and I trust my right hon. friend departing in that regard from his practice on the last few occasions on which I brought this matter to the attention of the House, will really on this occasion give the House information upon the subjects which I have ventured to refer to.

There has just been placed in my hands a copy of a journal which is sometimes supposed to be in the secrets of the government ; which is sometimes supposed to contain statements that have an official inspiration. I observe that this journal, quoting from the Montreal organ of a member of the administration, gives currency to a rumour that some question or questions in connection with this Bill are to be submitted for the consideration of the Supreme Court. If my right hon. friend's view, expressed when he introduced this Bill, is a sound one—and I presume it was not taken without due consideration—of course it would not be necessary to submit any question to the court, but perhaps he may have had new light on the subject since he made his speech. However that may be, I do respectfully ask the Prime Minister to give the House some information with regard to all these matters, and especially to inform us why it was that he did not see fit to consult these gentlemen from the Northwest Territories who were in Ottawa at his call and who were supposed to represent the voice and the desires of the people of the west.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) has stated that it would have been convenient for him to speak on this matter yesterday as he had given me notice, and that I had asked him to postpone his remarks until this afternoon, because I had an engagement after the dinner hour before which the question could not have been reached. I knew I could appeal to the courtesy of my hon. friend, because he and I have always managed these matters between us to our mutual satisfaction. I thanked my hon. friend, and I thank him all the more because I appreciate that in agreeing to my request to postpone this discussion, I deprived him of the pleasure of bringing forward once again extract after extract from his scrap book. Judging from the extract after extract which my hon. friend has read, and the innuendo after innuendo which he has given utterance to, my hon. friend has come to the conclusion that this Bill has been too hastily prepared. As an evidence of this hasty preparation he tells us that the Bill though given a first reading on the 21st of February has not yet been called for second reading. It is true that we have not yet moved the second reading of the Bill, and it makes my heart sink within me to think that whenever we defer to the wishes of my hon. friends on

the other side of the House, we are always reproached for having done something wrong. I had scarcely taken my seat when I moved the first reading, when a gentleman (Mr. Sproule) who sits very close to the leader of the opposition rose and spoke thus :

> This is an important Bill and I ask that a large number of copies be printed as there are many applications for it. I would suggest that the second reading might be delayed for some period until there has been an opportunity to hear from those who are most interested, the people of the Northwest.

This request seemed to be not unreasonable. I thought it would be advisable that all parties in this country should have an opportunity of reading the Bill and digesting its provisions. So persistent was my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that he again repeated his request on another occasion, and on the 7th of March he spoke as follows :

> The second reading of the Bill to establish autonomy in the Northwest Territories is expected to take place some time soon, and there are many members who desire to be present on that occasion. In referring to the matter I am not in any way intimating a desire to have an early reading of the Bill because the later this comes on the better for our aims and our desires.

In order to facilitate the aims and desires of my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) who is member of parliament for East Grey and who holds another position in the country also, I thought that by giving him an opportunity of having this Bill read and digested I was conferring upon him a favour and meeting the wishes of the leader of the opposition. It appears to have been a sad mistake on my part ; a mistake which I shall be perhaps slow to commit on a future occasion. I shall steel my heart against the blandishments of my hon. friend from East Grey in future, and strive to do my stern duty.

My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) has found another evidence of the hasty preparation of this Bill, in the general scope of the letter of Mr. Haultain. I do not agree with my hon. friend in this respect. It is true that the letter from Mr. Haultain which he asks to be placed on the table of the House, takes exception to almost every provision of the Bill, but, if I am to judge from the expressions of public opinion which are coming from all parts of the country, there is only one feature of the Bill, and that the school clause, which has caused any comment. With regard to the number of provinces to be created ; with regard to the land question, with regard to the finance question ; indeed with regard to all other proposals of the Bill I have yet to learn that serious exception has been taken. There have indeed been some expressions from here and there, but so far as concerns any general views from the people of Canada, the manifestations seem to be only against the clause referring to education. The House is aware that every day we have received numerous petitions regarding these Bills. Do they speak of the land question ; do they speak of the finance question ; do they speak of the number of provinces ? No ; it is only on the education clause of the Bill as to which we have received any petitions so far.

I know, Sir, that in dealing with this question we are walking upon very tender ground. It shall be my duty some time or other to discuss it, but I do not need to say anything as to the merits of the question at the present time. I take issue with my hon. friend when he says that the Bill bears evidence of hasty preparation. On the contrary it has every evidence of having been discussed and prepared with great care and deliberation, and, if the educational phase were eliminated, I do not think the Bill itself would then receive a word of criticism. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) says : You have not consulted Mr. So-and-So, and Mr. So-and-So, and in particular you have not consulted Mr. Haultain. On this ground I am prepared to give my hon. friend all the satisfaction, and perhaps more than all the satisfaction he is entitled to. Upon a recent occasion my hon. friend questioned me as to what had taken place in the conferences between us and Mr. Haultain and Mr. Bulyea. I did not think it advisable to give my own version on that subject, and I gave my reasons to the House and it is for the House to decide whether these reasons were good or bad. I stated that in my judgment and to my way of thinking these conferences had been confidential ; that there had been no secretary appointed ; that there had been no record kept, and that there had been simply an exchange of opinion across the table between the members of the government at Ottawa and the members of the Northwest government.

Under such circumstances, I do not think it would have been right for me to have given my own version of what had taken place at that conference. I am still of that opinion ; and, Sir, I can appeal to the judgment of any man in this House that when you have a conference, the proceedings of which are not recorded in writing, it is always a somewhat risky process to endeavour to say exactly what took place. Mr. Haultain thinks differently. I do not know that Mr. Haultain, in the letter which he has addressed to me, and which he has also given to the public, has improved the criticism which he makes of the Bill when he complains that he had not received due consideration. Sir, I would be sorry to think that I or my colleagues had been guilty of any want of courtesy towards Mr. Haultain in regard to the matters which were treated at the conference. But Mr. Haultain has relieved us of any such im-

putation, because, in the last paragraph of his letter, he speaks as follows :

In concluding this letter I beg to express, on behalf of the Northwest government, our high appreciation of the attentive and courteous consideration extended to us by yourself and the other members of the sub-committee of council throughout the whole conference.

I could not conceive it possible for Mr. Haultain to complain that the questions before us had not been properly treated, when, at the same time, he says he has been shown every possible consideration. It would have been showing Mr. Haultain very poor courtesy indeed simply to ask him to sit at the table of conference and give him no information whatever. But I will take the statement of Mr. Haultain. My hon. friend read it a moment ago ; I will take the liberty of reading it again, so that the House may appreciate whether there has been any fault on my part or on the part of my colleagues on the sub-committee, or whether Mr. Haultain is making a case which, as I have said, it would have been better for him not to have attempted. Mr. Haultain says :

I must take strong exception to the way in which the subject of education has been treated, both in the conferences and in the Bills. I must remind you of the fact that your proposition was not laid before my colleague or myself until noon of the day upon which you introduced the Bill. Up to that time the question had not received any attention beyond a casual reference to it from the previous Friday, and I certainly believed that we should have an opportunity of discussing your proposals before twelve o'clock on the day the Bills received their first reading.

So it appears, according to this testimony of Mr. Haultain, that this matter was considered twice by the conference—on the Friday previous to the 21st of February, and again on the 21st of February. Now, Sir, I do not propose, like Mr. Haultain, to go into the particulars of what took place there, but I will take his own language. True it is that we differed on several matters with Mr. Haultain. True it is, as he says, that we differed with him on the land question. Mr. Haultain was of opinion that the land should be given to the provinces. We thought, on the contrary, that the land should be kept in the hands of the Dominion government. I have already given the reasons for that, and I think those reasons, when they come to be discussed, will stand good in the judgment of every one. Mr. Haultain differed with us also in regard to the subject of irrigation. We thought that subject should go to those who have the management of the land, because the two are intimately connected. Mr. Haultain refers to the fact that we proposed to establish two provinces instead of one. We differed from Mr. Haultain on this point also. We thought it would be preferable to have two provinces in that vast domain ; Mr. Haultain thought it would be better to have only one province. But I appeal to the judgment of my hon. friend who has taken us to task because we have not adopted the ways and means of Mr. Haultain, and I ask him if he is prepared to say that there shall be one province in that immense territory instead of two—that we should create there one province which would have almost twice the area of the largest province of the Dominion. Whatever may be the views of Mr. Haultain on this subject, the government came to a different conclusion, and our action in this regard, as on everything else, is in the judgment of the House.

But now I come to the principal point made by Mr. Haultain—that the education clauses did not receive fair consideration. As Mr. Haultain says, this question was debated on the Friday previous to the 21st of February. Mr. Haultain calls this a casual consideration only. Well, Sir, this is the result of having no record of what took place. What may have been casual to Mr. Haultain may have been thorough to somebody else ; what may have been only passing to him, may have been sufficient for somebody else. On this I have only to say that the discussions which took place on the 21st of February between Mr. Haultain and members of Council there revealed this fact, that while he held one view, we held another, with regard to the educational clauses. As Mr. Haultain has laid down his views in his memorandum, I shall not commit any breach of privacy if I say what his views were. Mr. Haultain took the ground that section 93 of the British North America Act applied mechanically to those new provinces. The ground we took was that section 93 of the British North America Act did not apply mechanically, but that it should be made to apply in the legislation we offered to the House, subject only to such modifications as the circumstances of the new provinces would warrant. That was, therefore, a distinct difference of opinion between us and Mr. Haultain. The Bills before the House indicate what our position was. The letter of Mr. Haultain speaks of the views he laid before the committee of Council. Those views were that section 93 of the British North America Act applied mechanically to those provinces, and that there was, therefore, no necessity of going beyond section 2 of the Bill. But we said : No ; we agree with you that section 93 must go into this Bill, but we think it should be done legislatively, subject to such modifications as are called for by the present condition of the people. There was the subject of difference. Therefore, we knew exactly what our position was and what the position of Mr. Haultain was. Although we might have discussed the question for a month or a year, there would have been the same difference. We knew exactly the line of cleavage between us and him. We said to Mr. Haultain : We do not agree with you : perhaps you are right, perhaps

wrong ; but at any rate, that is our way of thinking, and we will prepare a clause according to our view which we will submit to you. When the clause was prepared, it was submitted to him. It was open to him to discuss it; but after he had taken his position and we had taken ours, I do not suppose there would have been much to accomplish by discussion. We knew where we were and where he was. That is the position of the matter, and I leave it to the House to say whether or not, under such circumstances, we have not given to Mr. Haultain, and Mr. Bulyea, the members representing the Northwest government, every opportunity to be heard by us and to have their views represented to us and thoroughly discussed. Every impartial man who reads the letter of Mr. Haultain will come to the conclusion, after the explanation that I have given to the House, that there was nothing to complain of on his part. The subject was thoroughly threshed out on the first day on which it was taken up, and after that we placed before the House the result of our deliberations.

Now, this is all I have to say on this question at the present time. My hon. friend has again pressed me for information on other subjects. I do not think that on such an occasion I am called on to give my hon. friend more information than I have given on former ocasions.

It will be the duty of the government, in due time, to give to my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) and to the House every information that is necessary for the discussion of the Bill. My hon. friend has asked me if we contemplate amendments to the Bill. I do not know, Sir, that any wrong will be done to anybody if we are contemplating amendments. Would it be the first time that a government when introducing a measure should endeavour to see whether or not it was possible to satisfy all sections of the country in regard to that measure ? In view of the petitions that have been presented to the House, some coming from one quarter and other petitions coming from another side, would it be wrong if the government would say : We will reconsider our position and see whether or not we can satisfy this country ? I am sorry my hon. friend has treated the subject a little more lightly than I would have expected him to do on an occasion of this kind. What is the spectacle we have to-day ? We have the spectacle of numerous petitions being presented asking that the educational clauses should be withdrawn from the Bill and numerous other petitions asking that the Bill should be passed as it is. This is a very delicate subject. It is not the first time this question of education has come before the House. It is not the first time it has engaged the attention of the country and upon every occasion that it has come before the House, in 1872-73 with regard to the New Brunswick school question, in 1875,

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

with regard to the school question again, and in 1896, whenever it has come before the country there has always been an exhibition of strong public sentiment and of contrary opinions. Sir, under such circumstances, if the government were thinking : 'Well we may consider again the position we have taken ; we may again look at what we are going to do,' is there any man on that side or on this side of the House, or without the House throughout this broad country who would say that the government was not doing right in thinking twice before taking a final step upon this question ? Sir, I claim that I have some sense of the responsibility that attaches to the government and to those who are entrusted with the administration of the affairs of the country, and, in a question of this kind especially, whenever such a matter is brought up the government is faced with a difficulty which perhaps it has not anticiparted and finding difficulties which no man could have foreseen, viewing the virulence with which passions are roused, perhaps, Sir, there is some reason why a government should be slow to take any action and should hesitate in coming to a final decision. I have spoken of the virulence of the passions exhibited. I do not say that offensively ; I know that would be greatly mistaken if I were to say anything offensively on this point. I would not do so ; I know that public passions, strong passions, are not always ignoble ; sometimes on the contrary, they are only the exaggeration of a noble sentiment, but even the exaggeration of a noble sentiment may lead to outbursts of public passion. I say to my hon. friend, if he wants to know, that this subject gives me a great deal to think about, and if it be possible to amend this Bill the government need not fear to consider the matter. More than this I will not say at present. This I will say, that we are thinking upon these matters, that it is our duty to do so and the result of our deliberations shall be given in due time to the House, but at this present moment, I think I have given to my hon. friend all the answer to which he is entitled.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Mr. Speaker, although the House can hardly congratulate itself that the right hon. gentleman who so ably leads it (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has shed any great flood of light upon the questions submitted to him, still, day by day, as question follows question we do elicit information, and in due time if the Bill continues to be delayed and if only as much information leaks out every day as has so far leaked out we will at all events be able to discuss the matter when it comes before us with a light of understanding that certainly was lacking in the first instance. To-day the right hon. gentleman has accepted the statement of Mr. Haultain as to the facts laid down in his letter and he has

told us in so many words that Mr. Haultain had no right or reason to complain of the opportunity given him to discuss the educational clauses in the Bill. When we look at Mr. Haultain's letter and find that he states that he never saw these clauses until noon of the day on which the Bill was introduced, that he never heard of these clauses until the previous Friday when there was but a casual reference to them—and evidently the clauses themselves could not have been laid before him—we have an idea of the importance the right hon. gentleman attaches to the opinion of the Northwest Territories when it applies to the educational clauses of these important Acts. When a most important question touching the province of Manitoba was presented to the right hon. gentleman, when the legislature of Manitoba and the people of Manitoba were a unit in desiring that their province should be extended to the west, when it was an undeniable fact that a little province 73,000 square miles in size, of which 10,000 miles were under water, was to be placed side by side with two gigantic provinces of a quarter of a million square miles each, when the legislature of Manitoba and the people of that province pleaded that their province might be placed on an equal footing with these new provinces, the one sufficient answer that the right hon. gentleman gave was why the people of the Northwest Territories through their legislature have opposed such a claim. And inasmuch as the people of the west have opposed it the request of Manitoba was promptly denied. Why is it that the people of the Northwest Territories and the premier of the Northwest Territories have so extraordinary an influence on the right hon. gentleman and his government in regard to some matters, and that their opinions have so little value in regard to the educational clauses which if passed must bind these provinces for all time to come, through all eternity. The right hon. gentleman thought the matter was of so little importance that to-day, after the country has been convulsed for more than a month he congratulates himself and gravely tells us that Mr. Haultain had ample opportunity to discuss these clauses which he never saw. I am sorry, Sir, that a case such as this, without precedent one might say, leads to peculiar complications, and so I am not perfectly certain that I agree with my leader in one statement that he made. That hon. gentleman seems to be under the impression that the seven members from the west were those who enlightened, instructed and controlled the premier in this legislation. Possibly they did, Sir, on the principle of the doctrine of exclusion. We know that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) did not; we know that the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) did not, and we know that the premier, representing the people of the Northwest Territories did not, and I suppose that the hon. gentleman who leads this side of the House, (Mr. R. L. Borden), must have concluded that the seven gentlemen in question were the ones who really did guide the premier, basing his opinion on the kind of advice they gave on statements of the right hon. gentleman as made before the House when the Bill was introduced. The hon. gentleman who leads the opposition may be right, but I decline to think that any native-born Canadian could have given the right hon. gentleman such advice as he evidently received. I think that no one who reads the statement which he made when the Bill was introduced, and I say it with all respect to the right hon. gentleman, because I quite understand that the onerous duties of the leader of a government, especially when the session is in progress—can doubt that the right hon. gentleman has no time to devote to the acquisition of facts of law and otherwise, and therefore he is dependent on some one for these facts. It would seem that the gentleman who instructed him relied on imagination for his history and his invention for his law, and I think we are justified in considering that even these seven were not consulted. The question as to the propriety or impropriety of the clauses is of course not a question which we can discuss at the present time.

But surely all must admit that the very evidence we have seen in this House day after day, when, from one end of this country to the other petitions are pouring in, some for and some against this measure, must be enough to impress the members of this House with the gravity of the position in which the right hon. gentleman placed this House, has placed these provinces, has placed the people of Canada by introducing the Bill which has been so long held back. And the right hon. gentleman seems to lead us to infer that the Bill was held back out of kindness and consideration for the wishes of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). Applying the old rule that it is the unexpected that happens, we would naturally expect the right hon. gentleman to defer his own wishes to the convenience and interest of the hon. member for East Grey. But, as I understand the complaints made by the hon. member for East Grey and other gentlemen on this side of the House, they are not that the right hon. gentleman has held back the second reading of the Bill so much as that we cannot find out what the Bill is. I think the hon. member for East Grey was right in asking that ample time should be given to the country to consider and digest the provisions of the Bill. But how is the country to consider and digest these most important matters when the right hon. Prime Minister will not tell us, though appealed to again and again, what the provisions of the Bill are to be. It is all very well for the right hon. gentleman to tell us that no important Bill

goes through parliament without changes and amendments. That is perfectly true. But I would ask the right hon gentleman if, in the course of his reading of constitutional law, he has ever found a case where the leader of a government introduced a Bill and, contrary to the ordinary practice not only explained its provisions, but made an impassioned appeal to the House by all the principles of right, and by all the claims of justice, loyalty, and even religion, to pass certain clauses, and days and weeks after told the House gravely that the government was considering these clauses and reserved its right to do as it saw fit about them? I would ask the right hon. gentleman's followers if it would not be more in accordance with constitutional procedure and more statesmanlike if this consideration, this discussion, had taken place before the Bill came down, and before this burning question was thrown into the political arena? Would it not have been better to discuss the matter with his hon. colleagues, so that they might have a chance, before the Bill was brought to parliament, to oppose the measure and to try, by resignation or in any other proper way, to compel a modification of its terms? Would not this be better than, after parliament is called, the members should be detained from their business week after week because the government is not ready to announce its policy? My hon. leader (Mr. R. L. Borden) asked the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) a most important question—it occurs to me the most important question in connection with this matter—which the right hon. gentleman did not answer. He inquired whether it was the intention of the government, as stated in a newspaper ordinarily supposed to be one of the organs of the party of hon. gentlemen opposite, to refer this question to the Supreme Court. Now, I do not know what the policy of the Conservative party or any other member of the Conservative party may be on this subject. But, speaking for myself, I oppose any proposal to refer this matter to the Supreme Court. We know that even a wise man may be caught napping once, but no wise man will be caught napping twice in the same way. I remember a question similar to this that agitated this country nearly ten years ago. I remember that a constitutional question arose along lines similar to this in the province of Manitoba. After it had been decided that Manitoba had not the right to separate schools because there were no separate schools by law or practice in the province at the time it entered into confederation, Manitoba claimed the right, under the remedial clauses of the law, to appeal to the Dominion parliament. The right of this parliament to repeal a provincial statute passed after the union was discussed, and the House was asked to consent to a reference of the matter to the Supreme Court. It was so referred. But no less an authority than the right hon. gentleman himself (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) pointed out—and, I think, wisely and correctly—that the very fact of the House referring to the Supreme Court the question of its right to pass this legislation was an admission by the House that, should it be held that parliament had the right to pass such a law, it was in reason and in honour bound to exercise that right. And it was for that reason, and not because we were advocating separate schools in Manitoba that I and many others like me, thought that, this House having asked whether it had the power to pass remedial legislation, it would be a monstrous absurdity, it would be a stultifying of ourselves not to pass it. To ask whether we had the right to act and, when that right was established refuse to act, would simply be playing a double game. It would be asking the Supreme Court and the Privy Council gravely whether our rights extended to a certain point while determined that even if they did extend that far, we would not act upon the right thus decided to be ours. There is a clear cut line between the right hon. Prime Minister and Mr. Haultain and many other gentlemen in this country as to the constitutional right of this House to pass the legislation now proposed. Of course, I do not propose to discuss that point at present. But I venture to say that no lawyer will look into the matter and not come to the conclusion that, at least, the question is open to argument that it is doubtful whether this House has power to pass and enforce such legislation. But, if we should pass such legislation, and it should be decided to be ultra vires of our powers, the provinces will find that out for themselves and it will not be long before the people will find that they are not bound as they were supposed to be. But I would protest against submitting the question to the Supreme Court or Privy Council whether we have power to pass such educational clauses as are proposed; for all must see that, if this House should ask the Supreme Court whether we have that power to pass such clauses, it might be contended, as the right hon. Prime Minister said ten years ago, that, if it should be decided that we had the power, then we should be bound to show our sincerity and good faith by passing such legislation and so impose these clauses upon the Northwest Territories for all time to come.

Now, the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) spoke of the educational clauses as the only objectionable clauses in the Bill. I would enter a very earnest dissent from that proposition. The Bill may have many objectionable clauses, but, if it has one transcendently objectionable, it is quite reasonable for the people, for the time being, to concentrate their attack upon that clause rather than spend their time on minor clauses which, however objection-

able, are comparatively of small importance. I can assure the hon. gentleman that he will find in the Northwest Territories the people have a very strong, and, he may find, a very well-founded objection to many of the clauses outside of the educational clauses to which he has referred. I do not wish to occupy time more than to say that the members of this House, I suppose, have a perfect right, when the government brings down such a measure as this and when the right hon. gentleman tells us that the government is considering the question, to ask that when they have pondered over, they will give us the benefit of their views. When the right hon. gentleman takes the position he does we have the right to ask if he brings to the discussion of this question the same open mind, the same views as to constitutional law and the rights of the provinces that he held years ago. In case he may have forgotten, I will read his own views as to the rights of the provinces, as explained by himself some years ago. In 1893, he said :

> Sir, I am to-day as firm a believer as I ever was in the doctrine of provincial rights. I take as much pride as ever I did in belonging to the great party which in the past carried that doctrine to a successful issue, an issue, indeed, so successful that we rank among the advocates of that doctrine to-day the most prominent of the men who opposed it in the past. And when the historian of the future shall refer to the first twenty years of confederation, the brightest page he will have to record will be the page in which he will trace the efforts of the Liberal party to maintain inviolate and intact the liberties and independence of the local legislatures. And I am proud to say that among the names which shall be revered in the hearts of their countrymen, as the names of those who stood foremost in the fight, will be the names of Edward Blake and Oliver Mowat.

Surely, Sir, we have the right even yet to expect that the right hon. gentleman, misled by those who by distorted facts and mistaken law, have caused him to abandon the position which apparently he would like to occupy—surely we have the right to expect that the right hon. gentleman, after considering the question, as he promised to do, will be only too proud to add his name to those dear to the Canadian people as the defenders of provincial rights, and thus complete the glorious triumvirate Edward Blake, Oliver Mowat and Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). When my right hon. friend, the Prime Minister, charged the leader of the opposition with treating this matter with levity, he made Mr. Speaker, what I consider a most extraordinary statement. I fail to see how any one who has listened to the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) could come to any other conclusion than that he has treated this question as what it really is, one of the most serious that has ever come before this House. But if a charge of levity in this connection rests against any one, it certainly does against the Prime Minister. In his reply to my hon. friend I fail to discover a single argument. Instead of arguing seriously the points raised by the leader of the opposition, he has sought lightly to brush them aside as if the question were not to be considered or discussed at all until it suited the right hon. gentleman to proceed further with his Bill and favour the House with some further particulars. But that my right hon. friend is daily finding his position more uncomfortable and his difficulties increasing is evidenced by the fact that in his reference to the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) he let slip an allusion of a personal nature, because that is a species of retort which my right hon. friend is usually careful to avoid. In referring to the hon. member, he spoke of him as not being a member of parliament only, but as something else. Well, we all know what the right hon. gentleman meant. We all know that by something else he meant that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was the chief source of those petitions which are being daily presented against the clause in this Bill relating to schools. For my part I can say, so far as my knowledge goes, that my hon. friend is not the chief source of those petitions. In fact I have been very much surprised that the body which the hon. member for East Grey represents has shown itself so thoroughly self contained throughout this matter. I do not believe that the First Minister realizes for a moment the feeling which this Bill has created. Already by this measure he has set creed against creed in the province of Ontario. Already he has done evil which ten years will not wipe out; and I appeal to him to lose not another day in submitting this Bill to the House and the people because every day's delay is widening the breach and intensifying the feeling against it. It is intensifying that feeling to such an extent that no matter whether the Bill be altered to meet the views of those who are opposing it or not the bitterness now created will last longer than the lifetime of many in this House. I have been astonished at the strength of the feeling which has been aroused in connection with this educational clause. My right hon. friend pleads that as this is the only clause in the Bill to which objection has been made, we must conclude that great consideration has been given to it. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact rather is that this educational clause so overshadows all the others that the other clauses have not received the criticism which they ought to get. It is stated in the newspapers without contradiction that this measure was left to four members of the cabinet—the First Minister, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), the Secretary of State (Mr. Scott) and the Post-

master General (Sir Wiliam Mulock). I am sorry my hon. friend the Posmaster General is not in his place because I wished to call his attention to the fact that there is a feeling in the constituency I represent and among my friends that he has not given his full assent to this measure and has reserved his right to withdraw later. I have felt it my duty to bring before the right hon. gentleman and this House what I believe, the right hon. gentleman does not realize, namely, the intense feeling which is being created by this Bill and I appeal to the First Minister not to delay a day in submitting the Bill in its present shape, if he be determined to submit it in that shape. Let us in that event deal with the Bill and fight it out, and perhaps the feeling which is being created in the country and is continuing to spread may then be stopped. Surely from the 21st February until the 15th March is a reasonable length of time to have the Bill before the country, and it ought now to be submitted to the consideration of parliament. Surely that is all the time the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) could possibly have asked for. Every day the feeling is intensifying. Every day the newspapers are instilling more and more into the minds of the people that this is a measure which simply is setting creed against creed. Let us then face the issue straight and squarely. Every day's delay is intensifying the feeling against the Bill, and that feeling has taken such root that I venture to-day that ten years hence will not see the sore healed.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY (Calgary). Representing, as I do, one of the constituencies directly affected by this Bill, I do not see how I can remain silent in this discussion especially in view of some of the remarks which have been made by the right hon. the First Minister. I rise to protest against the conduct of the administration in having framed this measure without any reference to, and in the absence of the minster who is charged by statute with the control and management of the affairs of the Northwest Territories, and for having introduced it in his absence. I may perhaps be permitted to draw the attention of hon. members to the statute to which I refer. By section 3 of chapter 22 of the Revised Statutes of Canada it is provided that the Minister of the Interior shall have the control and management of the affairs of the Northwest Territories. Why then should a measure of such vital importance to the people of that country have been framed and introduced without reference to the minister who has been clothed by statute with this particular duty. That needs explanation. No one can fail to see that there was no member of the cabinet whose presence was more necessary before arriving at a conclusion on such an important matter for the west than the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) for there was no minister whose individual responsibility in that matter was so great. It is a matter of common complaint that the affairs of the Northwest Territories can be given only a very small portion of the time which the ministers are able to spare from their respective departments.

That is a complaint that one often hears, and perhaps the reason is plain. There are matters pressing on the different ministers in their departments—matters near at hand —in which they must be more interested than they are in the rights of the people living two or three thousand miles away. That it has been the practice in the past to consult the Minister of the Interior in regard to matters of much less importance regarding the administration of the affairs of the Northwest Territories, I think cannot be denied. Looking at the correspondence which has been had between members of the legislative assembly and the federal government, it will be observed that nearly all that correspondence has been carried on with the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). I find that on April 5th, 1901, he writes the Hon. F. W. G. Haultain in connection with this matter, saying that business is so pressing upon the respective ministers that the measure could not be brought down that session. Then, again, I find that Mr. Haultain was communicating with the Minister of the Interior over an appointment to discuss affairs relating to the territories with the members of the government, and I find that on June 4th, 1901, the Hon. F. W. G. Haultain wired to Hon. Clifford Sifton :

> Can you arrange early meeting for us with sub-committee of Council before ministers disperse for summer ? Any time after fifteenth will suit us.
>
> (Sgd.) F. W. G. HAULTAIN.

And in answer to that a wire comes back, dated June 5th, 1901, as follows :

> Hon. F. W. G. Haultain,
> Regina.
>
> It is impossible to settle date of conference now. Finance Minister must be present. He has gone to England and is not expected back until August.
>
> (Sgd.) CLIFFORD SIFTON.

Apparently there is a variance between the mind of the right hon. First Minister, and even that of the ex-Minister of the Interior, as to the necessity of having the Minister of Finance present at the conference. Following on with that correspondence, I find that on December 7th, 1901, a letter was addressed to the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier by the Hon. F. W. G. Haultain. In that letter the condition of affairs in the Northwest Territories was fully gone into, and a draft Bill was inclosed setting

out what the legislative assembly of the Northwest Territories considered they were entitled to claim in dealing with this question. I will not read all the letter, but in part it states :

I have the honour to submit, on behalf of the government of the Territories, the following statement of the present position as it appears to us, together with such remarks as seem to be necessary to properly set forth the reasons which led the assembly to request that inquiries be made and accounts be taken with a view to the establishment of provincial institutions within that portion of the Northwest Territories lying between the provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia.

Then, further on in the letter, he says :

After giving some earnest thought to the matter of presenting this part of the subject as desired by the sub-committee of the Privy Council, I have concluded that I cannot do so in any better manner than by submitting the views of the executive council of the Territories in the form of a draft Bill, in which the several points we would like to have brought to an issue are duly set forth, making such comment upon the principles involved as occurs to me in connection with each section or group of sections.

And he concludes :

In conclusion I would venture to express the hope that His Excellency's advisers will, at an early date, arrive at a favourable conclusion to their consideration of the subject matters herein set forth.

(Sgd.) F. W. G. HAULTAIN.

That was written on the 7th December, 1901. On March 15, 1902, when the legislature was about to meet at Regina, a telegram was sent to the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier as follows :

Legislature opens Thursday. Important that we should know nature of reply to letter of December 7 for reference in speech. Will you kindly have summary wired if possible.

(Sgd.) F. W. G. HAULTAIN.

The answer comes back on March 18, 1902 :

Hon. F. W. G. Haultain,
Regina.

No answer can be sent until the return of Minister of Interior, who is absent through illness.

(Sgd.) WILFRID LAURIER.

The point I desire to make is that, although that was not a new matter which was before the members of this government, although they had had the matter under consideration since January 20, 1900, although there had been one conference on the Bill which had been in their possession since 7th December, 1901, they would not even take the risk of framing a bald telegram to the legislative assembly at Regina without first having a consultation and conference with the Minister of the Interior. What is it that has happened since that has caused this administration to change their minds as to consulting and conferring with the Minister of the Interior in respect to a question which was submitted to them by that draft Bill ? The right hon. leader of the government has stated that no complaints have come in from that country, with the exception of a complaint with regard to the educational clauses of the Bill. I may say that if that statement had not been made I would not have troubled the House this afternoon. I have here a copy of a resolution passed at Medicine Hat three weeks ago. I may say, explaining it, that it objects to the attempt of the federal administration to retain the lands ; it also objects to the proposed legislation in respect to education, and it goes further, and declares that the placing of the dividing line on the 4th meridian is a great hardship to the ranching industry, in that the laws governing a farming country would conflict with the laws governing a ranching country. Further on it says :

We would respectfully suggest that the government appoint a commissioner to inquire fully into all the circumstances, and that a copy of the resolutions be forwarded to the principal newspapers in the country, the premier and leader of opposition, also to the premier of the Northwest Territories, and W. Scott, M.P.

When the right hon. leader of the government says that no other objections were taken to this Bill, either he had not received a copy of that resolution, or the information which was communicated to the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) could not have been made known to him, or no attention was paid to the resolution by either gentleman. I say that there are complaints coming in, and that they are coming in all forms from all parts of the country in respect to the educational question, in respect to the boundaries of the new provinces, and as to the advisability of including in these provinces that great northern country. There is where the difficulty lies ; the people of the west to-day have no person through whom they can communicate with the government, because there is no Minister of the Interior. They can communicate with their representatives, as the people of Medicine Hat did with the hon. member for West Assiniboia ; but, apparently, if their representations do not meet the party views of these gentlemen, they will not take the trouble to lay the matter before the government. Therefore, the situation we have to-day is that the people of the Northwest Territories have no channel of communication with the government because there is no Minister of the Interior in the House of Commons. Taking up these resolutions that have been passed at Medicine Hat, which, I may say, is one of the most prosperous and flourishing towns in the Northwest Territories, and which is practically on the line which divides the proposed pro-

vinces in two ; while I do not propose to go at any length into the suggested dividing line, in view of what the right hon. gentleman has suggested to the House to-day, I feel that I would be remiss in my duty if I did not point out some of the objections that are coming from that country in regard to this proposed divided line. This line, I may say, is placed right in the heart of the ranching country. I have in my hand a map published by the Department of the Interior, and on which the ranching country in the Northwest Territories is shown, and from which it can be seen that but a very small portion of the ranching country is to be placed in the eastern province of Saskatchewan. The objection to that division is that the ranching country in that eastern province will have such small representation in the local House that its demands and its needs may not receive the recognition which they deserve. The people inhabiting that district have realized this, and so they sent their resolution of protest down to their representative in this House. Another objection which may seem of small concern to the people of the east, but which is very important to the people of the west, is that by placing a portion of the ranching territory in the eastern province there is a possibility that there will be a conflict in the branding laws, which would undoubtedly lead to great inconvenience.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member is now discussing the terms of the Bill.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. We were told to-day by the Prime Minister that no objections had been raised to the Bill except as regards the educational clause and I want to show the right hon. gentleman that there are still other objections. I point him to the fact that there is no channel through which we could approach the government to make known our objections other than by open statements in this House of Commons, and so it devolves on us from the Northwest to call the attention of the government to some very important objections which the people of the west have to this Bill. Of course, Mr. Speaker, if I am out of order I will bow to your decision and desist. Let me however point out that another very strong objection raised against this Bill is, that the great northern country is being included in the new provinces. While we may have great hopes and aspirations for the future prosperity of that northern country yet the greater part of that territory is not agricultural, if we can accept as true the statement of the Prime Minister on introducing the Bill.

If we look at the census of 1901 it will be found that in the provisional district of Athabaska the population consists of 80 English ; 8 Irish ; 39 Scotch ; 105 French ; 7 Germans ; 2 Scandinavians ; 1 Belgian, or 142 white people in all. There were 2,393 halfbreeds, 3,716 Indians, 262 unspecified, giving a total population for the district of Athabaska of 6,615. We remember that the Prime Minister when introducing the Bill discussed the question as to whether or not it was advisable to give Manitoba, with a population then of 10,000 a provincial status in 1870, and he suggested that it would have been better to allow them to mature by gradual process. If that view were sound in regard to Manitoba is it not equally applicable to-day to this great northern country ? Is there any great demand from that northern country to be included in any province ? I believe that they need and are entitled to the establishment of courts of law and a further measure of civil justice, but I have not heard there is any demand for autonomy in the district of Athabaska. Would it not be just as logical to add the Yukon to British Columbia or to add Keewatin to Ontario or to add Ungava to Quebec, as to add the district of Athabaska to the western province and extend that territory to the north ? There is this additional objection : that under the proposed autonomy Bill the provinces have no interest in the lands, mines, or minerals, and that is an important consideration when we are dealing with this phase of the measure. What would the members in this House from British Columbia, from Ontario and from Quebec say if the territories to the north of their provinces were to be given representation in the provincial legislatures and they were to be saddled with the cost of this administration under conditions similar to those on which Athabaska is to be included in the province of Alberta ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is plainly discussing the terms of the Bill, and that is out of order.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Then, Sir, it is my duty to point out to the First Minister the very serious inconvenience suffered by the people of the Northwest by reason of the fact that we have to-day, no Minister of the Interior. The right hon. gentleman has complained that no objections to the Bill have come from the Northwest save in respect to the educational clauses. Let me remind him, that there is no minister of the Crown representing the Northwest, to whom the people can transmit their grievances. I trust that the Prime Minister will at a very early day be able to assure us that the portfolio of the Interior will be filled. Day after day questions are asked in this House, which should be answered by a responsible Minister of the Interior ; day after day people are coming here great distances to interview the Minister of the Interior on matters seriously concerning the Northwest, but there is no Minister of the Interior to whom they can make their representations. It is true there is a very capable officer in the position of deputy minister, but, he has been so recently appointed

that he is not familiar with the details of the department, and he cannot be expected to give that authoritative information which a cabinet minister would. We have people here to-day from Dawson city, from Battleford and from distant points who have travelled thousands of miles to transact business with the Minister of the Interior, but they have been forced to return home without being able to attain their object. I trust, Sir, that we shall soon have a Minister of the Interior with whom the people of the Northwest Territories can transact public business, and through whom they can make their grievances known to the government of Canada.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). Mr. Speaker, in a matter of such importance to the Northwest Territories, I feel it my duty to say a very few words at the present time, and especially shall I address myself to the urgency of the appointment of a Minister of the Interior. To learn, as we did the other day, that the terms of this Bill had been agreed upon and laid before parliament without consultation with the Minister of the Interior—and as it afterwards proved, in direct opposition to his known views—was surprising enough ; but to have the statement ten days later from the Prime Minister, that he had then no intention of selecting a new Minister of the Interior, was simply amazing. I am glad to say that on the following day the right hon. gentleman modified that statement and gave us a hope that in the near future there would be an appointment. I feel that we are entitled to ask from the right hon. gentleman an absolute and positive statement on this question.

If it is not unconstitutional to go on with such important measures as those before the House in the absence of the Minister of the Interior, and I believe it is unconstutional, I will make this assertion, that it is plainly against the spirit of the constitution, and that it is also against the principles which were laid down by the Prime Minister himself, in the Order in Council which was published in connection with the retirement of the Earl of Dundonald last year. I submit, Sir, that it is absolutely necessary at the present time that the Prime Minister should admit into his most confidential counsels some man who is thoroughly imbued with the spirit and the aspirations of the west. I do not believe that the Bills in their present form would have been brought down if the Prime Minister had had in the cabinet at the time they were being discussed a gentleman from the west who was in touch with the west ; and I feel quite certain that those Bills would not have been introduced in the terms in which they were—terms which practically threw down the gauntlet to the people of the west on a subject on which the Prime Minister must have known that they were very sensitive indeed.

In his speech in introducing the Bills, the right hon. gentleman said : 'The Northwest Territories have at the present time a large measure of local autonomy.' He went on to say that they have 'most of the essential powers which are now given to the provinces,' and he concluded by saying that he proposed to crown that with 'complete and absolute autonomy.' I sometimes wonder whether it could be possible that the right hon. gentleman really meant that when he said it. I do not think that anybody who chooses to study these Bills and to take them in connection with the constitutions of the other provinces of Canada, can doubt but that it is proposed to form in the Northwest Territories 'imperfect and inferior organizations,' to quote the words of the premier of that country ; and if more proof were needed that the people of the Territories did not believe that they were going to be put on the plane of the older provinces of the Dominion, I would point to the character of the meetings which are now being held almost daily throughout the west. This question is not dealt with up there as a party question. I notice that in the towns in the district which I have the honour to represent, in several cases the prime movers are gentlemen who are supporters of the right hon. gentleman opposite ; and I was surprised to hear that he had not heard that other objections had been taken to the terms of these Bills above and beyond the objections which were taken to the educational clauses. I may tell him that I have received copies of resolutions taking the very strongest objections to other clauses. Of course, the terms in which the educational clauses are couched have been such as to raise a feeling which must overshadow all other feelings amongst the people of the Northwest Territories ; and therefore we find that the agitation against these educational clauses takes the first place. But I can assure the Prime Minister that there are the very strongest objections against the proposal that our lands should be retained by the Dominion of Canada. There are the very strongest objections to having the perpetual exemption from taxation which is at the present moment enjoyed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company placed on the shoulders of the new provinces forever. That is a burden which we believe the Dominion of Canada should bear. I may say that the large measure of local autonomy which the Prime Minister referred to in his speech as having been enjoyed by the Territories has developed a strong western sentiment and solidarity which is manifesting itself in connection with the clauses of these Bills ; and I would suggest to him that he should put this matter to the test by inviting some genleman from amongst the western Liberal members of parliament to enter his cabinet and in this way open a seat in the Northwest Ter-

ritories and see what the verdict of the people will be.

The right hon. gentleman said : 'We have had the benefit of the presence of Mr. Haultain and Mr. Bulyea,' and he went on to say further : 'We have had the advantage of the advice of several members from the Territories in the discussion of these Bills.' Now, as has been pointed out this afternoon, Mr. Haultain at any rate has put himself definitely on record as objecting to the terms of the draft Bill. And I may say that Mr. Haultain and Mr. Bulyea do not speak as private individuals ; they speak as being armed with the authority of the accredited representatives of the government and the legislative assembly of the Northwest Territories. And it must be remembered that the claims of the Northwest Territories were set forth in the most distinct and definite terms—were set forth categorically—in a draft Bill which the premier of the Northwest Territories submitted to the Prime Minister more than three years ago. Those terms were discussed in the legislative assembly, and were for all practical purposes unanimously approved. I may say that there was a unanimous approval of the various terms of that draft Bill, with just one exception : that was as to whether there should be one or two provinces. On that question the majority——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member is again commencing to get very close to a discussion of the Bill on the order paper.

Mr. LAKE. I was endeavouring, Mr. Speaker, to answer a remark which was made by the Prime Minister himself ; but I will get at it more directly. The Prime Minister made a strong point of the fact that Mr. Haultain had objected to two provinces being formed. That made a large part of his argument, and surely I should be allowed to say a few words in reference to that. What I wish to point out is this, that a very large majority of the members of the legislative assembly were in favour of one province. There was a small minority in favour of two provinces, but they were divided in opinion as to how these two provinces should be formed—whether there should be a northern one and a southern one or an eastern one and a western one. Mr. Haultain was only doing his duty when he advocated what was the very strong verdict of the members of the legislative assembly. When the right hon. gentleman referred to the immense province which such an area would make, I think he forgot that the legislative assembly had not asked for the immense area which he now proposes to include in the two new provinces. They had only asked for a portion of it ; and I might suggest to him that the three present organized districts only include an area less than that of British Columbia or that of Quebec.

I may say further that the terms of this draft Bill formed the principal question in the general election of the Northwest Territories which took place shortly after its submission to the legislative assembly ; and that the principal campaign literature issued by the local government of that day was the correspondence in connection with the draft Bill, and the draft Bill itself, so that there can be no question, seeing that Mr. Haultain's government was returned to power with an overwhelming majority, that he was voicing the opinion of the people of the Northwest in the demands which he has made in regard to the terms upon which the Northwest Territories were to become provinces. But, as the right hon. the Prime Minister says, he had discussed this question and had great advantage in the discussion not only with the representatives of the Territorial government, but also with several western members, we must presume that the Bill was introduced with the concurrence of these western members. We must assume that, or else these remarks of the Prime Minister would have no significance or meaning. I noticed also that some Northwest members on the other side of the House greeted the remarks of the Prime Minister on that occasion with the most vigorous applause.

Again I say that I consider that the presence of the Minister of the Interior in this House is most necessary. A proposal is made in these draft Bills that the Dominion government should remain in possession of the public lands of the Northwest. I venture to assert that it has been found impossible in the past to administer the lands of that country, with satisfaction, from Ottawa and I think that if a close inquiry were made into the conditions it would be found that there is a great deal of dissatisfaction in that country with the proclaimed policy of the Minister of the Interior with reference to the settlement of these lands, and that the administration of these lands is not satisfactory to the people of the Northwest. This House should have the fullest information on these points, and I apprehend that it would be practically impossible to get that full information unless we have, sitting in his seat on the other side of the House, a Minister of the Interior.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Mr. Speaker, as a western representative, I desire for a very short time this afternoon to discuss more particularly one feature of this debate that has been referred to, especially by my colleagues from the west, a question in which we are particularly interested in common with the people who reside in that portion of Canada. I refer to the vacancy which exists in the portfolio of the Minister of the Interior. Some two or three years ago when the territorial executive consulted with the right hon. gentleman as to whether he was willing and realy to

enter into a conference with the members of the executive with a view to granting provincial government to the people of the Northwest Territories, the right hon. gentleman replied at that time that he could not accede to their request; for what reason? Because of the absence of the Minister of the Interior through illness. He could not take up this great question in the absence of the member of the government who was particularly charged with looking after the welfare of western interests, with the gentleman who, from his long residence in that western country and from his long official connection was better able to give him official advice than any other colleague in his cabinet. I must admit that the contention of the right hon. gentleman at that time was a very valid one and that in the absence of this gentleman it was not reasonable to take up the question of self government for the Territories. According to my judgment this was in accordance with constitutional procedure and was a deferring to the Minister of the Interior that was only that gentleman's due. The granting of autonomy to the people of the Northwest Territories is a most important question; it marks another epoch in the history of the confederation of Canada and it is a question requiring the best advice of the most responsible advisers. Realizing this, as undoubtedly the Prime Minister did, he would not enter into the initial stages even, he would not take up the question of holding a conference with the territorial executive in the absence of his responsible Minister of the Interior. If, however, it was so very necessary to have that gentleman present in the conducting of negotiations, how much more was it necessary to have him here when that Bill was being drafted for submission to this House. And yet, we find the right hon. gentleman having a Bill prepared or preparing it himself, in company with his colleagues, without that gentleman's presence, without his consent, without his knowledge even, and launching it on this parliament without ever having submitted it to him for his approval or disapproval. No explanation has yet been vouchsafed to this House by the Prime Minister why he followed such a course. He has not touched upon that phase of the speech of the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) this afternoon. He realizes that there is no explanation that can be forthcoming for his having treated his Minister of the Interior so cavalierly and having so contemptuously treated indirectly the people of the west. There has been no explanation of why he took so different a position from that of two or three years ago when he would not even have a conference in the absence of the Minister of the Interior. This information, I may say, did not come from the right hon. gentleman himself; it remained for the Minister of the Interior, upon his return to the House of Commons when he saw for the first time this Bill that has been submitted to parliament, when he read the educational clauses, and realized that he could not consistently give his support to the educational clauses to sever his official connection with the government and give an explanation to the members of the House, which conveyed the idea to every member in this House that that hon. gentleman resented, and justly resented, the treatment accorded to him by his chief, the head of the government, in paying so little respect to those views which the premier knew quite well his colleague held. This is especially remarkable in view of the policy that was laid down by the hon. gentleman and his colleagues no longer ago than the session of 1904 in regard to the principle that was to guide the right hon. gentleman and his government in the division of ministerial responsibility. This has been referred to on a previous occasion, but it will stand emphasizing, and I desire to read this Order in Council wherein the hon. gentleman laid it down as his guiding principle as to how the affairs of the country were to be managed. He said:

> In the case of members of the cabinet, while all have an equal degree of responsibility in a constitutional sense, yet in the practical working out of responsible government, in a country of such vast extent as Canada, it is found necessary to attach special responsibility to each minister for the public affairs of the province or district with which he has close political connection, and with which his colleagues might not be so well acquainted.

And yet, notwithstanding that declaration of policy within eight months of laying down that principle to guide himself and his colleagues, he, the erstwhile democrat to the hilt, in the most autocratic manner, rides roughshod over the terms of this Order in Council and practically ignores the fact that he has a Minister of the Interior at all. The right hon. gentleman knew quite well the very strong views held by his Minister of the Interior on that separate school question. He was quite well aware of the fact that in the west a few years ago he earned himself the sobriquet of being the special champion of national schools. The right hon. gentleman knew the strong stand his minister had taken against Dominion interference with matters that should be entirely under provincial control and yet, with this knowledge in his possession, he had so little respect for his colleague from the west that he did not even submit the educational clauses to that hon. gentleman. The right hon. gentleman evidently did not do so, to judge by the remarks of the ex-Minister of the Interior himself. Is it at all surprising, therefore, under the circumstances that that gentleman should resent such treatment and should sever his official connection with his colleagues and should step down and out.

But, at the same time, the country, and especially the west, is left without a voice in the council, without a representative of the western interests that are paramount, at a time when they should have somebody in the cabinet to maintain their rights. The Prime Minister has informed this House that he has taken no steps to fill this vacancy, nor is it his intention to take any immediate steps towards that end. In order that I may not do him any injustice, let me quote from 'Hansard' of March 9, the right hon. gentleman's answer to a question of the leader of the opposition :

> My hon. friend asks a second question. He wants to know whether any action is to be taken to fill the vacancy in the portfolio of the Interior caused by the retreat of my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton). He is entitled to a full and categorical answer. No action has been taken, and it is not my intention now to take any action in the way of filling that portfolio.

Now, it is because of that declaration on the part of the Prime Minister that I rise to protest as a western representative, against this procedure. The idea of having these great questions considered without having that portfolio filled is contrary to the best judgment of the people of western Canada. The Prime Minister may say that there has been no undue delay in filling that portfolio, that a longer time has elapsed in filling other vacancies in other cabinets. But this vacancy at this particular time is unique in its character, and there are very special reasons why the portfolio should be filled at the earliest possible moment. In the first place, the resignation has taken place during the holding of a session of parliament, and even before the estimates of this department have received the approval of this House. Important transactions have been carried out under this department since the session of 1904, especially in regard to western Canada, which transactions should be explained to this House by a responsible head of that department. Then, we have the Autonomy Bill, a Bill of vital importance and affecting the whole future of the people of western Canada. The people of that portion of the country demand that they shall have a voice at the council board. The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) must know that no acting Minister of the Interior, no colleague of his holding another portfolio, can possibly discharge the duties of the Minister of the Interior to the satisfaction of the people of the west, especially at this juncture ; for they need a man there whom they can hold directly and especially responsible for his official acts. The territory from the great lakes to the Pacific ocean, a territory some 2,000 miles from side to side, is to-day without cabinet representation. Fancy for a moment the great province of Quebec in a similar position. Suppose that, with its 351,000 square miles, a large portion of it were still without provincial autonomy ; and suppose that a Bill were submitted to this parliament to confer upon the territory organized all the powers of local self government ; and suppose that there were no representative of those people in the council to maintain their rights ;—would not there be strong expressions of indignation ? And would not those expressions be justified and be supported by every other portion of Canada ? And still, to-day, we have all the territory west of the great lakes, almost a million square miles, inhabited by almost a million souls, of whom half are in the new provinces about to be created, and as yet they are left without anybody to stand up for their rights and see that even-handed justice is meted out to them. Now, there is another great question that demands a representative in the cabinet council to-day and one in which, as a representative of Manitoba, I am especially interested ; I refer to the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba. I will not enter into the merits of that question to-day. I have only to say that we have had many requests made to this government by the people of Manitoba through their legislature, speaking with unanimous voice, for the extension of the boundaries of the province. This is a most opportune time to have that question settled, now that the new territories are having their boundaries fixed. Let any one look at the map, and he will see the proposed new provinces with an area of about 250,000 miles each. British Columbia with 370,000 miles, Ontario with 260,000, and Quebec with 351,000 ; and, in contrast with these, you find little Manitoba cribbed, cabined and confined within an area of 73,000 square miles. The right hon. Prime Minister gave his reason why he would not accede to the request of the Prime Minister of the Northwest Territories to have only one province. He said in effect : Look at this one territory of 500,000 square miles, and then look at Ontario and Quebec with so much less. Well, turn the right hon. gentleman's argument against himself ; look at little Manitoba with an area of 73,000 square miles in contrast with each of these other provinces with an area of 250,000 square miles. Any person with a spirit of fairness must resent such treatment of Manitoba at the hands of the Prime Minister. And what is the reason for this refusal on his part to listen to the unanimous demand of the people of Manitoba ? I am afraid the right hon. gentleman has not been as frank with this House as he might have been. I am not sure that we have had the true reason expressed publicly by the representatives of the government why this treatment is meted out to Manitoba in regard to her boundaries. The Prime Minister says that the government cannot even accede to the request to extend the boundaries of Manitoba northward to Hudson's Bay, but must consult Quebec,

must consult Ontario, and even must consult the new province of Saskatchewan—but must not consult his own Minister of the Interior. Apparently, he did not submit this question to the responsible representative of the west, his own Minister of the Interior, for I cannot and will not believe that that hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) representing, as he does, a Manitoba constituency, and knowing the wishes unanimously expressed of the people of his own province—for this has not been a party question—would agree to have the representations of Manitoba turned down as they have been, and her request refused on the ground that these other provinces must be consulted, even though Manitoba's boundaries might be extended without trespassing upon a single foot of territory belonging to any of these provinces. I think we shall have to look to the press of the right hon. gentleman to find out the reason. The hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has told us already that the press supporting the right hon. gentleman has given the reason away. I do not know whether these newspapers speak by the book or not. The Prime Minister has stated that he must not be held responsible for the utterances of his party newspapers. But, when a paper like the 'Le Soleil' will announce itself as follows :

> We declare, once for all, that 'Le Soleil' is the organ of the Liberal party, and by that fact is under the direction and absolute control of Sir Wilfrid. The supporters of Sir Wilfrid, and those who affirm themselves to be such, are begged to take notice of the present declaration.

I say when the 'Le Soleil' so announces itself, surely the Prime Minister will not repudiate an organ that distinctly states that it is so abject to him as to be under his absolute direction and control. And, this is why Manitoba's boundaries have not been extended at the present juncture, according to this paper :

> The school legislation of the little province is not of a nature to attract the immigrants who people the districts. The Northwest has its separate schools. Manitoba has abolished them.
>
> Every good act has its reward, every bad act its chastisement. Manitoba will remain lowest with her pretentious law.

Is this the true reason ? Have we to go to the press of the right hon. gentleman for his true reasons in these matters ? Is it not a humiliating position for any government to be placed in, when one of its own journals distinctly gives such a reason why Manitoba's boundaries have not been extended ? But it is not only that one journal which has been speaking in this manner. There is another publication in the west, the 'Northwest Review,' which deals with the very same question in much the same spirit. Speaking a couple of weeks ago about Mr. Rogers and the Winnipeg 'Telegram,' it says :

> Two days after the 'Telegram' had trumpeter abroad the Hon. Robert Rogers' great hopes for the western extension of Manitoba, the same wise and prophetic journal deplores the fact that there will be no such extension in any direction.

Then this newspaper goes on to say :

> But it omits to give the reason thereof. The only obstacle to the territorial expansion of our province is its iniquitous and cruel school system. Not even the wildest corner of any unorganized territory will consent to saddle itself with such a tyranny. Manitoba must be content to remain small and mean so long as it maintains its small and mean school policy.

Is that the kind of policy we have in that province? If it is, who is responsible? Who but the right hon. gentleman's own colleague, the ex-premier of Manitoba (Mr. Greenway) now the hon. member for Lisgar. It was Mr. Greenway's government which passed the school law, and the hon. gentleman, ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) is one of our public men who was mainly responsible for the passage of that law. These gentlemen will hardly agree that it is a mean and a cruel school policy. If there is any blame to be attached to the people of the province by reason of this school policy, the hon. gentleman's own friends are responsible and he himself is accessory to the fact. He supported the instigators and the supporters of that policy every time they appealed to the people of Manitoba both before and since this Manitoba school law was passed. He gave them every assistance in his power to gain their re-election, and he has been heralded everywhere as the great conciliator, the gentleman who settled the school question to the satisfaction of everybody. But his own journals evidently are not satisfied. They say that it has not been settled to the satisfaction of the minority, and that on that account the boundaries of Manitoba will not be extended. Because that province happens to be ruled at present by a Conservative government and because that government will not alter the school policy to suit the wishes of supporters of the right hon. gentleman, we are to be denied our just request for an extension of our boundaries. I bring this matter to the attention of the House because the right hon. gentleman may not be aware of the extent to which the discussion of this question is carried in the journals of the west. I have even seen that reason given circulation in the Toronto 'Star.' Well, if we are to be treated in this way, we ought to know it. The right hon. gentleman has never yet given this House any reason why the request of Manitoba for an extension of its boundaries should not be granted except the puerile one that he

must consult three of the other provinces before he can accede to it. But his own supporters are coming from Winnipeg to protest against such treatment. The Board of Trade and the city council are sending down deputations, and I trust the right hon. gentleman will give some satisfaction to these representatives and remove the impression created by his own press that the reason why the application of Manitoba is denied is because the government of that province will not change its school laws. As a singular indefiniteness characterizes the utterances of the First Minister regarding his intentions with respect to this measure, I am not in a position to discuss it at present. He has not yet explained why he did not consult his own colleagues and responsible ministers, the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) and the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) or why he did not consult on this educational clause the First Minister of the Northwest Territories. Who then did he consult? Did he consult the other members of the cabinet? Perhaps not, except the sub-committee which drafted the clause. It may turn out that until noon on the day the Bill was introduced, the other members of the cabinet knew nothing about that clause. I am forced to the conclusion that the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) did know about it because he was a member of the sub-committee, but I am somewhat shocked at his success in swallowing himself as he has done. I have here a record of the views he held in 1896 regarding provincial jurisdiction. Let me read a few words of the speech he delivered in this House on March 20th of that year, pages 4189 and 4190 of 'Hansard':—

> There are seven provinces in this Dominion. There is territory out of which to carve many more. There is a minority in every province. Shall we to-day, hastily, thoughtlessly and without due consideration, without first exhausting every other means of settlement, legislate as is proposed by this Bill, and place upon our statute-book a statutory invitation to the minority in every province now existing, and every province that may hereafter be carved out of our territory, to appeal to the people's representatives in this parliament to settle questions that might be better settled, under the spirit of the Confederation Act, by the provinces in which those questions arise.

Here is a distinct statement by the Postmaster General that, according to the spirit of the Act of Confederation, these questions should be settled, not by the Dominion parliament, but by the provincial legislatures where they arise. He then realized that the question of education should be left as a matter of provincial concern, to provincial jurisdiction. But as a member of the sub-committee which drafted this clause, he took entirely different ground.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE.

I do not desire to weary the House any longer. I simply rose, as a western representative, to protest most strongly against the course of the government in deciding this question and others incidental to it in the absence of that representative in the cabinet from the west whom the people of that country can hold particularly responsible. If the right hon. gentleman wants to give the people directly interested an opportunity to make their views known, let him select a representative from the west to replace in the cabinet the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) and have him go back to the people for election. If he should be re-elected, then the right hon. gentleman will be in a position to say that the people of the west have given their sanction to this Bill and the other provinces should not press further any objections. I would urge the right hon. gentleman to adopt that mode of procedure without delay and not push the Bill through the House first and then invite a representative from the west to enter his cabinet. Let the people of that country be given an opportunity of expressing their opinion and let them have a representative in the cabinet to whom they can look to vindicate their rights.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

OTTAWA ELECTRIC COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 12) respecting the Ottawa Electric Company.—Mr. Galliher.

On the preamble,

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, before the preamble is carried, perhaps I ought to say that as the first sections of this Bill deal with arranging for sufficient capital to buy stock in another company that exists and is doing business in the city, the objection that the city takes to the Bill is that if the powers that are asked for by the Ottawa Electric Company are granted, then it follows that they will purchase the stock of the other company and thereby destroy competition. I do not know what the promoter of the Bill has to say; but if that is the object of the Bill, I am here to enter my protest on behalf of the city against the preamble.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that this Bill was held back for a length of time until some arrangement was reached, and that it was finally referred to a special committee, and that that special committee reported. But while the Bill seemed to be specially objectionable, there is one feature of it—the power to increase the capital stock—to which I understand there is no general op-

position. My understanding is that that would be permissible and that there was no serious objection to it. But the power to purchase the stock of a competitor of its own was the feature of the Bill which we were informed was objectionable, and to my mind it ought to be objectionable, because for a long time they have had competition in this city in regard to electric light. At one time there was no competition, but after two or three companies got Acts of incorporation the city got competition. In one of these Bills that was passed there was a clause, which was accepted by the company, providing that they should not at any time purchase the stock of another company. Now, then, after having been in operation for some years, they come back and want their original Bill amended so as to allow them to purchase the stock of another company which reduced the cost of electric lighting below what it was before. I believe this company stated that they were willing to accept the provisions of this Bill, with the condition that they should never charge more than they now charge for electric lighting. The company were charging 52-100ths or 56-100ths of a cent per hour for light according to a certain measurement.

Mr. BELCOURT. Fifty-two one hundredths of a cent per ampere hour.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, per ampere hour. But at the present time the people of Ottawa are getting their light for 36-100ths of a cent per ampere hour. Why should we give this company, which is supplying lights at that rate to-day, the power to raise the price at any time to 52-100ths of a cent per ampere hour ? Why should we take away or destroy the contract that was entered into between this company and the city years ago, by which it was provided that the city should have perpetual competition between these companies ? If we allow this Bill to pass in this form we are deliberately legislating into the hands of a monopoly. There is no doubt of that whatever, because, although we impose a limit, the price prescribed by the limit is very much above what is being charged the people of the city to-day. There is no justifiable reason, in my judgment, why we should allow a company to secure the right that they did not ask to have years ago, for the purpose of enabling them to buy up the stock of other companies, and prevent that healthy competition which the city has enjoyed for some years. I think we should not do it, and I think we should stop at the preamble of the Bill. The principle is an unsound one. The city objects to it. This company accepted a clause which prevented them from destroying this competition years ago. Why should we turn around and enable one party to the contract to violate and dishonour it, while the other party holds to its side of it, is something that I cannot understand. I think that the members from the city of Ottawa, as well as the members from every city in Canada, ought to be sufficiently interested in this to prevent any such Bill from passing. What we want to-day is competition, not monopoly, and this Bill is making for monopoly as straight as anything could.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. SPROULE. No ; it is not carried yet.

Mr. MONK. As one of the special committee, I do not think my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) quite puts it before the committee as it ought to be put. In the first place, it would be good to note to the committee that the special committee, not only was unanimous after having heard the parties interested, but, so far as I am aware, I did not notice any dissent among the parties present at the time the committee arrived at its final conclusion and adopted the Bill in the present form. It is possible that the amendment might not have given entire satisfaction to those who represented the city of Ottawa—the mayor was there—but there was no expression of dissent. This struck me all the more as I was credibly informed that a year ago, under similar circumstances, this very proposal upon which we finally settled had been proposed to the representatives of the city and had been accepted. I have no personal knowledge of this, but I am credibly informed of it. Now, what I would like the committee to consider is this : The Bill does not create a monopoly, whatever may be its ultimate effect. The Bill grants to the Ottawa Electric Company what we have never refused before. We have granted by the Bill power to the Ottawa Electric Company to acquire stock in other companies. This is a thing which is perfectly legitimate in itself, and which has been granted often by this parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask the hon. gentleman if this was not refused to this same company years ago, and if a provision was not put in their charter to the effect that they could not do what they now ask to be allowed to do ?

Mr. MONK. I do not think so. I do not think my hon. friend is well informed on that point. The obstacle we met with was this : one of the objections raised was based upon an agreement entered into between the city of Ottawa and the Electric Company. Speaking from memory, I think there was a clause in that agreement which prevented amalgamation. The principle upon which we have always acted having been to grant power to acquire stock, why should we refuse it in this instance ? because of the private agreement—if I might call it so—between the city of Ottawa and this company to prevent amalgamation. I submit to the committee that it is the habit here to grant legitimate powers of this

kind. Is this parliament going to make an inquiry into agreements entered into between private parties ? For instance, if a man enters into an agreement with another man not to do a certain thing and he comes to Ottawa to seek incorporation with associates, is this parliament to be asked to adjudicate upon his application and to enter into an inquiry as to the nature of this agreement and its consequences and its value ? I do not think that is the role of parliament. We would become a court, and a very incompetent court too, sitting to decide questions which belong to the constituted tribunals. When a company comes to us and makes application for powers which are in themselves legitimate and which we are in the habit of granting, it is not for us to become a court of inquiry into private agreements between the parties ? If we did so most of our time would be taken up trying such questions and I do not think that is the mission of parliament. Why should we refuse the powers asked by this company when they are legitimate powers and when we are in the habit of granting similar powers to other corporations ? I, for instance, am not sufficiently conversant with the law of Ontario—I believe most of the members of the committee are in the same position—to interpret this agreement, to weigh its terms and to finally decide upon its effect. If we undertook to adjudicate as to the rights of the parties founded upon this agreement, we would be entering upon dangerous ground and we would make ourselves judges in a matter which we have neither the time nor the qualification to adjudicate. It is probably for that reason that the committee unanimously decided to grant this application. It might have been advisable to add a proviso to the amendment we adopted, saving the rights of the parties to such damages as the law of Ontario gave them, but I express no opinion as to that. The committee did not give this company a monopoly ; any person or company can furnish electricity to the city of Ottawa. I was informed that there is at present another company in existence for that object. Moreover, if the committee took care to insert a provision that the maximum rates agreed upon between the city of Ottawa and the companies interested should not in the future be exceeded.

Mr. SPROULE. As the statement has been made that there was nothing in the agreement which prevented this company from buying out the other companies, I shall read the following statement in a circular issued on behalf of the city :

That the company may acquire shares in the capital stock, debentures and securities of other electric companies ; and that the proviso be struck out of the original Act which provides that such stock, debentures or securities shall only be issued as the consideration for goods, wares or merchandise sold to such other companies in the ordinary course of business.

Under this they would be prevented from using their securities to buy out the stock of other companies.

Mr. STEWART. In reply to the hon. member (Mr. Monk) I may say that there are only two companies doing business in the city of Ottawa, and not three companies as he has stated. It is true that previous to the inauguration of the second company in existence, namely the Consumers' Electric Company, a charter was granted to the Metropolitan Electric Company, but that company has never gone into existence.

Mr. MONK. Is there anything in this Bill to prevent that company from going into operation to-morrow ?

Mr. STEWART. There is nothing in the Bill to prevent that company going into business, but it would be a very long time before that company could be equipped to enter into business. In the meantime, if the ostensible object of this Bill is attained the Ottawa Electric Company will have absorbed the Consumers' Electric Company. There is no doubt that the intention of the Bill is that the Ottawa Electric Company should be given power to purchase the stock of the Consumers' Electric Company, and thereby get over the agreement made as between the city and the Consumers' Electric Company, which agreement stipulated that the Consumers' Electric Company should not sell out to any other company. To-day there are two companies competing in Ottawa, with the result that the rates for electric light are comparatively low. The companies and their friends say that the rates are entirely too low, but that is their own business. It seems to me that they might be very well left to look after their own business, without parliament being asked to interfere in order to override an agreement made between the city and the Consumers' Electric Company in which the city distinctly stipulates that the Consumers' Electric Company shall be forbidden to sell out to the Ottawa Electric Company or to any other company. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) cannot see why parliament should interfere in this case to protect the rights of the city when these rights are being invaded. But let me point out to the hon. member what parliament did once before under such circumstances. In 1894 there was an amalgamation of three companies, namely, the Ottawa Electric Company, the Chaudière Electric Company, and the Standard Electric Company, and the same company applied to parliament, and parliament gave them power to amalgamate, but in order to protect the rights of the city a provision was placed in their charter which reads :

Provided that if any such purchase, lease or other acquirement, working arrangement, agreement or amalgamation is entered into, the company shall not, without the consent by by-law or otherwise of the municipality of the city of Ottawa or of the city of Hull respectively, as the case may be, increase the ordinary price of rates charged by any of the said companies for electric light in the city of Ottawa or in the city of Hull respectively, at the time such purchase, lease, or other acquirement, working arrangement, or amalgamation is entered into.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What statute is that ?

Mr. STEWART. 1894, chapter 111.

Mr. GALLIHER. What was that rate ?

Mr. STEWART. I do not know, and I do not know that it makes any difference what it was.

Mr. GALLIHER. It was '72.

Mr. STEWART. Whether it was '72 or what it was, it was forbidden that they should alter the arrangement without the consent of the city. I think it is only right that the city's interests should be protected on this as on the former occasion. We have only the two companies at present competing. It is said by the friends of the company that the cost of electric lighting in Ottawa is low. Perhaps it is ; but we think it is only reasonable that these two companies should agree so that remunerative rates should be secured by both of them without asking parliament for the rights proposed to be granted by this Bill. I may say that the ratepayers of the city of Ottawa feel very keenly on this subject. They think the rights of the municipality are being invaded, and they protest very vigorously against that. The feeling throughout the city of Ottawa today is very strong against the adoption of this Bill. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have given notice of an amendment which I will read. Perhaps it may be accepted by the promoter of the Bill, and if so it will settle the whole difficulty. This may not be the proper time to move it, but my amendment is as follows :—

That section 5 be struck out and the following be substituted therefor :

Provided that the power to acquire shares in the capital stock, debentures or securities of other electric companies, possessing power similar to those of this company, will not apply to the capital stock, debentures or securities of the Consumers' Electric Company, Limited, or the Metropolitan Electric Company, Limited, or their or either of their successors or assigns.

If this is accepted by the promoter of the Bill, we think it will stop all difficulty, and will assure the citizens of Ottawa that parliament has no desire to invade their rights.

Mr. N. A. BELCOURT. It may perhaps be more convenient to discuss this amendment now, because, as intimated by my colleague, if it is accepted, it may settle the difficulty. This Bill was before the House last year. At that time I had the honour of being Speaker of this House, and could not take part either in the Select Committee or in the Committee of the Whole, and consequently took no part in the proceedings concerning the Bill at that time. This year, in the early part of the session, the promoters of the Bill asked me to take charge of it. I declined, because I knew that last year the citizens of Ottawa generally were much opposed to the measure, and the Bill was confided to another member, who has had charge of it since. Before the Bill came up for discussion in the Private Bills Committee, I endeavoured to see if some arrangement could not be arrived at between the city of Ottawa on the one hand and the company promoting this Bill on the other. I had an interview with the mayor of the city, and suggested to him that possibly the amendment of which notice was given last session by my then colleague, Mr. Birkett, might be satisfactory to the city of Ottawa. I went over the amendment with the mayor, and he came to the conclusion that the amendment prepared last year would be satisfactory to the city. The notice of the amendment given by Mr. Birkett, which I find at page 434 of the Votes and Proceedings of last year, read as follows :—

Mr. Birkett.—On the third reading of Bill No. 110, 'An Act respecting the Ottawa Electric Company,'—Will move that the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same by adding a clause providing that if the company acquires a majority of the shares in the capital stock or in the debentures or securities of the Metropolitan Electric Company, of Ottawa, Limited, or in the Consumers' Electric Company, Limited, the company shall not increase the prices or rates for electric light, heat or power beyond those provided for in the franchises granted by the city of Ottawa to the Metropolitan Electric Company, of Ottawa, Limited, and to the Consumers' Electric Company, Limited; and being those contained in by-laws Nos. 1857 and 2138 of the city of Ottawa.

The mayor stated that that would be satisfactory to the city, and I appeared before the committee, and as a member of the committee I proposed that a clause worded almost exactly like this amendment, should be added to the Bill as section 5. The mayor was present before the committee when I made that proposal. The company objected to the proposed clause, contending that it would be unfair to them if in the future they were compelled to put their wires underground. A rider of three lines was suggested, to the effect that the clause would be binding on the company so long only as they were not compelled to put their wires underground. The chairman put the amendment with this rider to the committee. I objected

that the rider was not part of my amendment, but the amendment with the rider was put to the committee and agreed to. The Bill was reported to the House, and, as the House knows, on the motion of the premier, the Bill was again referred to a select committee. I understand now, as I have understood for some time, that even the amendment which I proposed to the committee, without the rider, was not acceptable to the city. The mayor came before the Select Committee the other day and explained that he had agreed to the amendment which I had proposed and was quite content with it, but that when he went back to the city council he was told by the city councillors that he had exceeded his authority and had no right to accept the amendment. The city council declared by a vote of 19 to 5 that he had exceeded his authority, and instructed him to oppose the Bill. The whole question seems to be this. At present there are two companies in Ottawa supplying electric light—the Ottawa Electric Company which is promoting this Bill, and the Consumers' Company. I understand that the rate charged is .36 cent per ampere hour. The Consumers' Company, when it got its franchise, was limited to .52 cent per ampere hour. The Ottawa Electric Company, when it got its charter, was limited to .75 cent per ampere hour. When I proposed my amendment as the mayor had agreed to it, I thought the city would be willing to have the maximum rate of the Ottawa Electric Company reduced to the maximum rate of the Consumers' Company, namely .52 cent, and would be willing to let the Bill go through with that provision. That was what was proposed in the amendment of which Mr. Birkett gave notice last year. When I proposed the amendment to the Private Bills Committee I had no doubt that the amendment I proposed would have been accepted by the city. However, the city council opposed that, and is opposed to it to-day. As my hon. colleague has explained, the citizens of Ottawa generally are opposed to this Bill. They are at present enjoying light at the rate of .36 cent per ampere hour. This Bill would enable the Ottawa Company to put up the rate to .52 cent. Under the circumstances, as the city is opposed to the Bill, and as we have been asked by the city council to oppose it, there is no course left to both my colleague and myself except to oppose this Bill. If the suggestion which is embodied in the amendment proposed by my colleague is accepted, then I imagine that there will be no other objection to the Bill and the Bill might go through. I did not understand that in the committee any special objection was taken to the increase of capital. The objection was to the clause permitting the acquisition of shares of other companies which would have the effect of enabling the Ottawa Electric Company to acquire the shares and securities of the Consumers' Electric Company. What the citizens of Ottawa are afraid of is that by the adoption of the Bill as it is the competition which exists to-day may be destroyed, at all events to the extent of the difference between 36-100 and 52-100 of a cent. Under the circumstances I propose to vote against the Bill, and ask the members of the House to do so also.

Mr. AMES. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) who acted as chairman of the special committee, will doubtless remember that I reserved the right to discuss and object to the principle involved, provided the Bill was not acceptable to the city of Ottawa. From my point of view, therefore, we are here to discuss the reasonableness of the city of Ottawa upon this matter. It may or it may not be that the city council has acted unreasonably in deciding that they will not accept the amendment and in deciding also to instruct their delegates to oppose the Bill in toto. The fact still remains that the city of Ottawa, by resolution duly passed in their gathering and by a vote of 19 to 5, has decided that this Bill should be opposed and therefore they, who were originally one of the consenting parties to what I think will be shown to be a contract, object to hurrying the original terms of that contract altered by a higher authority. It involves, therefore, the entire principle of municipal rights, and because it is so far-reaching, although apparently a very simple Bill, I find it necessary, following the footsteps of the member for Ottawa, to vote against the Bill or at all events against paragraph 2 of the Bill. I wish to point out the full significance of the failure of the city of Ottawa, through its council, to assent to the Bill as amended and as now presented to this House. This Ottawa Electric Company received a charter, under which it presently operates, in the year 1904 and at the same time that they were securing their charter, concurrent legislation was being carried through the local city council with the view to giving a franchise as soon as the company was duly constituted. We find the Bill introduced in the House on April 18, 1894; it received its third reading on May the 18th, and it passed through the House without amendment and without comment. We find that it then reached the Senate and secured its second reading on June 8th. We then find a by-law passed by the city council on the 11th of June, 1894, based upon what by that time had evidently been accepted as the probable mould in which this charter would be formed. It passed the lower House without amendment and passed the second reading in the upper House, then and on the basis of that a franchise was granted permitting the company to operate in Ottawa. The city council therefore were thoroughly cognizant of the fact

that in this charter there was a clause that this company was not to be permitted to acquire the capital stock, debentures or securities of other electrical companies except in the way of return for goods that might be purchased. Practically therefore this company had received a charter, but a charter with limitations. Certain things they were not empowered to do, and not being empowered to do these things they secured a franchise from the city council. When this Bill came up in the Senate the fact that the Bill was a settlement agreed to by all parties, is borne out by the 'Hansard' of that body. Senator Clemow introduced the Bill and explained it as follows in the Senate, and this is the only reference to the Bill that is found in the 'Hansard' of either chamber. Senator Clemow said:

> This is a Bill to incorporate certain gentlemen under the name of the Ottawa Electric Company, and also to give them power to amalgamate with other companies now in existence. The arrangement has been made with the city council and received their full concurrence and it is with the avowed object of reducing expense that this Bill is introduced, and there can be no objection to its passage. The citizens are very well satisfied with the arrangement made.

The introducer of the Bill therefore plainly stated in the Senate that this Bill exactly as drawn had the concurrence of the city council in 1894 and therefore that it was in one sense a contract which the company on one hand and the city council on the other had come to and which they asked this parliament to ratify. You will notice therefore that the council in giving this franchise on June 11 did not deem it necessary to place any clause in the agreement restricting the company from amalgamating. Therefore they said that this was entirely provided for by the statute under which they would operate, and when the city council found it necessary four years later to give a franchise to another company, the Metropolitan Company, whose letters patent contained no such clause as we find in this Bill of 1894, the city council took good care to put in this clause:

> That the said company shall not at any time during the said period amalgamate or combine with any other company now carrying on or which may hereafter carry on in the city of Ottawa during the said period the business of supplying electric light, &c., &c.

In other words, when the council gave to the Metropolitan and to the Consumers' Companies their franchises, having noticed that in the letters patent and the Bill of these companies there was no such limitation, they took pains to put that limitation into the franchises, and consequently to-day the Consumers' and Metropolitan companies cannot acquire stock in any other company under the terms of the bargain which they made with the city of Ottawa. Now the city of Ottawa has refused to consent to this present proposition. We may or may not think that the city of Ottawa is aggrieved in the case. We may think that the Bill as amended is in every respect a reasonable Bill, but the fact still remains that the city of Ottawa originally agreed with this company, that that agreement was made a law and that now, without the consent of one of the parties to that agreement, parliament is being asked to remove one of the protective clauses which existed in that Bill before the franchise was given. That is practically the only point I wish to make and I make that point owing to the principle involved, because it seems to me that it is an infringement of municipal rights and, following the example of the right hon. the Prime Minister himself, who recently, in introducing a Bill to this House, has taken good care to present to the House the 'Hansard' record of the introduction of the Bill in order that we might know not only what the Bill said but what those who passed the Bill thought and meant at the time the Bill was introduced. So, taking a leaf from him, I shall do the same in this case, and I bring to the attention of the House the fact that when in 1894 the Ottawa Electric Company was incorporated it was by understanding with the city of Ottawa that they were restricted in their powers. Now you take away that restraint, you make this company a competent buyer, and so put out of competition the other company. You remove the limitation which existed when the contract with the city was made.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. As one of the members of the special committee who had this Bill under consideration a few days ago, I wish to explain briefly the reasons why we reported the Bill. The Ottawa Electric Company had a charter, and also had an agreement with the city by which they had the right to furnish light to the city of Ottawa, at 75-100 cents per ampere hour. The Ottawa Electric Company, instead of being limited, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) who has just spoken said, had an exclusive contract with the city of Ottawa. The city of Ottawa, by a resolution of its council, declared that this company should have the exclusive right to furnish light to the city. But, it seems that a resolution is not binding upon the city. The only way a corporation like the city of Ottawa can be bound is by by-law, and no by-law was passed in that direction. While that resolution was unrevoked, the city entered into an arrangement with the Consumers' Electric Company, which company agreed to furnish light at a great reduction—about 50-100 or 52-100 cents per ampere hour. Another company was formed and entered into an agreement with the city—the Metropolitan Company. The two companies are furnishing light to the city for 36-100

cents per ampere hour, which does not pay them. The object of the company is evident. The Ottawa Electric Company apply for power which nearly every other company has, of purchasing stock in similar companies. The city of Ottawa objected, because of its bargain with the Consumers' Company, which bargain was to the effect that they would not amalgamate with any other company. The city of Ottawa says that we are facilitating the evasion of the contract that they have with the company by allowing the Ottawa Electric Company to obtain stock in the other. I do not know that it was entirely necessary for the company to have the power to obtain stock. The only object would be to facilitate the transfer of stock of the Consumers' or Metropolitan Companies to the Ottawa Electric Company in order to give it control. The assertion of the Ottawa Electric Company is that at present it is impossible to make the undertaking pay. They do not wish to alter any contract made with the city of Ottawa. The city of Ottawa have a contract with the Consumers' Company to furnish light at about 50 per cent less than the contract with the Ottawa Company. In order to guard the rights of the city of Ottawa, we inserted a clause in the Bill providing that if the Ottawa Electric Company obtained control of the stock of the Consumers' Company they should not be entitled to charge the city of Ottawa any more than can be charged by the Consumers' Company under its contract with the city. It is a very ordinary provision to put in such a Bill that one company can buy stock in another. The reasons assigned to the committee for the change I thought very reasonable—the cheapness of arrangement and the saving of expense, and the impossibility of making a profit at the present rates. Now, what is the position ? The shareholders of the Ottawa Electric Company may make a bargain with the shareholders of the Consumers' or Metropolitan Company and obtain control of either of these companies. It is true that, to a certain extent we have facilitated the transaction, for we authorize the company to make such arrangements, and it is possible that they may make such arrangements. But, even without such a Bill the parties who control one corporation can obtain control of the other and carry out any policy they desire. The city of Ottawa are only entitled to their contract with the Consumers' Company, and we have made provision under the Bill that the parties who are facilitated, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) says, in obtaining the stock of these other companies, shall not be able to charge the citizens of Ottawa a higher rate than may be charged under the contract which already exists.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that the essence of the case is this : To-day there are two or three electric companies in Ottawa and there is competition. The aim of legislation should be to secure for the people the cheapest rates, and, in order to do that, to facilitate competition. This we do in regard to railways and other transportation lines as well as in other matters. But we know these companies will try to destroy competition by buying one another's stock. At present the city of Ottawa has competition in the supply of electric light. Are we going to deprive them of that benefit by enabling one company to buy out the other ? But we are told : 'We have provided that they shall charge no higher rate than 52-100 cents per ampere hour.' But suppose that improvements in the facilities for the supply of electric light greatly reduce the cost, then, with competition, the price to the consumer will go down. The best proof of that is the fact that it has already gone down from 52-100 to 36-100 cents per ampere hour. But the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) says that the companies cannot pay a dividend. Every company that wishes to amalgamate presents that as a stock argument. Before accepting it we should make full inquiries that we may judge whether the argument is well based or not.

I do not know whether that allegation is founded on fact or not, but we do know that it is one of the stock in trade arguments which corporations always advance. The very fact that we provided by legislation years ago to secure competition and that the city has benefited by that competition must create the presumption that if you destroy that competition to-day the rates will undoubtedly be raised. If you should do so in this case, you will have other corporations applying for similar Acts; if it succeeds in this city we may soon look for other companies from other cities coming here for similar favours. We all know that corporations are not slow in trying to get what they can from parliament. We have frequently legislated to prevent railway companies from amalgamating or to compel them to specify the companies with which they desire to amalgamate in order that we may decide whether the amalgamation would be in the public interest or not. But notwithstanding all our precautions we find that by no legislation, we can pass, can we prevent railway companies somehow or other agreeing on rates and preventing the public from getting the benefit of competition. But in this particular instance, the limitations we have put upon the powers of these three corporations have resulted in obtaining for Ottawa the benetions we find that by no legislation we can asked to destroy the binding contract that exists between the company in question and the city of Ottawa and under which the company got its charter, because it only got its charter subject to the limitation.

Mr. HAGGART. There was no binding contract made with the city of Ottawa. There was a resolution passed by the Ottawa council in which the city gave an exclusive right to the company. As regards the question whether the company received remuneration for its expenditure, we had the balance sheet of the Ottawa Electric Company before us and we had the statement that the Consumers' Company never paid a cent of dividend.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would judge from what my hon. friend from South Lanark has said that the object of the Bill is in reality to enable the company to advance the rates. That may be a perfectly proper object, but I would ask whether or not the promoter of the Bill agrees in that view.

Mr. GALLIHER. There is nothing in the Bill which would indicate to anybody that the object of passing this legislation is to enable the Ottawa Electric Company to increase its rates.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not suggest that there is anything on the face of the Bill to indicate any such object, but I am simply taking the statement of my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart), who was a member of the special committee, as to the way in which the case was presented by the company to that committee. I would gather that my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) is entirely correct, because he pointed out that the balance sheets of both companies were before the committee for the purpose of demonstrating that the company is not earning dividends at present. That proof could only have been made for the purpose of showing the necessity for an increase in the rates. If the companies are not paying a dividend on capital fairly invested, and especially if my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) is right about the agreement which was entered into, it is perfectly proper for the companies to ask for some relief in that regard. But what I want to know is this: if that be the object of these two companies, what is there to prevent them from increasing their rates now? The maximum rate for the Consumers' Company and the Metropilitan is ·52 of a cent per ampere hour. The maximum rate of the Ottawa Electric Company under the arrangement made with the city of Ottawa is ·75 of a cent per ampere hour. One company has a margin of about ·39 of a cent per ampere hour and can double its rates, and the other company can increase its rates by nearly 50 per cent. Why should they come before parliament to increase their rates when they can do so without taking that course?

Mr. GALLIHER. Would not that do away with the necessity for the city of Ottawa opposing this legislation? If the city of Ottawa could not prevent an increase of the rates now, it will be in no worse a position when this Bill passes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think parliament ought to be asked to pass this legislation unless there be some good reason given for passing it. There must be some necessity on the part of the companies for coming here or they would not come. But if they have the remedy in their own hands, why do they appeal to parliament for one? Besides if there was really an arrangement between the city of Ottawa and these companies, such as has been suggested by the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. H. B. Ames), it would have been perfectly possible for the city of Ottawa to have gone to the courts and absolutely prevented the Ottawa Electric Company from coming to parliament. There is a well established principle in law that any corporation or person may be restrained from coming to parliament to seek rights in violation of an agreement with some other person or corporation. Had the city of Ottawa gone to the courts and asked for a restraining order, it would have been granted at once, and the companies prevented from applying to parliament for any legislation inconsistent with the agreement they had made. But the fact that such a remedy existed and that the city of Ottawa did not use it creates of course the very strong presumption that there could hardly have been as definite and distinct an agreement as has been suggested by my hon. friend from St. Antoine's division. But, still, after all, here is the other question and the fact that my hon. friend who is promoting this Bill is not able to give me any better answer than that which he has vouchsafed to-night in response to my inquiry certainly does leave some suspicion in my mind that there is an object behind this Bill which we do not appreciate. Otherwise, I think it would have been for my hon. friend to give a frank, straightforward answer, or at all events a better one than he vouchsafed to-night.

Mr. STEWART. My hon. friend from Kootenay, in replying to the hon. leader of the opposition, when he asked the question as to whether the companies could advance the rates, stated that there was no need for the city to ask that this measure should not go through, because to-day the company have the right to increase rates. They have now the right to increase rates, as has been pointed out by more than one hon. gentleman, up to ·52 in one case and up to ·75 in the other case. But the hon. member for Kootenay touched the question, when he asked why the city came to parliament and

asked that this legislation should not be granted when the company had the right to increase the rates. The authorities of the city believe that if you take away from the city the competition that exists to-day the rates will go up. The whole gist of the question is that this legislation aims at destroying the competition, with the result that rates are bound to be increased. The city does not object to the two companies making a reasonable profit. If the rates are too low, surely they can get adequate rates. In reply to the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), as to the resolution passed by the city council, or the promise made by it, I understand him to say that the city of Ottawa had promised a monopoly to the Ottawa Electric Company. It is true a resolution was passed by the council of the city of Ottawa promising a monopoly to the Ottawa Electric Company. I think it is open to the members of the Ottawa city council to change their minds on this question. Immediately after the resolution was passed—and it may have been secured in some way, although I am not suggesting anything of that kind—notice of reconsideration was given, and it was pointed out by the solicitor of the company that the resolution promised something that no municipality could give, that in common law it was impossible to grant a monopoly to any one company. An illustration of the fact that it was against the common law was shortly afterwards afforded by something that happened in the adjoining municipality of Hull. The corporation of the city of Hull endeavoured to give a monopoly to the Hull Company and the Ottawa Company, which is to-day seeking a monopoly in the city of Ottawa, entered a protest; an appeal was taken to the courts, and it was found to be a violation of the common law. The result is that to-day there is competition in the city of Hull, where an endeavour was made to create a monopoly. Now the point made, as I understand it, by the hon. member for South Lanark is that the city of Ottawa had entered into a bargain, or made a promise, that they afterwards did not keep. It is true this resolution was passed by the city council, but I do not think that should govern parliament. If we consider that in our judgment it is a wrong thing to interfere with the vested rights of the city of Ottawa, then I do not believe we should pass this legislation. We should not interfere with the rights of the municipality.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We are now on the preamble of the Bill, and perhaps it would be more regular if we adopted the preamble and proceeded to deal with the clauses as they arise. There are clauses in the Bill which are not objectionable, and when we reach any clause that is objectionable, then we can consider the question. I have a great deal of respect for vested rights as far as cities are concerned, and I have some respect for the vested rights of corporations also. I am sorry to say that I am not a municipal ownership man, but I am in favour of corporations when they are properly regulated, and I want to have an opportunity of saying so.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I happen to be a friend of municipal rights.

The hour for private Bills having expired, the Speaker took the chair.

SUPPLY—PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES.

House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Fielding, that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris). Mr. Speaker, I would not rise to-night to address this House on this question, which has been so well discussed this afternoon—perhaps I shall only be repeating very many of the statements that have been already made—were it not that I felt it to be an imperative duty. There are one or two reasons why I believe it imperative that I should have something to say on this question. I will endeavour to-night, in the few remarks which I make, not to discuss the Bill. There seems to be a great temptation to enter into a discussion of the Bill. When the proper time comes to discuss the Bill, I hope to have an opportunity of making a few remarks. But I will say right here that when the proper time comes my effort will be to address this House on that question in a manner absolutely free from offence to any creed or any set of people in this House or in this country. I believe that this great question in connection with the formation of these two provinces in the Northwest is more than a provincial question; it is a national question; and I believe that whatever men, or whatever hon. members on this or the other side of the House think, that is the way in which we should endeavour to discuss it. There are one or two reasons why I wish to trespass upon the time of the House. One is that I represent a constituency of the west, which I can say—and I do not do it boastfully—has to-day more elevators and grows more wheat, although it is somewhat of a large district, than any other section of a similar size in the Dominion of Canada. One other reason why I would like to make a few remarks is that the present government were good enough to give us, before the last election, increased representation. In order that we might have that increased representation, it was necessary that the constituencies that already existed should be divided. I was particularly favoured by having the honour of contesting a portion of the constituency which has been represented by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). I was given the south half. In the south half of that constituency, which

was controlled by and which always elected my hon. friend the member for Brandon when he was able to bring those wonderful powers which he possessed to bear upon the electorate, he was able to secure a majority of 200 or 300. To-day, after that power has been withdrawn, the same people who elected him were good enough to elect me by a majority of a little over 500. Knowing, as I do what these same people think on this great question, I feel it my duty to trespass upon the time of the House for a short while.

Now, Mr. Speaker, although I am new in this parliament, I am not very new in the matter of years, and I am not very new in my knowledge of the political aspect of this country and of my friends who sit on the other side of the House. Living so near as I do to the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), we became to same extent at least chums—I do not know if that is a parliamentary expression, but it is at all events a somewhat endearing term. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) wants my sympathy, but I cannot help being a little sensitive for him and I feel very deeply the manner in which he was treated in connection with this Bill. Some time ago, when we asked the First Minister as to when the member for Brandon might be expected back, we were told he was in the south for his health. Soon after that Bill was introduced, and from a health point of view it was very unfair to compel the Minister of the Interior to make such a break neck journey to Ottawa, and after getting here to force him to rush out on the street to ascertain what were the contents of the Autonomy Bill which had been introduced to parliament. The Prime Minister told us to-day that the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) had asked for three weeks' delay between the first and second readings of this Bill, but hon. gentleman will remember with what derisive cheers from the government supporters that request of the member for East Grey was met at the time. The three weeks asked for by the member for Grey have passed and although this House of Commons has not been very busy, we are still waiting for the second reading. To-day the honoured leader of the opposition endeavoured to get some information from the premier as to when the second reading would be moved, and when that request was made a gentleman on the Liberal benches remarked : You will know soon. Well, I for one, would like to know how long that 'soon' is. We have the information now that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) was not consulted as to this Bill, that the Minister of Finance was not consulted either, and that Mr. Haultain, the Prime Minister of the Territories was not consulted as to the educational clauses. The Prime Minister tried to make out that Mr. Haultain had been consulted, but I have too much confidence in the ability of the right hon. gentleman to think that he for one moment thought that he was making the House believe any such thing. So far as we know at present, the Minister of the Interior, the Minister of Finance, Mr. Haultain and the members of parliament from the Northwest Territories were not consulted on this matter. Right here I would like to say that this afternoon during the discussion of this great question, not one member from the Northwest Territories supporting the government was in his place in the House. I do not know all these members and that statement may not be correct, but I am told that it is a fact. Any way, whether they were here or not they were absolutely silent on the question and I suppose the inference is they are satisfied with what has occurred. I have not such a deep interest in the other members of the government as I have in the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) and therefore I am not so concerned in the fact that the others were not consulted about this matter, but I really do feel chagrined that the Minister of the Interior should have been so slighted. There are other gentlemen in the cabinet, who, if they were consulted must have experienced an extraordinary conversion from their views if they gave their consent to such a measure as that now before the House. In 1896, when the Manitoba school question was before parliament, the present Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) said :

> This measure proposes to make use of the powers of this House as has never been attempted since confederation, namely, to interfere, to amend, to supplement, to change the legislation of a province with reference to a subject over which the provinces have exclusive control under our federal system of government.

Even if I rested my case there, that is pretty strong language from the Minister of Militia and we have no reason to think that his views have changed since. How did it come that he gave his consent, or was it that he was not thought of when the consulting was going on. Sir Wilfrid Laurier (then Mr. Laurier, leader of the opposition) used this language :

> But the hon. gentleman knows that the bitterness of the initiation of confederation, the feeling against the coercion then practised has never been removed, and never will entirely disappear until it is buried in the grave of the last man of that generation whose manhood was outraged by the arbitrary proceeding which trampled under foot the dignity and manhood of a proud people.

That reference to coercion was intended by Mr. Laurier for Sir Charles Tupper in relation to his efforts to bring Nova Scotia into confederation, but I am old enough to remember some things which were said and done by members of the present govern-

ment in reference to the same matter and which they would no doubt like to forget.

Now, it is my opinion, and I say it believing it from the bottom of my heart, that it will be more than ten years, when many of us who are now in this House will have reached the chloroform stage, before this question will be satisfactorily settled by the Bill which was introduced a short time ago. Again, the Minister of Militia said :

My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) might have gone further than he did in his statement because it will not only be the last man who was able to exercise the franchise of that time but his children and his grandchildren will have to pass away before the memory of that unjust Act is effaced from the minds of the people of Nova Scotia. . . . When we think that we are about to pass a system of laws upon the subject of education which is exclusively a provincial right, and that we are going to impose upon a great province this law for all time, no matter how the circumstances may change, or how the population may change, or how desirous they may be to make a change in that matter, when we think that for ever that law, by our act here, is to be fastened upon that unwilling province, surely it ought to cause us to pause.

Again, he said, that nine-tenths of the people were known to be opposed to that legislation, just as the vast majority of the people of Canada to-day are known to be opposed to the Bill which these hon. gentlemen are now trying to force through this House. Further he says :

And I dare say it is fitting that the hon. gentleman who so successfully bull-dozed the legislation of Nova Scotia in 1867 could carry confederation through the House against the well understood wishes of the people of that province, should be brought here to coerce this House into passing legislation which the majority of the people are opposed to and which is inimical to the interest of the province of Manitoba and the interest of the Dominion at large. . . . We hear a great deal about the rights of minority. I believe in preserving and conserving the right of minority, but, Sir, we are here under a system of responsible government, and the very foundation stone of responsible government is to govern in the interest of the majority with a view to the greatest good of the greatest number.

That is a noble and very old and tried sentiment.

It is most gratifying to us on this side of the House, whose policy has favoured this course from the first, because my hon. friend the leader of the opposition long ago laid down the policy of investigation and the policy of conciliation as opposed to the policy of blind coercion.

And I want to say that if anybody reads the speech then delivered by the then Mr. Laurier, now the right hon. leader of this House, he will find that the very core of his argument, the silver thread that ran through it from beginning to end, was the argument of investigation. Now, it has not been shown to us that the First Minister took any great pains to make an investigation before introducing his own Bill ; he did not even consult the members of his own cabinet.

What possible good can be served by proceeding with this Bill until we know what becomes of these negotiations. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman who leads this House has conducted himself in such a way as to give every indication of the strongest desire to annoy the government and the people of Maitoba to the utmost extent of his ability. . . . Well, Sir, I leave it to the hon. members of the House to judge who are mainly responsible if these fires have been kindled in this Dominion—whether it is those hon. gentlemen who rush madly into this offensive course toward the province of Manitoba, or whether it is my hon. friend here, the leader of the opposition, who has always counselled moderation, who has always counselled conciliation, who asks only that all the facts of the case be ascertained and the fullest information be secured before this tremendous step is taken.

The right hon. gentleman said something to-day about creeds. I want to ask right here, who is responsible if we have any trouble with creed, race and religion in connection with this Bill ? Upon whom must this House and this country place the responsibility if it is not upon the right hon. gentleman and his cabinet who have introduced these unnecessary clauses into this Bill ? The hon. Minister of Militia went on :

Was the hon. gentleman able by himself to make up his mind what alterations should be made in the tariff ?

He is asking when the great fiscal policy was introduced into this country by the great party which I have no hesitation in saying has introduced nearly all the great policies of this Dominion. I admit that these policies have been followed by our friends on the other side. They may not be very good introducers of policies, but they are first-class mimics. I am very thankful that in their fiscal policy they have come so near to adopting those rules and directions that were laid down by the members of the great Conservative party. The hon. gentleman said :

Was the hon. gentleman able by himself to make up his mind what alterations should be made in the tariff ? No, Sir, he took his two assistants, the Comptroller of Inland Revenue and the Comptroller of Customs with him and he went all over the country and called into his counsel people who are going to be affected by the legislation which he proposed—that is, some of the people. But at any rate he laid down this principle that he was going to enact legislation which affected the rights and might affect prosperity of the people of this country, and that it was his duty to consult or confer with those people who are to be affected by the legislation which he proposed to enact.

Now, there is no use in saying that we have rumours. The rumours are regrettable,

but where there is so much smoke there must be some fire, and there is no doubt that there is a great disturbance in the cabinet to-day, a disturbance which is retarding business and is detrimental to this House and this country. Then the hon. gentleman referred to what was said by Mr. Kenny, a member for Halifax, as to the way the school laws were being operated in the province of New Brunswick, as follows :

I was glad to hear him say he went further, and would be willing to leave it to the common sense of the majority of the people of this country that they would not inflict an injury upon any minority in this country. Well, Sir, if that is the case, if the hon. gentleman has so much confidence in the good sense of the people, why should he not leave the administration of the law in the province of Manitoba to the people who are charged with administering that law ? Why not give them an opportunity at any rate of showing whether they are willing, by the administration of the law, to do as the government and people of Nova Scotia have done—that is, consult the prejudices or requirements of the minority of that province. Mr. Speaker, in the province of New Brunswick we have a law similar to that of Nova Scotia. I was here during part of the time in 1872-73-74 when the question of the New Brunswick school was brought up by the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who invited us to interfere. Wisely, Sir, we abstained from interference, and what is the result to-day ? The result is that in New Brunswick the law is being administered in a way that is satisfactory to all classes of the community. Suppose we had listened to the hon. gentleman who now fills the position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who so eloquently urged upon us the necessity of interfering with the legislation of New Brunswick, and had undertaken to interfere with the laws of that province. Suppose we had interfered, what would have been the position in that province to-day ? Think you that you would have had the same amicable and friendly relations between that province and this Dominion that exists to-day ? No, Sir. If the hon. gentleman had prevailed he would have sown the seed of discord throughout this Dominion. As a result I say that to-day you have in the province of New Brunswick as happy a condition of things as exists in the province of Nova Scotia, so also in the province of Prince Edward Island. There is a Public School Act and there is no difficulty among the different denominations in that province.

There we have the three maritime provinces of this Dominion presenting an object lesson to this parliament to take note of and to take warning by that it is possible, nay that it is probable that if the province of Manitoba is left to the administration of its own laws it will administer them in such a way in its own interests, if it is wise that every part of the community shall be satisfied.

These are the words, these are some of the sentiments expressed by the Minister of Militia who, I suppose or really I cannot suppose, was one of those who sanctioned the Bill introduced some three weeks ago.

But hon. gentlemen opposite propose, without having given that province an opportunity to say whether they desire to make their law satisfactory to the minority of that province, to start out on a policy of coercion. They take the province of Manitoba by the throat by issuing their remedial order, and then follow up that remedial order by legislation.

Hon. gentlemen propose to coerce that province. Mr. Speaker, I ask you and I ask this House whether anything was ever gained anywhere by a policy of coercion. I say you cannot coerce Manitoba, and the legislation will be a failure. We hear a good deal about the rights of minorities.

And that is something of which we will hear a good deal when this question comes up for discussion. I said in the beginning that I believed in treating these questions freely, that I believed in treating them on high national principles and when we treat them in that way we will certainly settle all these questions to the very best interests of this country.

I have referred to the particular view that the member for Leeds takes of the rights of the minority, but speaking seriously we all desire from the bottom of our hearts to protect the rights of the minority everywhere. The rights of the minority appeal to our best sympathy always. But, Sir, we have to consider what is the best course in the interest of that minority. Is it the best course to pursue in the interest of the minority to run a muck of the great majority of the people of Manitoba and to attempt coercive measures upon that province ? No, Sir, I think not. I think that no more fatal mistake could be committed in the interest of the minority of Manitoba than to attempt to force this measure through this House at this time.

If we substitute 'the Northwest Territories' for 'Manitoba' we will have a pretty good description of the Bill which is now proposed in this House, and which no doubt this House will be asked to sanction. We have here just what the Minister of Militia thinks about this question, and if he thinks that, how is it possible that he could have approved of the present Bill which is contrary to the views which he expressed before. Now, let us sum up briefly the opinions which he expressed. First he objects to coercion. None of us like that word. Then he takes the stand that what is past cannot be changed even down to the third or fourth generation. I am afraid that before that time we will all be chloroformed. He also takes the stand for provincial rights he thinks the minority should be considered, he thinks that before any great change in the policy of the country is made there should be an investigation. He thinks that if Manitoba is left to administer its own laws it will administer them in its own interest and in the interests of all parts of the Dominion. I have taken some pains to find what the minister said on this question, and I want the House to take it into consideration that it is difficult to understand how this gentleman ever supported the introduction of a Bill of this spirit. As

regards the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba, I would like to say that I think that is a right principle. The people of that province have been to a large extent pioneers in that western country; they have been pioneers in reference to the government of that western country. In that case are they not deserving of some rights now? When the First Minister wanted to make two provinces in the Northwest he seems to have been determined on making them so large that even the member for Calgary, who lives in that district, thinks they are too large and yet he did not even consult the Minister of the Interior or the Minister of Finance or I believe the Minister of Militia, or several other ministers. It is impossible, the First Minister says, to extend the boundaries of Manitoba unless he calls into council with him the province of Quebec, Ontario and the Northwest Territories. I claim that that is not fair to us in Manitoba. I cannot understand how it is that the hon. the First Minister could occupy as much time as he does in replying to straight away questions put from this side of the House, and say so little. It seemed to me that he absolutely failed to give information. I suppose, perhaps, that is part of the game and that I have not been here long enough to understand, but I think on some points at least we should have the information we asked. He said to-day that although this question had been before the people for some three weeks the only fault found with it was in connection with the school clauses. This House must remember that the people who are most interested in that clause are scattered over very many hundred miles of this country and it takes quite a long while for mails to reach them, but if that hon. gentleman has not yet received any communication from that country objecting to any other clause except the school clause, I wish to read to-night a petition that has been received since the meeting of the House this afternoon, which will show that there are others and perhaps just as great objections to this Bill. This petition is as follows:

> The undersigned settlers in and around the town of Neudorf, Assiniboia, do strongly protest against the proposed action of the Autonomy Bill in regard to the compensation offered by the present government, for withholding our public lands from us. Also in regard to clause 23 which leaves the exemption of Canadian Pacific Railway from taxation for ever free, and lastly in regard to the educational clauses, and we wish to express our indignation, to the above, by appending our signatures as follows:

I am glad to have an opportunity of presenting this petition before the right hon. gentleman, and of assuring him that from this time forward, he is likely to receive a great many petitions of the same kind. A question that affects me personally, as greatly as any is the fact that that great country west of Lake Superior is not represented to-day in the Dominion government. However great his ability may be, no man on either side of this House at such a time in the history of the country as this can be Prime Minister and at the same time perform with satisfaction the duties of the Minister of the Interior. I hold that this cannot be done, and I want to say further that I do not want to detract from any eastern province. Nearly all of us who have been in that western country for 20, 25 and 30 years, who have been pioneers, nothwithstanding that we have made that country our home, we are sons of the east —I am sure this is true of the majority of the people of that country—and we are loyal to the east. Personally, though I have been in the west for twenty-four years, I never hear the word 'Nova Scotia' spoken but it fills me with pride. And I believe that is true of every easterner. Every member of this House, I am sure, believes that if this Canada of ours is to be a great country like the country to the south of us, great in population, in trade and in wealth, the resources upon which its progress must be based lie west of Lake Superior. We have, perhaps, to take some of our lessons from the east, but if we are to become great, if we are ever to have forty or fifty millions of inhabitants, it must be because of the resources of the west. And yet that country is deprived of a man in the council to represent our case as it should be represented. That is not a condition of affairs that ought to exist to-day. I think I need not say more on the subject of the extension of the boundaries. If I were to talk for an hour I could not make myself better understood than by the statement that I believe it is the right of Manitoba to have her boundaries extended. And we should have at once a Minister of the Interior, a man who can do our business for us. And I would like to make a suggestion—well, no; I have no right to put it that way; I would like to submit a request—to the First Minister that when he, in his own good time, appoints a Minister of the Interior, he will appoint a man who is responsible to the people. We do not want a man, however great his ability may be, that belongs to some constituency in which he is not directly responsible to the people. I would like to see some constituency in the west opened up to test public opinion on these great questions. I think we are ready for it. When this question was being settled for Manitoba the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was very anxious for investigation. Well, Mr. Speaker, don't you think that a very good way to find out what the people think upon this question would be to throw open one of the constituencies? We are not very particular which constituency in the west these hon. gentlemen decide to open; any of them will

afford a fair test. I thank the House very much for the kind attention with which they have heard me.

Mr. J. HERRON (Alberta). I shall occupy only a few minutes of your time, Mr. Speaker, in stating, as briefly as possible my views on the phase of the provincial autonomy question that is now before us. I was much surprised to hear the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) state this afternoon that he believed that the clauses of his Bill affecting education were the only clauses not satisfactory to the people of the Northwest Territories. If the Prime Minister believes that he expresses the opinions of the people of the Northwest when he says that, except for the educational clauses, they are entirely in accord with the Bill, I can only tell him that I believe that he is mistaken. What his sources of information may be, I do not know. But this is one of the reasons, I think, why we should have a Minister of the Interior to represent that country and express at the council board the wishes of its people. Dealing with the question which involves such important questions, such grave financial responsibilities and controls such vast areas of land, and dealing also with the right of half a million people, it seems perfectly plain that those people should be represented in the government. I do not consider that we are represented at this time. And that is one of the objections the people have to the present situation. We in the Northwest will not be satisfied unless we get the handling of our own lands and our own minerals. I for one believe that no compensation could be given by this government that would reconcile the people of that country to being deprived of this control, for this involves far more than dollars and cents to the people. I wish to put myself on record as saying that there are several clauses in the Bill as objectionable to our people as the clauses dealing with education.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, the discussion of this afternoon, I believe, has not been without its lessons for this House and the country. Any one of an observant turn of mind sitting in the gallery or even on the floor of this House, would have thought over a great many things, while many deductions from the circumstances would have forced themselves upon his mind. Why is it, for instance, that when an important question of this kind is being discussed we are not afforded even the courtesy of having responsible ministers—still ministers, however long they may continue in their positions—in their seats ? The conduct of the policy of the government of which they form, I suppose, a responsible part is being reviewed by His Majesty's loyal opposition. I do not think there is any sufficient answer to that question. I think these ministers ought to be here. I think they owe it to themselves, to those they represent and to the country at large to be present in their seats. And yet, as this discussion has gone on the observant person would have noticed that at one time there would be but one minister in his seat, at another time two, sometimes even three, but the number always very small. Now, it may be good policy for hon. gentlemen opposite to affect a show of indifference, and, perhaps, at the same time to conceal their true feeling, which is not indifference, but a very genuine discomfiture at the mistakes they have made and the position in which they find themselves. Why is it also that when a subject involving so greatly, the interests of the Northwest is under review, we find almost all the members on the other side representing constituencies in the Northwest Territories absenting themselves from their places ?

Was it because they have such superior knowledge and such superior parts that they did not think it consistent with their high qualities to listen to animadversions and to statements reflecting on a policy of the government or a Bill which vitally affects themselves ? I do not think it was. I think that their modesty would not allow them to come to any such conclusion. Then was it because they were supremely careless and did not care a fig how things went? I hardly think it was that either. Or was it because they were schooled to silence and told to say nothing and get out of the House ? Perhaps that would come nearer the right answer than either of the other suppositions I have made. These hon. gentlemen opposite were wont to be voluble enough. In 1896, their tongues were not tied. When they were on this side of the House they had a volume of speech and sound which was admirable, long continued and vehement it seemed to come from inexhaustible sources. Why are those gentlemen so silent now ? Why is it they have not a single word to say in their own defence? Why is it that responsible ministers who, I suppose, count for something in the cabinet—some ministers do count for something—why is it that two of them at any rate who counted for something were forestalled deliberately before the Bill was brought down. The others who remained, and who presumably did not count for much, were simply taken in hand by that autocrat, the First Minister. His Bill was rushed in and he practically said to these gentlemen : there it is before you and the country ; you can support it or not as you please. I make bold to say, Mr. Speaker, that never before has any parliament witnessed such an exhibition. Like whipped children fearing the lash, yet afraid to confess their faults, the members of the government, from the

highest to the lowest, sit in the House, take their medicine and say nothing. To the simplest question they have no answer, or if they attempt an answer—I should not put it in the plural but in the singular—or if the Prime Minister attempts an answer, it is an attempt not to give the information but to evade the questions put to him. I put it to the right hon. gentleman as a serious sensible man: Is it or is it not a question to which the opposition and the country have the right to an answer, why he rushed his Bill into parliament as the measure of a united government when he knew that his two most important ministers were diametrically opposed to one of the principal clauses in that Bill, and had placed themselves on record as irrevocably pledged against it time and again? Was not that somewhat peculiar? One by one the pretenses of the right hon. gentleman have been struck from him, and by this time he stands before this House and country pretty bare. He is no longer the somewhat picturesque object he was a few months ago. Shorn of his feathers and his beautiful colours, he is coming to be known more and more for what he is and what he has proved himself. If in 1896, my right hon. friend secured any popularity among the staunch stalwart Liberals of this country, he secured it solely because he then made himself the champion of provincial rights. And if to-day he has forfeited the respect, esteem and confidence of thousands and tens of thousands in this country, as he has, it is because he has at last come out in his true colours as being the opponent and not the champion of provincial rights. It is because he has reversed his position. The position of 1896 was apparently a brave one. That of 1905 is an entirely different one, and to it is due the loss of respect and confidence of which the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues are only too well aware. The speech which he delivered in this House not two weeks ago abounded in pretense and assumption, but when the facts come to be known these are stripped from it one after the other. He declared that he was about to put the crown of complete and absolute autonomy on these western territories, and all his people behind him cried out amen, and rent the air with their plaudits. But five minutes after any one of them that listened knew that the two most sparkling gems in that crown, the control of education, the right to the public lands, were missing and thus rendered his statement absolutely meaningless and without foundation. In 1896, what was the plea of the right hon. gentleman? It was that he wanted to consult the people whose interests were chiefly affected. He wanted to get at the exact condition of things amongst the people of Manitoba in order that he might find out the exact remedy to be applied. He wanted to know exactly what the people desired. He was, as he had often boasted, a democrat up to the hilt and—he wished to find out exactly what the people required and carry out their will. What reason had he for not giving autonomy a year ago? Because he wanted to wait until he had ten representatives from that country in this House instead of four. He wanted also to have the executive of the Northwest here in order that he might confer with them. And yet when I asked the right hon. gentleman to-night whether he embodied in that educational clause any of the fruits of that wide and thorough consultation of the wishes of the 500,000 people of the Northwest, what answer has he? He must answer that he had not. When I asked him whether in that same clause he embodied the results of his conferences and interchanges of opinion with the executive of the Northwest Territories, his reply and that of Mr. Haultain taken together show that he did not.

I ask him and ask hon. members from the Northwest sitting on that side of the House if the educational clause embodied their last thought, or deepest conviction, or complete assent, to what ought to be given to their people in the Northwest, and I have but to ask the question to answer it. Can the right hon. Prime Minister say that he did? Yet in his speech he declared that what he had the benefit of was, not only the consultation with, but the advice of the representatives from the Northwest. Let him get up and answer now whether the educational clause embodied the advice, the last thought, and best thought of the representatives from the Northwest. Let any representative from the Northwest get up and say that it did so. I challenge them to-night—those that are here—I challenge them. Does that clause represent them? Did it represent them when it was brought down? Does it represent them now? There is not a man of them that wil get up on his legs and say that it does. All of the preceding negotiations of the Northwest in reference to autonomy went on the assumption that the man chiefly to be employed, the medium chiefly to be considered, the representative through whom all the ideas should filter to the government, was the right hon. gentleman's Minister of the Interior. Does he deny that? The records show it. The whole course of the administration shows it. It was so in our time; the people from the outside get to the inside of the cabinet through an accredited member of it. It is more so now, because, at the instigation of my right hon. friend himself, the government have enlarged and strengthened the functions of the cabinet minister. Not only have they made each a cabinet minister as

to the country at large, but they have invested him with what we may call a geographical ministerial responsibility, and they have declared above board, honestly, we suppose, earnestly, we know, that the new doctrine has been embodied in the government of this country, that a minister is not only responsible to the whole country, but he is especially responsible to the geographical division which he is more intimately connected with. Now, Sir, if that were good for a Fisher, why is it not good for a Sifton ? If that were good enough when you wanted some machinery and engineering in order to carry out a piece of vile patronage, why is it not a thousand times better when the rights of 500,000 free people in the great and growing Northwest are in question ? Good, when you want to suppress a Dundonald, but bad, when you want to use it as the means for keeping these 500,000 people from getting their wishes embodied in parliamentary form. The pretense of absolute and complete autonomy has been completely stripped off from the right hon. gentleman. These pretenses were lovely and beautiful when the speech was being delivered, and all the men on that side of the House said 'amen' and rent the air with their plaudits. What do they think now, that these pretenses are stripped off ? To-day the Northwest has no representative in the cabinet. To-day I cannot say that the Northwest has any friend in the cabinet. You are not legislating here for the province of Nova Scotia, you are not legislating here for the province of Prince Edward Island, you are not legislating here for the province of New Brunswick, of Quebec, of Ontario or of British Columbia. Only in a general way are you legislating for these provinces, and in this particular Bill that general way is a very small way indeed. Thus we, the representative of these other provinces, are legislating for a great people now and an immensely greater people hereafter, laying down a hard granite mould, outside of which they cannot step or run in their great growing life for all the years that are to come. Yet these gentlemen who stood up in 1896 to demand provincial rights, who stood up in 1896 in strong demand that the people in the country for which that legislation was demanded were the people whose wishes and will were to be found out—these people to-day rush into legislation without consulting the accredited representative of the Northwest, who, I do not think, have a single friend in the cabinet. Why should I think they have not a single friend in the cabinet ? Who is a friend ? The hon. Minister of the Interior had his convictions. He made them known. The right hon. First Minister knew them. But there were other men who said they had convictions. The hon. minister who sits alongside my right hon. friend, the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock), said in 1896 that he had convictions. They were as strong as those that were held by the Minister of the Interior. That hon. minister has been in the cabinet. He has seen his brother minister who had convictions leave it for these convictions. He himself has subscribed to the clause which has made it necessary for his brother minister, the Minister of the Interior, to leave the cabinet. Can we count upon the hon. Postmaster General as a friend of the Northwest Territories ? We have got to say this, that the hon. Postmaster General agreed with the legislation, helped to frame it, stands by it, let his convictions of the past be what they may have been. We know the hon. Postmaster General to be a man who has ideals when they are pleasant, who has ideals, and high ones, when he is aiming for power, but who forgets to practise them when once he gets into power. What have we to-day ? My right hon. friend has declared before this House that he does not propose to take into consideration at present the nomination of a minister of the Northwest Territories. How long are we going to sit in this parliament without having a minister for the Northwest Territories, without having the cabinet filled up ? The hon. Postmaster General had ideals at one time. One ideal was that you should not keep offices dangling before the minds and eyes of representatives for fear you might influence them corruptly. What a splendid thing to keep dangling to-day is the ministership for the Northwest Territories ? How effectively my right hon. friend might use it, and he knows how to use such things. He used them with Mr. Langelier, and all the world knows it. He has been using them ever since, and all Canada knows it. How nice it is to see him now holding this Ministership of the Interior up before the gaze of all the members from the Northwest, as much as to say—and it is not necessary for the right hon. First Minister to say it in words—behold the beautiful thing ! See the patronage and power that are attached to it ! Look at the splendour which crowns it ! It is for one of you, which one I do not say ; but it is certainly not going to the chap who does not stand by me. Yet the hon. Postmaster General, who made a long crusade against that kind of thing at a period when he had ideals, helps to forward the same gross and material conception as an aid to twentieth century statesmanship.

Where is the Minister of Finance ? He too was a brother of the Minister of the Interior in these good old days when they were straining for power and when it was popular to advocate provincial rights. Can any stronger statements be made by anybody than were made by the Minister of Finance ? Is that the reason why the Bill should have been brought down before the Minister of Finance got here ? Any way the Bill is down and the education clause is in it. Is the Minister of Finance a friend

of the Northwest, is he to take the place of the Minister of the Interior ? Their opinions were the same, their convictions were the same, one has stood by his convictions and gone out—the other, where oh where is he ? It is said that he may go out ; well, he may go out. And there is the Minister of Customs, not in his seat of course, but the Minister of Customs has a record on this very question. In what thundering tones in 1892 and 1896 and years inclusive, did he pulverize these Tories who were against provincial rights. Where is he to-day ? Is he a friend of the Northwest, or does he believe in the school clause as it is, and has he been one of those who has favoured it and brought it down, and so must stand by it. And the Minister of Militia ; his record has been read. The statements he made in 1896 were as strong as ginger ; were stronger in fact. Does he too acquiesce ? Now, there is the government for you, with all its pretenses stripped, with its professions of 1896 absolutely reversed, flinging to the winds anything smacking of the democratic idea of consulting the people whose interests are at stake. And, like the autocratic Czar of Russia, the Prime Minister rushing his Bill in before his ministers can get together to consult him, declaring the Bill to embody his doctrine and the doctrine on which he is bound to stand. What is the weakness of the Czar of Russia to-day ? It is because he does not consult the people ; it is worse than that : it is because while not consulting the people he consults only the Grand Dukes. The Prime Minister of Canada is in the same position to-day. The people, are the 500,000, out in the west for whom he legislates. Who are the grand dukes ? We know right well whom he has not consulted, but do we know whom he has consulted if there has been any consulting. I am bound to say that if anybody is to be consulted it is the members of this House primarily, and it is essentially the representatives of the people of the great Northwest for whom we are legislating in this matter. When my friend the leader of the opposition put his question and put his case to-day, every man in this House noticed how he was answered. The question was : Why so much haste to get the Bill down two days before two of his most responsible ministers could arrive here, when three weeks have since elapsed without a step in advance ? That was a fair honest question. What was the answer the right hon. gentleman gave ? Did he himself believe in that answer ? Did any man who heard him believe in it ? He tried to make it appear that this delay was all due to the fact that my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) asked him not to be in too great a hurry to bring on the second reading of the Bill. I ask the right hon. gentleman now : Is that the reason of this delay of three weeks ? The right hon. gentleman knew it was not the reason when he stated it, and why then make that answer ? If that was simply the reason, why all this travelling to and fro by the ministers for the last three weeks ; why these frequent consultations ; why this disruption in the cabinet ; why the rumour of other ruptures ; why this government reduced to utter incapacity for three weeks ? Is it all because the member for Grey asked the Prime Minister to postpone the second reading ? My right hon. friend may take credit to himself for having dodged the question, but he cannot take credit for having answered it. What reply has the Prime Minister to the question put to him as to whether he thought it right to go on in this matter in the absence of any accredited representative from the Northwest Territories. Has he given any answer ? There is none. I call the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that this is all the worse because there are now two departments of government which are in hypothec, so to speak ; they are not being carried on by men responsible to this House. One is under the nominal headship of my old friend Sir Richard Cartwright, but Sir Richard Cartwright is in another House, and the deputy minister is not physically able to transact the business. That is not a live department, and we only needed to have the exhibition of the Minister of Customs trying to put through its simple estimates to tell us how little anybody else knew about that department. There is the Department of Public Works not under a responsible head. I sympathize as much as any one can with the cause that prevents our friend the minister from being in this House, but the business of this country must go on, and sickness, and death, cannot always be pleaded as an excuse for the public business not going one. It is high time that there should be a responsible minister in this House in charge of the Public Works. I believe it is nominally under my hon. friend from London (Mr. Hyman). Will not the Prime Minister now do a good turn to the hon. member from London, and do a good turn to the public service, by accepting the resignation of the Minister of Public Works at once and giving a chance to my hon. friend (Mr. Hyman) to go back to his old constituency and get the endorsation of his people.

Mr. BENNETT. He may not run there.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman would run where he ran before.

Mr. BENNETT. Only twenty.

Mr. FOSTER. Only twenty ; but this Bill which has been brought down in such a hurry is of such sterling quality and commends itself so strongly to the electorate of the west, that it would be a strong factor in favour of the member of London if the constituency were opened now. My hon. friend (Mr. Hyman) will not be doing

his duty and living up to his responsibilities, and gauging the possibilities of the passing hour, if he does not demand that he shall have an opportunity of testing the feelings of the people of London. The portfolio of the Interior is vacant. To-night in this city, there are two or three hundred men from all parts of the Dominion, and especially from the great Northwest, who are down here to do business with the Minister of the Interior, and very important business at that. Can they do it? No, it is absolutely impossible. Even this House has not been able to do anything in connection with the Interior Department for the last three, or four, or five weeks. The right hon. gentleman says he is trying to administer the department. He may be trying to do it, but he will not think I am saying anything out of the way when I say that he is not doing it, and it is practically impossible for him to do it. It is a very large department, with great ramifications. The right hon. gentleman has all he can do without trying to master the details of that department. It is impossible for him to do it; he cannot undertake it and he cannot overtake it. Why should not my right hon. friend appoint his Minister of the Interior and let him go to his constituency and come back here as soon as possible in order that the business of this country may go on? It will not take long, and it will serve another very useful purpose, the purpose, namely, of testing the feeling of the Northwest itself upon the measure which my right hon. friend has brought down. Will he do it?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think he will; but I think he ought to do it in the interest of good government and also in the interest of a full and free expression, in the only way in which it can be given, of the people of the Northwest in regard to the measure which he has brought down.

My right hon. friend accused the leader of the opposition of treating this subject lightly. Well, I must say that I bent forward quickly in my seat when I heard that expression, to make sure that it was the expression actually used. If the treatment of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition was light treatment, what does the right. hon gentleman think of his own treatment? If the earnest, honest, straightforward way which my hon. friend beside me took to put his question and to ask for explanations was light treatment, what was the tone adopted and the arguments used by the right hon. gentleman himself? Surely my right hon. friend must have been laughing inside of himself when he made that statement. Does not my right hon. friend see this? He took his own method of getting his information; he took his own time to consult the members of his government—those whom he chose to consult; he took his own leisure to frame a measure that should be adequate; and so sure was he that it was adequate that he could not wait until the second reading to make his argument, but made it on the introduction of the Bill. However, he had taken his ground, and was determined to stand to it—that was the position of my hon. friend when he introduced this Bill three weeks ago. Now he says that even his government is not above making changes if they are necessary, studying the people and the expression of their feelings, and trying to meet them if they possibly can. Should not that have been done before? The right hon. gentleman spoke of the gravity of the question. It is a grave question. I do not think we are going to discuss this question, whenever it does come before us, in any other than an open, honest and straightforward manner, on its merits. The merits of separate schools are not involved in this Bill. It is a constitutional question, pure and simple, as it seems to me. If we differ upon it, we will differ as gentlemen differ, not reproaching each other for differences of creed or race.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Hon. gentlemen do not wish to do that. They are opposed to such a course as that. Very well; they can have their way. If they wish the other way, they can have it; but if they do wish it, upon themselves will be the responsibility, that is all; and there is this further to be said, that although no man knew better than my right hon. friend the danger of explosion, the closeness and nearness with which opinions on creed and race are held, and the danger that whenever you touch them you will have harsh expressions, which will grate upon opposing ears—although no man knew better than my right hon friend, for he has been through these from confederation up, yet, when it was not called for, when he himself disowned it in the first part of his speech, he forgot himself in the latter part and raised the question pure and simple of public schools as opposed to separate schools. Now, if in the heat of debate some harsh expression is used, you will probably find the right hon. gentleman and some of his followers saying: Oh, you are raising the sectarian discussion. The sectarian discussion has been raised by my right hon. friend. He has challenged the public school system of this country and of this continent. He did it gratuitously; it was absolutely unnecessary; although in the first part of his speech he declared that he was not going to do it. Therefore if there is any sinner, it is my right hon. friend; and if there be further sinners, so far as I am concerned, they will be gentlemen on the other side of the House, and not myself at least, nor, I believe, gentlemen on this side of the House. Autonomy is a question which was bound to come up. No human

foresight could, I suppose, have prevented it. New provinces had to be created, and when they were created the question of their educational rights would have to come up. Statesmanship does not cower before a problem of that kind. It meets it in a bold and statesmanlike way. We who represent the people of different creeds and races have to meet it in this House, and whilst we have our opinions and hold them strongly and express them boldly, we will not, I hope, offend even the most sensitive of those who do not agree with us on questions of creed or race.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to carry this further to-night. I am going to reiterate what I think the right hon. gentleman ought to take into consideration. He ought to fill up his vacant or dormant cabinet positions, especially the one in which is needed a representative of the Northwest people, whose interests are being legislated upon; and I hope the right hon. gentleman will revise the statement which he made a few days ago, that he does not propose to give his attention to that matter at the present time. I think it ought to be done; we on this side of the House think it ought to be done; I believe the people of the great Northwest think it ought to be done. Deprived of their own champion and representative in this matter, they do at least ask the government of the day to give them another representative through whom they can voice their opinions. It is not enough to say to that great country and the million of people who are there: Give your views to us, and we will take them into consideration. Everybody knows that even a representative cannot go where a minister goes. The formative process is in the cabinet itself, and it is difficult to decide upon what is not formulated in the cabinet. Therefore I say the west needs its representative, needs its champion. How inadequate was the argument of my right hon. friend that there was no objection to any part of this Bill but one clause. Suppose we take that for granted, will not my right hon. friend admit that that one clause is the great clause for this whole Dominion as well as for the Northwest? If public opinion centres, with unerring aim and unerring sense of right, upon the one great essential clause, is that an argument for saying that all the rest of a multiplicity of enactments are satisfactory and find no dissentients in the Northwest or anywhere else in this country? It is simply that this one overshadows the others, but that there are others my right hon. friend knows and he will know still better as this discussion goes on. He will find out one thing I think and that is that his financial terms, as he has placed them in this Bill, will bring upon him every province in this Dominion. Already the mutterings are in that direction, already the tendency is clearly discernible. Take it on any ground you like and by the proportions which you have meted out to the Northwest and you have gone beyond the financial conditions of every other province of this Dominion. That is why the Minister of Finance, I think, should have been here and should have been considered when this Bill was in preparation. But my right hon. friend will find that there are other clauses besides the educational clause which will be brought up.

Now what has the right hon. gentleman told us? He gave us the wonderful information the other day that amendments are very often made to Bills and that they are very often made as the Bills go through committee. He did not say whether he was going to amend the Bill or not. To-day he rather foreshadowed an amendment. The right hon. gentleman came out without its being necessary or constitutional, three weeks, four weeks, five weeks, out of due season and ahead of time, burned all his bridges behind him and made an impassioned argument for the four chief points of his Bill. He nailed his colours to the mast, and he declared that he would have the courage once his convistions were formed to stand by those convictions. What said he in 1895?

> Well, Sir, to be wanting in courage is a grave charge I admit. But if to make promises and not to implement them is courage, if to make threats and to quail before their consequences is courage, if to be boisterous in language and meek in action is courage, if to pass an order and refuse to execute it is courage, if to act in such a manner as to force your best friends to the conviction that you are deceiving them is courage, there is a galaxy of courageous men on the treasury benches before us, such as we have not seen for a long time. Sir, courage is a noble thing in itself, but foresight is not to be despised either. Foresight is not to be despised in such a country as this, with all its conflicting elements. My courage is not of the kind of courage possessed by hon. gentlemen opposite, I admit. My courage is not to make hasty promises and then to ignominiously break them. My courage is to speak slowly, but once I have spoken to stand or fall by my words.

That is the right hon. gentleman's answer to the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) to the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), to the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) to the people of the Northwest, to the people of this broad Dominion: 'I have foresight; I have used it. That Bill is the result of it. In that I have made my promise and mine is the sterling courage which never goes back on its promises.'

We will see, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). It is not necessary for me Mr. Speaker, to say that I have no desire to follow my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) on the path on which he has entered. I have no desire to do it because I think it would entail a useless waste of time in the first

place and in the second because I feel I am not by any means qualified to tread the same path. However I think it proper to say that my hon. friend's (Mr. Foster's) allusion to my friend the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) should not pass unnoticed and my answer to him will be brief, brief because I trust it will express the sincere convictions which I entertain. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has spoken of the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) as one who has been shorn of his feathers ; he has referred to him in contemptuous terms as the erring champion of provincial rights. Now in the first instance let me say that in so far as my hon. friend's allusion to the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) as one who has been shorn of his feathers is concerned, our answer to him is this : We have heard that statement, not so eloquently put forth but put forth very frequently in this House, and our answer is to appeal to the verdict which the people of this country have given in 1896, have given again in 1900 and have renewed in the month of November last, 1904. He has said that the leader of the government has lost the respect and the confidence of the people of this country. I venture to make this statement, Mr. Speaker, that the leader of the government has not lost the respect nor the confidence of any man in this country whose respect and whose confidence he values. My hon. friend has gone on, leaving the path marked out by the leader of the opposition when he began this discussion to-day, to challenge the government to appeal to the country at the present time so as to see whether or not, under existing conditions, the conduct of the government in respect to this Northwest Territories Bill will be approved of. I say Mr. Speaker, and I say it deliberately, and I say it with the honest conviction that my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Foster) will agree with me that designedly gentlemen opposite, as representing the Conservative party, have appealed to passions, have aroused prejudices in this country——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FITZPATRICK—in connection with this Bill upon which they expect to rely. But they will find that appeal in the present time to be nothing more than a broken reed as was the case in 1896 when they endeavoured to appeal to the passions and prejudices of the Catholics in this country.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. I ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is in order to say that the opposition deliberately and of set purpose appealed to the passions of the people.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT. What meant your circular ?

Mr. SPROULE. I ask the ruling of the Speaker if the hon. gentleman has not gone beyond the bounds 'deliberately and of set purpose'.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that that statement goes a little beyond the bounds of parliamentary decorum.

Mr. FOSTER. Shave it down.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If that expression goes beyond the rules of parliamentary etiquette as suggested by the hon. member for North Toronto, I will attempt to pare it down, and instead of making the statement I will bring forward the proof. What is going on at the present time, in this country, Mr. Speaker ? What is being done ? Petitions are being circulated emanating from the other side, addressed on the one hand to the people of Ontario in the hope that they may arouse them against this Bill on the ground that the privileges of the Northwest Protestants are being invaded. And, on the other hand, what have we going on ? Petitions emanating from the same source addressed to the Catholics of the province of Quebec.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We have them in our possession——

Mr. FOSTER. Trot them out.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Petitions are being circulated throughout the province of Quebec asking what ? Asking that this government should be forced to adopt that clause in this Bill that hon gentlemen opposite are asking the people from Ontario to repudiate.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) allow me a word? He said he was going to prove it. Does he not acknowledge the gravity of the charge ? Will he not prove it ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What I for my part, would ask is this : The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has said that there were petitions to the province of Quebec emanating from this side, pointing to myself and to the gentlemen around me, asking the Catholics of that province to urge the government to pass this Bill. Now, I want to tell the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) that, so far as I am concerned——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as I am concerned, and so far as I know——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Allow me to get through;—so far as I know any act on the part of any other hon. gentleman on this side of the House, the statement of the Minister of Justice is without one particle of foundation.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) in his usual guarded way says that so far as he knows, this statement is without foundation—

Mr FOSTER. Prove it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I want hon. gentlemen opposite not to trouble themselves about attempting to intimidate me.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no; we would not do that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The statement I made——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. Hon. gentlemen must keep better order.

Mr FITZPATRICK. The statement I made was that these petitions were being deliberately circulated in the province of Quebec. And I make the statement now on the authority of a colleague of mine in this House——

Mr. FOSTER. Trot out your colleague.

Mr. FITZPATRICK—that these petitions are being circulated by one Elie Maurault, secretary of the Jacques Cartier club, which has extended its hospitality to the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) within the last ten days.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN Mr Speaker——

Some hon MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. R. L BORDEN—if every other statement that the Minister of Justice has made is equally untrue with the one he has just made, there is not the slightest truth in any of those statements.

Some hon MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am perfectly in order I am speaking of that which is within my own knowledge. I say the Jacques Cartier club did not extend its hospitality to me within the last ten days; and if the Minister of Justice has no better knowledge of other facts than he has in this particular case, he had better defer his remarks until he is more fully acquainted with what he is talking about.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The statement I made was that these petitions were being circulated——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman stated that——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman stated that the club from which emanated these petitions sent to Quebec had extended its hospitality to me within the last ten days, meaning to imply, if he meant anything, that I had in some way some connection with the circulating of those petitions. I ask him to make that statement good, or, as a gentleman, to withdraw it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The statement that I made was that these petitions were being circulated through the agency of Mr. Elie Maurault, of the city of Montreal, secretary of the Jacques Cartier club. The Jacques Cartier club is a prominent Conservative organization in the city of Montreal. And, in that connection, I said that the leader of the opposition had been entertained by the Jacques Cartier club within the last ten days. I am now informed that in the last statement I was incorrect, and I now take it back.

Some hon MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like one word more;—we might as well thrash these things out as we go along. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) said that he is able to prove that those petitions emanated from some gentleman on this side of the House. I ask him either to withdraw that statement or to name in your presence, Mr. Speaker, and in the presence of members of this House, the hon. gentleman on this side of the House from whom any one of those petitions emanated.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I want to say for the benefit of the leader of the opposition that I do not intend to allow him or any other member in this House to put words into my mouth——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr Fitzpatrick) said——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman said every word of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And it was said for a purpose——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. For a purpose——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What I said to-night was said for a purpose, and said deliberately——

Mr. FOSTER. And untruthfully.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not think the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) ought to say 'untruthfully.'

Mr. FOSTER. Let me explain.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) if he will allow me to explain. If ever I heard anything plainly and distinctly—and now, if I am wrong, I will take it back—it was the statement made by the Minister of Justice that these petitions emanated from hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman did not state that, then, my ears deceived me. But, I most certainly, have pretty sharp ears.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not want to get into any altercation with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick)——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think I am showing a great deal of good temper about this matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the hon. gentleman objects——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN—I will take my seat at once.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not object.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This is a personal matter, and it seems to me it is better to thrash these things out on the spot than have any ill-feeling on the matter afterwards. I distinctly say, that, so far as my ears could gather the words of the hon. gentleman, spoken distinctly and with a great deal of passion and earnestness, they were that these petitions to which he referred, and one which he said he held in his hands, emanated from this side, and he pointed to this side of the House. I ask him to name to this House and this country the hon. gentleman on this side from whom these petitions emanated, or else to withdraw the statement.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I did not make the statement that the petitions emanated from any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House. I did make the statement that they emanated from the other side——

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman said they emanated from the same source as the petitions from the province of Ontario.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) is pretty badly in——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is because I am so badly in that my hon. friends opposite ought to be more generous. It seems to me not quite fair that I should have to answer four or five at a time. When it is realized that I am endeavouring to come after the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) it seems to me that I ought to have the sympathy of every member of this House.

Mr. FOSTER. You have mine.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am entitled to the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Foster's) sympathy, because my task is no easy one. I quite understand that. Now, leaving that question aside for the moment I want to be precise in the position I take, I want to be quite sincere about this, for it is a serious matter. I hold the Conservative party responsible for the fact that two sets of petitions are being circulated in this country at present—one addressed to the people of Ontario for the purpose of creating prejudice in their minds against this Bill and the other addressed to the people of Quebec for a like purpose. My hon. friend the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) charged us with not having consulted the people of the Northwest who are most concerned in this Bill. I say, and I say it deliberately, that an attempt is being made to prejudice the people of Ontario against this Bill. And for what reason forsooth ? Because they are jealous that a Catholic happens to be connected with it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Read the Toronto 'Telegram' and you will find the proof of what I say. But, Mr. Speaker, it is said that this Bill was introduced into this House without any previous conference or consultation with the representatives of the people of the Northwest Territories who are most concerned. Let me say that every line of this Bill was settled after previous conference with the people representing the Northwest Territories, with the single exception of the educational clause——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I rather like to hear my hon. friends interrupt me. There must be some reason for it. When I rose in fear and trembling to follow the Goliath of the opposition, I did not expect so much success. As far back as 1902, Mr. Speaker, a Bill was prepared by the executive of the Northwest Territories in anticipation of that autonomy which is now about to be granted. They prepared for the consideration of this

government the provisions under which they wished to be granted provincial status. That Bill has been under consideration since. Not only that, but it was in the possession of the present member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) and we had the advantage of his notes on that Bill and his consideration of it. The only exception was with respect to the clause regarding education. Let me deal with that, and I want to be precise. In so far as that clause is concerned, there is no direct reference to it in the Bill as it was submitted to us or in the Bill which was handed over to me by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) previous to his going away on his last journey immediately before the session. But when that question came up for consideration I myself had a conference with Mr. Haultain, and I want now to say that in the statement I am about to make I have absolutely and exclusively to trust to my recollection of what took place in that meeting. I have no notes of what occurred, but I feel certain I can put almost in terms what passed between us. When that Bill was up for consideration it was necessary to refer to the educational clause; and on the Thursday preceding the day when the Bill was introduced Messrs. Bulyea, Haultain, Read and myself with two or three other members of the government—I forget who they were—discussed the measure. Then the question arose regarding schools, and I said to Mr. Haultain, what are we to do with respect to this educational clause? His answer to me was that provision was made for the school question, so far as the Northwest Territories were concerned, by section two of the Bill, section two being that section which makes applicable to the Northwest Territories the provisions of the British North America Act, section 93 included. My answer to that was that in my judgment to make the British North America Act applicable in these general terms would be fruitful of difficulties in the future, and I had no desire to have a repetition of the Manitoba school controversy. I wanted to make the position of the people in the Northwest with respect to educational matters so clear and simple that any man might understand the clause when he read it. I said that nothing should be left to doubt, uncertainty or misconception; and in so far as I am concerned, that clause, in the terms in which it is now drafted, was prepared merely for the purpose of giving to the people of the Northwest Territories those things which they now have and it never was intended to go one inch beyond that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What does my hon. friend mean by that? He says the intention was to give the precise rights which are enjoyed at present. Of course that might be susceptible of two meanings, as my hon. friend will rightly gather. He knows what I mean, and I would ask him to be a little more precise.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not think that this is the proper time to discuss that provision of this Bill. When the time comes, it will be my duty to explain line by line and clause by clause this Bill from beginning to end, and I shall endeavour to do so to the best of my ability. But I think the question put by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition is a perfectly fair one, and I shall answer it as briefly as I can without, I trust, breaking to too great an extent the rules of the House. In 1875 the principle of separate schools was settled so far as the Northwest Territories are concerned, and so far as it could be settled under the provisional legislation of that time. Under the Act of 1875 a system of schools was created by an ordinance of the Territories; and to that system of schools so created, certain pecuniary allowances were made. This Bill is intended for no other purpose, in so far as I am concerned, than to give effect to that provision of the Act of 1875 and the conditions of the ordinances now in force in the Northwest Territories.

I am quite sure that I have trespassed on the attention of the House far beyond the limits I originally assigned to myself, but I would like to say a word in conclusion. My hon. friend the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has spoken of the 500,000 people in the Northwest who ought to be consulted. I have no desire to introduce unnecessarily controversial matter, but I ask him in all earnestness—and when I do so I ask him to remember the speeches he made in this House in 1896 which I read then and have read only quite recently—I ask him in all earnestness; have we no regard to pay in the settlement of that delicate question, to the opinion, the honest convictions of over forty per cent of the population of this Dominion? I say that there are deep seated prejudices being aroused, passions being inflamed, and the desire, I am quite convinced, of every man in this House is that peace should reign supreme throughout this land. All I say now, and I speak for myself, is that there can be no peace except that peace which is based on justice; there can be no peace expect that peace which is based on equal rights and respect for the honest convictions of every man in this country.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT. (East Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, the government are at least to be congratulated on the fact that at last they have found some hon. gentleman ready to stand behind them and perhaps it may be that there is some truth in the rumour that the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) is about to retire from the cabinet, and that to-night he is giving a parting shot. Be that as it may the hon. Minister of Justice has appeared as he always has done in his favourite role of fanning and appealing to prejudices. One would imagine that the hon. Minister of

Justice had comported himself throughout his lifetime and particularly prior to his advent to this House as a perfect harbinger of peace, and that he had gone from one end of the country to the other in order to pacify and alleviate the feelings of those who might have been influenced by religious prejudices. One would have supposed, at least from the strong statements he has made to-night, that the hon. Minister of Justice would be the last man who would desire to look back upon the recent history of this country. There was a general election in 1896 and it was found by hon. gentlemen opposite to be a matter of life and death. From 1878 down to that time they had attempted time and again on different issues to achieve office, but always with the same result that they had been repulsed by the electors. Unfortunately, perhaps, for the peace of the country and for the peace of the Conservative party, a question similar to the present one loomed up on the political horizon. The hon. Minister of Justice went down through the province of Quebec and his complaint against the Tupper government on that occasion was that the Tupper government had been recreant to the cause of the Roman Catholic part of the population and he said that if he went to Ottawa he would go there—to be a Liberal ?—No, not a Liberal. To be a Conservative ?—No, not a Conservative, but that if elected he would only support the party which would support a Remedial Bill. I challenge the hon. minister to-night to deny that statement.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) used that quotation with very much more force before, and I think I can stand a repetition by my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett)).

Mr. BENNETT. Well, the hon. gentleman may affect that, but I challenge him to deny the statement that when he went into the province of Quebec and was elected for the county of Quebec he did not think it was wrong on his part to pledge himself to the hilt to the bishop of the diocese, that if he was elected to a seat in this House he would not be a Conservative, not a Liberal, but he would be a Remedial Bill man, first, last and always. That was the pledge the hon. gentleman made and the pledge upon which he was returned by the electors of that riding. How did the hon. gentleman redeem his pledge ? He came into this House, he secured or was appointed to the position of Solicitor General, and after the pledge that he had made to his party and the pledge that he had made to his electors that Remedial Bill was thrown to the winds and nothing further was heard of it. But, the day has come when the hon. gentleman has to meet his overdue note. That is what it is. The hon. gentleman has found out that he cannot hoodwink the people of the county of Quebec any longer. Living as he is living, not on what should be the ground work of statesmanship, but on religious fanaticism—and that is what he is living on in the province of Quebec,—he finds that he is brought face to face with the question of this Northwest school Bill and he is bound to throw in his lot on the side of the church, that is why the hon. gentleman is to-day posing as the advocate of these people in the Northwest Territories. But, I tell the hon. Minister of Justice that in the province of Ontario and in every province of this Dominion there would be little religious prejudice were it not for fire brands of the stamp of the hon. Minister of Justice.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It does not make any difference.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) will withdraw that remark, I hope.

Mr. BENNETT. No, I am not sure that the hon. Minister of Justice has been a flaming torch in Quebec nor has he been a flaming torch perhaps from Quebec on the minsterial side because to-day the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) announced that he was going to back down from his position. The hon. minister is put in this position that after all these strong pledges and promises which have been given, he and the right hon. Prime Minister are to-day endeavouring to cover their retreat. I had supposed that the hon. Minister of Justice would have denied the charge that he had made a pledge to support a Remedial Bill, but as nothing has been denied he stands confessed to the new members of the House at least as having secured his election in the county of Quebec by making a promise and a pledge to the bishop of the diocese and to the electors of that riding that if he came here as their representative, and that if Sir Wilfrid Laurier—then plain Mr. Laurier—became premier, he, the Minister of Justice, would vote against him unless he produced and formulated a Remedial Bill. Yet, here the hon. Minister of Justice sits, his pledge made to the people unredeemed and unfulfilled, he continues in the emoluments of his office and being confronted with this overdue note he is endeavouring to get even with his pledge. The hon. Minister of Justice talks about religious prejudice in the province of Ontario. Who is stirring up religious prejudice in the province of Ontario to-day ? Who is stirring it up in this House to-day ? Not one word is said from this side of the House on this question, but, when the Bill is introduced one of the supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) rises up on his feet, denounces the

Bill and tells the right hon. Prime Minister and the government that they shall not have his support on this question. What attitude has the Toronto 'Globe' taken on this question? What attitude has been taken by Mr. Stapleton Caldecott, a gentleman who a little time ago was nominated in the city of Toronto as the Liberal candidate, but declined the honour? It is a very doubtful honour to be nominated as a Liberal candidate in the city of Toronto. And, to go further, Mr. Robinette, the candidate for hon. gentleman opposite in Centre Toronto, only a few months ago, has denounced the stand taken by the government on this question. Still further, the candidate of hon. gentlemen opposite in North Toronto, Mayor Urquhart, has also denounced the position which the government has taken on this question. The hon. Minister of Justice says that the right hon. Prime Minister has not lost the respect of any of his former supporters. I say to hon. gentlemen opposite, let them bring on a general election to-day in Ontario and throughout the whole Dominion, and they will find whether or not he has lost the respect and support of the country. What an exhibition this government is to-day before the people of Canada. Ministers are in open mutiny. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), one of the most prominent members of the cabinet, the gentleman who has been named as the successor of the Prime Minister when the Prime Minister shall see fit to drop out of his position. is insulted. He is on his way to the city, but within two or three days of his arrival this Bill is brought down without his knowledge, consent or confirmation, and Sir, while it was manliness on the part of the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) to resent the insult, apparently the Minister of Finance likes to lick the hand that smites him.

As to the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior he is to be congratulated on his position and on the attitude which he has taken. Insult could not have gone further, and hon. gentlemen opposite show their pique and resentment as soon as an hon. gentleman on that side of the House, be he a member of the House or Minister of the Crown, turns upon them. What is being said to-day of the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior? Look at the newspapers in the province of Quebec. Do they attribute to the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior the fact that he left the government by reason of an honesty of purpose and a regard for principle? Not at all, but he is reported as having been kicked out of the government by reason of scandals which it is said attach to him. Why does not the right hon. Prime Minister display a more noble and manly spirit towards his late minister? Why does he not stand up in his place and resent the imputations that are being cast upon the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior? Nay more, there are other hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. There is the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) whose name is associated with 'Le Nationaliste.'

Why does he not rise in his place and impeach the ex-Minister of the Interior for wrong-doing in connection with his department? The fact is that this government is all at sixes and sevens, knowing not where to turn or what move to make next. And as to the ministers from Ontario, with the two old men of the sea in the Senate Chamber and the two chloroformed ministers in this House—the Postmaster General and the Minister of Customs—both Oslerized because they are over 60, what can the Liberals of Ontario expect from them? What is the hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) doing on the present occasion? He was at a meeting in his own riding the other night, at which the government was denounced on all sides, but the member for Centre York was afraid either to condemn the government or approve of their policy. His cry was: Wait, wait; you will see something will happen. To-day we have an intimation of what is going to happen. I suppose it will be a repetition of the Remedial Bill experience in 1896, of members and ministers opposite giving their pledges that they are going to do this and that, and then doing the other thing. The debates on the Manitoba question show that the question of the Northwest schools was a live question in 1896, and although the Minister of Justice did not go so far as to pledge his word of honour that in the event of a Remedial Bill not being passed he would oppose any administration that might be formed by Mr. Laurier; yet there were other members who found their way into this chamber by giving pledges that when the question of the Northwest schools came up they would stand for legislation similar to the remedial legislation for Manitoba. There is fear and trembling among them to-day. The Solicitor General (Mr. Lemieux) came to parliament on one of these pledges.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman did not?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Perhaps I had better read it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Read it.

Mr. BENNETT. I thought perhaps the Minister of Justice might invite me to read his.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I can refer the hon. gentleman to the four elections I have since had in my county.

Mr. FOSTER. How did you get in?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In the last two my opponent lost his deposit.

Mr. BENNETT. We all know that certain influences were at work in the province of Quebec in the last election ; there was the pledge that there should be separate schools in the Northwest, and I have no doubt that was worked to the bitter end ; quietly no doubt ; much quieter than in the case of the Remedial Bill in 1896. Be that as it may, here is a cabinet disjointed and disrupted, paralyzed before the people of Canada for the last three weeks, fighting within and fears without, and its supporters all muzzled except the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Leighton McCarthy), whom I congratulate on his bravery in standing up in defiance of the government, and the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), who has not been seen since. My fear is that if any other gentleman on that side were to make a similar statement, the same fate might attend him. And what is the position of the hon. member (Mr. Guthrie) to-day ? Here is the Bill which he was to support going to be emasculated, nothing to be left of it, and if the hon. gentleman comes back to the House he will have to denounce the government for taking the very vitals out of his pet measure. And where is the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) ? He published in the newspapers that he was favourable to this legislation, but to-night he is as silent as the tomb. What a humiliating spectacle ! Only the Prime Minister to speak, and after him the Minister of Justice ; and when the Minister of Justice has had his say, it is the same parade of the stock in trade that brought the Prime Minister to the front in the province of Quebec, and on which he has been depending ever since, and on which he must always depend in order to have a political existence in this country.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). If this House can congratulate itself that during the discussions of this measure inflammatory addresses have been unknown in the past, we have now to regret that such a happy condition of affairs has come to an end. It has remained for another member of the silent ministry to drag in that passion, that prejudice and that extreme asperity and bitterness which hon. members on this side of the House have been most anxious to exclude. In reply to the repeated demands from this side of the House that some one should speak for the government, the Minister of Justice flew to his feet and indulged in the most extreme degree of heat and passion. I would remind the hon. minister that there is a time to be bitter, as there is a time to be tranquil. If, in the bitterness of his soul, the Minister of Justice is forced to rise up and denounce the engendering of passion and prejudice where passion and prejudice did not exist, I must refer him to his leader, the Prime Minister, for the ground upon which passion and prejudice is fostered. Eating dead sea fruit is bitter work, and the bitterness of the eating lies with the Minister of Justice to-day, and it is made more bitter because the bitterness of it is thrust down his throat by the leader of the government. The hon. gentleman has appealed to the verdict of the people in 1896. Will he stand by the verdict of the people in 1896 ? Is he content to take that verdict upon the principles involved in this question ? But, Sir, it is the verdict of the people of to-day that is wanting, and that verdict we have not by reason of the fact that this measure was not submitted to the people, but was kept in the back ground when the government made their appeal at the last general election. The Minister of Justice has told us that in pursuing the course which he has pursued, the Prime Minister has not lost the respect of a single person whose respect he values. Contrast that with the statement of the Prime Minister, who said he accepted with sorrow and regret the resignation of his Minister of the Interior, and you will see in it a direct contradiction of the statement of the Minister of Justice.

The right hon. gentleman said, in accepting the resignation of the hon. Minister of the Interior, on the first day of the month, that he had regret in accepting it—that there were no causes of difference between them beyond the cause of difference set forth in the correspondence. Yet, the hon. Minister of Justice would have this House believe that the right hon. gentleman did not care for the support of the hon. Minister of the Interior, and therefore he dismissed him and sent him from the cabinet doors. There is a position of inconsistency, Sir, which it is hard to reconcile. But when we talk of inflammatory addresses, let us see the extraordinary position in which this cabinet finds itself to-day. Upon this important question, which has occupied more or less off and on the attention of this House since the 21st day of February last, when the Bill was introduced by the Prime Minister, what intimation have we had from the members of the ministry of their individual views pro or con? Although challenges have been issued from this side of the House, they have not met with any response except from the right hon. gentleman who has posed as the Czar of this measure. Yes, they have. Through these weary days of waiting, we have heard from the hon. Minister of the Interior, and the moment he spoke he condemned the measure; and when after further weary days of waiting, enlivened possibly by the eloquence the mental vision and the mental dexterity with which the right hon. gentleman evaded the appeals to him from this side of the House to explain, we have at last, at long last, Sir, been favoured with an expression of opinion by the hon. Minister of Justice. Sir, from all that rumour has brought to our ears, some

of us on this side of the House would not have been astonished if we had seen the hon. Minister of Justice rise to disagree with the right hon. gentleman, and to state that he was not entirely in accord with him; because rumour has been bandying about strange things lately in connection with the name of the hon. Minister of Justice. But that is indicative only of the tempest that is raging or the fire that is burning within those doors. There was a burst out on the 21st day of February, when the Bill was introduced, and we have again had a burst out from the Minister of Justice in another way. But I must refer again to what the hon. gentleman said, although the hon. member for Simcoe has referred to it. The hon. Minister of Justice has stated that we have appealed to prejudice, that we have circulated petitions and have dragged in the creedal question. Sir, I have been in this House during the whole of this discussion since this Bill was introduced, and I say that on every occasion on which it has been dealt with, it has been dealt with on this side irrespective of party, faction, section or creed. There has been no question raised upon which that charge could be visited upon any member on this side of the House. But it has been said that the action of bodies or associations of persons, and of individual persons who have felt themselves aggrieved, and who are exercising their prerogative in appealing to parliament by petition, has been engineered and provoked from this side of the House. I would ask the Minister of Justice if he considers that the action of the Liberal papers in Ontario has been engineered by gentlemen on that side of the House—whether they are responsible for the position which the 'Globe' has taken, and the papers which profess independent support of hon. gentlemen opposite, in opposition to this Bill. Would he like to take one horn of the dilemma or both? If we are responsible for one, is it too much to say that they are responsible for the others? Then, Sir, there is in this measure that which has provoked some questions from the leader of the opposition to-day; and, without desiring or intending to take the time of the House longer than a few moments to run over the ground, I would just like to point out to you, Sir, the extraordinary position, chronologically, in which this government finds itself to-day, face to face with the utterances of the Prime Minister himself. On the 21st day of February there was transacted here an event for which this House had been waiting for some time. In the speech from the Throne we had read that the long-looked-for Bill granting autonomy to the Northwest Territories was to be brought down. Questions were asked in the House as to when that might be expected. On the 31st day of January, the Prime Minister was asked across the floor of this House when the hon. Minister of the Interior might be expected to return, and the hon. member for North Toronto was informed by the Prime Minister that the minister was expected to return on the 15th day of February. On the 10th day of February, as appears by 'Hansard,' the question as to the absence of the Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Finance was again repeated by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and, in conjunction with other business, it is a notable circumstance that the Prime Minister was asked whether it was his intention to introduce this Bill, and he stated that the Bill would be introduced, so far as he then knew, on the 21st day of February; and significant was his remark, when asked if the Minister of the Interior would be here, that 'the Prime Minister would be in his place'. The introduction of the Bill took place on the 21st day of February. With regard to education, the clause which the right hon. gentleman says is the only one to which there is opposition, the right hon. gentleman, in the course of a deliberate speech, says, on page 1526 of 'Hansard':

> I now come to the question of education, and this question is perhaps under the existing circumstances the most important of all that we have to deal with.

This afternoon the right hon. gentleman stated, and the hon. Minister of Justice has echoed his remark, that we on this side of the House are responsible, forsooth, for the outbreak of passion. The right hon. gentleman went further, and put it in an abstract interrogative form, that there was a hesitation on the part of the government, because was it not open to the government to change this measure if it thought fit so to do? Then, what does he say?

> There are evidences, not a few coming to us from all directions, that the old passions which such a subject always aroused, are not, unfortunately, buried.

However, this was before the Bill received its first reading. The right hon. gentleman was fully in touch with the situation throughout the country, knew that these old prejudices and passions, as he is pleased to call them, would be engendered and were engendered and further on he says:

> The government has been warned, threatened from both sides of this question, from those who believe in separate schools and from those who oppose separate schools.

And then the right hon. gentleman, proceeding to argue the case, set forth reasons why this clause which he read should be introduced, and in order to show the House that he really intended at that time to stand

by what he said I shall read his further remarks :

That is the position that we have before us to-day. I am not here to advocate separate schools as an abstract proposition, but we have introduced into this Bill the two propositions that the minority shall have the power to establish their own schools, and that they shall have right to share in the public money. It is the law to-day.

And further on the right hon. gentleman says in the same speech that he had decided on the incorporation of this clause as it then stood with the explanation and the argument in support of it which he then gave the House. If I understand the word 'decision' it means that first there were conferences, consultations, deliberations and a great deal of searching of hearts with respect to matters then under consideration, and that the final decision which was reached was then crystallized into that Bill and was then explained and argued for by the introductory speech. Then a change came over the spirit of the dream of the right hon. gentleman. The Minister of the Interior resigned, and there came one of those eloquent silences which have prevailed latterly over the government benches when awkward questions from this side of the House have been asked. There have been silences when questions as to the absence of ministers have been asked, and questions with regard to the intention to change that which the government had said was decided upon, and there have been great silences to-night and this afternoon with regard to the cogent questions which have been asked by the leader of the opposition. The right hon. gentleman is face to face with a position which is not an enviable one and one which he will find it difficult to reconcile with what has been said. There has been the deliberation which he admits, there has been the knowledge of the existence of the factional strife, knowledge of the existence of that prejudice to which in his speech he referred ; there has been the argument and the positive assertion that the clause has been introduced after mature deliberation ; there has been the first reading of the Bill, its printing and circulation, and then there were rumours with regard to the dissentions which exist in the cabinet to-day. The House and the country are in the dark, are labouring to know what the intentions of the government are with regard to this important clause in that Bill. I consider, Sir, that they are entitled to know because if the Prime Minister of this country can stand up in his place and pronounce for a certain state of things as the result of deliberation, and state that that is his decision, and that is the law to-day, and then afterwards state or hint vaguely that changes may take place and will not deny the suggestion that there may be a reference to a judicial tribunal, then I say the people are entitled to know the reason for this vaccillation. The position of the government upon this question is simply incomprehensible. It is simply impossible to ascertain from its members where it stands. The record of 'Hansard' shows that it stands in one place and that it is absolutely, irrevocably or in the words of the hon. member for Wellington, unalterably committed to one line of policy. Then we have the dark hints which have fallen from the lips of the Prime Minister, that there might be changes —and changes with regard to the very clause of this Bill which he states was the subject of mature deliberation. There is a point with regard to the resignation of the member for Brandon, the ex-Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton), to which I would like to refer. The hon. minister on that day made an explanation of his reasons and that explanation is before the House. It contains something to which I would invite the consideration of the House in view of the statements made by the Prime Minister since that time. He says :

Before leaving I discussed with the Prime Minister most of the subjects that necessarily required to be dealt with in the Bill which was to be introduced, and so far as I was able to do so at that time, I communicated my views to him upon the various subjects. I may say that when I went away I did not anticipate that it would be considered necessary to introduce the Bill for creating the new provinces before I returned.

What does that indicate? Is it not reasonable to infer from the very plain utterance of the hon. gentleman that he had conferences with the leader of the government, that the result of these conferences was that clauses of this Bill were submitted for consideration that he was leaving on a prolonged absence and that further consideration, further conferences at any rate, as he understood, were postponed until he should have returned ? He further proceeds :

As members of the House are aware, I returned to the capital on Thursday afternoon. I immediately took occasion to read carefully the speech which the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had delivered in introducing the Bill.

And hence followed the resignation. If I read English aright that meant that the Minister of the Interior felt that he had not been rightly treated by the leader of the government ; he felt that he had been promised consideration and attention and that he had a right to be further consulted before that Bill was brought down. And very natural was his chagrin and disappointment when he found on his return that the Bill had been introduced with clauses to which he had objected. Sir, reference has been made by the Prime Minister to the record of the election of 1896, when hon. gentlemen opposite came into power, on the advocacy of a principle the diametrical

opposite of the principle that has been lately enunciated by the leader of the government. I would point out that the quotations the right hon. gentleman has given from the utterances of hon. George Brown will not gloss over the inconsistency he has shown or make more tenable the unstable position he has taken. The hour is late and in conclusion, I would only desire, if the right hon. Prime Minister were in his place to contrast the position he took in 1895 and 1896, when he was on this side of the House, with the utterance he has recently made. I would contrast the inflammatory addresses which he then made in this House and on the hustings advocating provincial rights and non-interference with the acts of provincial legislatures, with his present speeches. And I would refer the right hon. gentleman to the words of the Hon. George Brown on the subject of the stability, and consistency that ought to be the ornament and the crown of the Prime Minister of a country of the importance of Canada. In 1896 the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) took a certain position in order to obtain power. And now, after his third return, we have him laying down a policy which is the absolute negation of that which he contended for in 1896. Let him consider the words of Hon. George Brown : 'If, Sir, a public man can avow certain principles, agitate those principles and seek to overthrow the government of the day to establish those principles, and, when he obtains power laughs at his professions and casts his principles to the winds, he is aiming a blow at public morality.'

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). At this late hour, I do not intend to take up much of the time of the House. But, in view of the Bill introduced by the Prime Minister on the 21st of February, in view of the large number of inquiries that are being made from time to time concerning it, and in view of the rumours that are in circulation, I have not been in a position, up to this evening, to give a definite answer to those who have asked me whether the government proposed to carry the Bill through the House as it has been introduced or not. So, I wish to compliment the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) for being so frank as he was this evening, for he has stated that when he framed this Bill he framed it on the line of the legislation already affecting the people of the Northwest Territories. That being true, I am in a position to state exactly what the government propose to do in the matter of this legislation. The Minister of Justice stated that there could be no peace except it were based on justice. There are a large number of people in this country who do not believe in the present system in the Northwest Territories being carried out by any law passed by the Dominion parliament. I would like to ask him whether he believes that those who oppose this legislation are doing what they ought not to do ? And will he say that there shall be no peace in this country if his so-called justice is not meted out to the people of the Northwest ? The Minister of Justice is the man above all others in this House who should keep an even temper, should calmly consider all questions coming before him and should be particularly guarded in the remarks he makes, for it is to his department that the people look for good advice based upon calmness and judgment. I was sorry therefore, to observe, the tone of the hon. gentleman's speech to-night. He has charged hon. members on this side with appealing to prejudice. He was not a member of this House in the first session of 1896. Had he been, how would he have found his friends occupied ? The government of that day, after introducing a Bill in this House, were trying to get it into committee to have it considered on its merits. But hon. gentlemen opposite then on this side, showed no willingness to have this carried out. They even remained for one hundred and twenty-nine hours without rest, keeping this House in session, for the purpose of preventing that Bill being considered by the House. And, on the one hand we found members in the opposition of that day standing up and condemning the government because the Bill went too far. On the other hand some condemned it because it did not go far enough. Still others condemned the financial arrangements as unsatisfactory. But, on all sides, they were fanning the flames of prejudice, and it was through the existence of these prejudices that they came into power in 1896. So far as the present opposition is concerned nothing of this kind has been done. No man on this side, so far as I can learn, has expressed his opinion in regard to that legislation. They have carefully waited to see what the government would do in the matter—and rightly so. The leader of the government has told us that amendments may be introduced. But, thank goodness, the Minister of Justice, with his frankness has stated exactly the position the government is in. And, when the First Minister proceeds with the second reading of the Bill, I have no doubt that the same good judgment will be displayed and the same calm criticism given by the opposition, whether they agree or disagree with the Bill. Whatever hon. members on this side may say will be in parliamentary form and will be the result of calm consideration and not of mere prejudice. The Minister of Justice tried to work up a little agitation about the Toronto 'Telegram. Everybody who knows the 'Telegram' knows that it is an independent paper with Conservative leanings. It is almost as likely to condemn the Conservative party as to condemn the Liberal party. The Conservative party would not hold itself

responsible for the opinions of the Toronto 'Telegram.' Reference was made to the Bill of 1902 as submitted by Mr. Haultain. The Minister of Justice did not pay much of a compliment to the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) when he said that the draft Bill was submitted to the goverment for its consideration. If that statement meant anything at all it meant that the draft Bill contained the very sections the ex-Minister of the Interior is objecting to in the Bill introduced by the leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have read that draft Bill and I fail to find in it any similarity to the educational clauses in the Bill now introduced. That being true, the governement could not have consulted the ex-Minister of the Interior with respect to these educational clauses.

I wish to say a word or two about these gentlemen who resign from the government. It seems to me that if a question arises on which the difference of opinion between one of the ministers and his colleagues is so clear that he feels it is his duty to resign, then, he is not doing his duty to his conscience, or to the people he represents, or to the people who agree with him, by sitting silently in his place and refraining from taking any part in the discussion of that question when it comes up. It strikes me that if I were in such a connection, I would lose no opportunity to make myself heard. I would rise day after day and, by my protests seek to prevent the passing of the legislation which seemed to me so far wrong. Those hon. gentlemen who have resigned from the cabinet seem to think they do their duty when they make one speech explaining their position. If there are more ministers in the cabinet who take the same view, it seems to me that, even though they differ with their colleagues they might as well swallow the objectionable legislation holus bolus and remain where they are.

Now, a word about the petitions and I am through. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) seems to lay great stress upon the fact that certain Conservatives sign petitions in favour of this legislation. I fail to see why any Conservative in the province of Quebec, or Nova Scotia, or in the Northwest Territories for that matter, if he feels that the legislation introduced by the government of the day is legislation that should be approved, does any wrong by petitioning the government in favour of its being made law. If the petition is a proper one, one that can be fairly presented to this House, in what way does a Conservative violate good taste or any rule of this House when he signs it? But, what is the object of what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has stated? He remembers quite well the conduct of his own friends in 1896 —his own included—when they did not take an honourable stand on the school question. They fanned the flame of prejudice, and it was only by doing so that they attained power. A prominent legal Liberal came to this House in 1896 and advised his friends here to keep up the work of increasing popular prejudice as the only means by which they could get into power. And, had it not been for their success in that work, they would have been in opposition until this day. And I say, as a humble member of this Conservative opposition, that, I would remain in opposition until doomsday rather than obtain power by such means. We ought to be above that kind of thing, and we are. We have here a good country, a great country, and our aim, instead of stirring contention should be to unite our people and, as far as possible to quench these dangerous fires of popular prejudice.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I wish merely to refer to one or two statements made in the course of this discussion. The first was a statement by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who spoke of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) as occupying a dual position, and in one capacity stirring up strife in the country, while in the other he might be doing his duty as a member of this House. That can only refer to one thing, to the petitions which are coming in and which hon. gentlemen opposite have been good enough to attribute to myself as having sent them out. I accept that; and I gave the explanation. I have never denied or attempted to deny that I did it nor do I make any apology for doing it. The Minister of Justice followed this up by saying that the members of the opposition were deliberately and of set purpose arousing religious prejudices by distributing petitions amongst the Protestants of Ontario for that purpose while, from the same source, they were distributing petitions to the people of Quebec to arouse feeling amongst them. I took down the hon. gentleman's statement as he made it. Have I recorded it correctly?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) says he took it down, I suppose he took it down correctly. But I must say that I do not think he did.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the statement as I took it down. Had it not been that the Minister of Justice displayed so much warmth and declared that he could prove his statement, while at the same time flourishing a document as though it contained the proof, I would not have paid so much attention to his statement. But he made the statement that these petitions emanated from the same source as the others. And just before that he had attributed the distribution of these petitions in Ontario to myself. Had he not thus, by implication at least, attributed the distribution of these petitions to myself, I would not have paid any attention to the matter. If any one in this House could know whether his allega-

tions are correct, it would be the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and I rise to give that the most emphatic contradiction possible. There is not a word of truth in the statement. I am not here to deny that petitions may have come in on the other side from the province of Quebec. About that I know nothing. The Minister of Justice endeavoured to lead this House to believe that these petitions were distributed among the Protestants of Ontario for the purpose of inflaming their passions, but that similar petitions were not distributed among the Protestants of Quebec. I said last night, and I repeat, that the very same petitions which were distributed in Ontario were distributed throughout Quebec, and many of them have come back since signed, not only by Conservatives, but by Reformers as well. If petitions did come from the supporters of the one party for and against a certain measure, does it necessarily follow that the members of that party are working these petitions for the purpose of raising sectional strife? If it does, then let me refer the hon. gentleman to the fact that supporters of the government in Ontario are petitioning to-day in hundreds of thousands against the very Bill the government has before the House, and from the province of Quebec as well, and likewise the maritime provinces. They are petitioning against this Bill, while, at the same time, supporters of the government are sending here petitions in favour of it—doing the very thing which the Minister of Justice tried to lead this House to believe is so very wrong. Because petitions come against this Bill from Conservatives and also in favour of it, therefore the Conservatives must be doing something that is radically wrong. But the very same thing applies to the opposite side. And, as my hon. friend from East Elgin has said: Is it not the right of every British subject to petition the Crown and parliament? Have we not members supporting the Conservative party who are to-day supporting this Bill and others who are opposing it? Have we not among the members of the Reform party some who are petitioning for this Bill and others against it? If that argument is worth anything, it applies with equal force to the opposite side as well as to this side.

But, with respect to the petitions that have been circulated, the hon. Minister of Justice made the statement that they were deliberately and intentionally put in circulation to arouse religious strife and passion. What justification has he for making that statement? Who is responsible for raising the religious strife and passion that have been imparted into this debate during the present session? Was it the Conservative party?—not by any means. Who introduced the Bill? Was it not the Reform party? Who made an impassioned appeal along religious lines? Was it not the right hon. Prime Minister on the occasion of the introduction of the Bill and was it not a thing most unusual in this House? It invited reprisals from the other side of the House. I can tell the hon. Minister of Justice when he says that there will be no peace until it is fought out, and he added I throw down the gauntlet and I invite this fight to come on. He has thrown down the gauntlet and I assure him that he will not be disappointed about the fight. When it is over he can congratulate himself upon what he has done for the purpose of promoting peace, harmony and good feeling amongst the citizens of this country. If he succeeds in doing it I will be very much mistaken. He has thrown down the gauntlet to a class of people who will stand up for their rights whether it pleases or displeases the Minister of Justice. There is no doubt that from the commencement of this discussion, from the first word to the last which has been said on this subject, there has not been displayed so much rancour as that which has been exhibited by the hon. Minister of Justice, and there has not been heard as strong language as that which has come from the Minister of Justice who ought to be the last man in this House to set such an example to the parliament of Canada. If this measure results in arousing passions and creating hard feelings let me assure hon. gentlemen opposite that upon them above all others must the responsibility rest.

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

Mr. FIELDING. I do not imagine the House has any desire to take up the estimates at this hour. I therefore move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business may we expect to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. We may take up the business at the point at which we left off to-night; that is if we have a clear conception of what that point is.

Mr. FOSTER. Yesterday when the hon. Minister of Finance was not in I asked the right hon. First Minister if there was any decision as to the probable time of bringing down the budget speech and he promised to confer with the hon. Minister of Finance.

Mr. FIELDING. I am sorry that I am not able to give a definite answer to my hon. friend. I will promise that he will

have timely notice but it may be some days yet.

Mr. SPROULE. The right hon. Prime Minister in introducing the measure referred to correspondence he had on both sides of the questions involved in the Autonomy Bill and he was requested to lay such papers on the table of the House. I understood him to say that he would do so. I do not think it would be a fulfilment of the requirements of the House to lay them on the table on the day that the debate commenced. I should hope that he would put them on the table at least early enough to give us an opportunity of examining them before the debate commenced.

Mr. FIELDING. I think that the papers bearing on the subject ought to be brought down at a reasonable time in advance of the second reading. Would the hon. gentleman indicate the particular papers to which he refers ?

Mr. SPROULE. I could not because we did not have any information in regard to them beyond the fact that the right hon. Prime Minister referred to correspondence and papers that he had on both sides of the question.

Mr. FIELDING. I will call the Prime Minster's attention to the hon. gentleman's remarks.

Motion agreed to, House adjourned at 12.05 a.m., Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 16, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

THE CROWN CASUALTY COMPANY.

Mr. H. GERVAIS moved :

That in accordance with the recommendation contained in the 12th report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders that portion of the 49th rule which limits the time for receiving petitions for private Bills be suspended in reference to the petition of H. D. Garland and others presented this day, for an Act of incorporation under the name of the Crown Casualty Company of Canada, and that the said petition be read and received forthwith.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. GERVAIS moved for leave to introduce a Bill respecting the Crown Casualty Company.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Annual report of the Marine and Fisheries Department for 1904, Fisheries—Hon. Raymond Préfontaine.

QUESTION.

MAIL SERVICE—COLDWATER AND LOVERING.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Has a contract been let for the mail service between Coldwater and Lovering, from the 31st of March, 1905 ?
2. If let, were tenders asked for ?
3. If let, who was the contractor ?
4. If let, what is the consideration per year agreed upon ?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). A contract for this service was let by tender in 1897 and awarded to the lowest tenderer, W. H. Lovering, at $130 a year. On its expiring it was, in 1901, renewed with the same contractor at the same price for four years ending on the 31st March, 1905, and it has been agreed to renew this contract for another term of four years from its expiring with the same contractor at $156 a year.

SUPPLY—INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. F. R. LALOR. On the 13th February I asked concerning the purchase of certain supplies for the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I also, on February 20th, inquired concerning orders given in the department without public tender.

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I am having the papers copied and will lay them on the table as soon as possible.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. An order of the House was granted on the 3rd February for the enumerators' list in use at the last elections in the Northwest Territories. This matter was also referred to on the 21st February, and no return has come down.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I might add to what my hon. friend has said that I mentioned several returns at the time when the Bill was introduced. I also, in the concluding portion of my remarks on that occasion, pointed out certain other information which I thought would be extremely useful in the discussion of the measure. If the information is to be of any practicable service, it should be brought down reasonably early, so that it may be before the House when the question is being discussed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are some returns which were asked by my hon. friend and I hoped they will be brought down on Monday. There is also some information which he asked, and which requires a good deal of compilation ; I am not sure whether we will have it but we are working at it.

Mr. MONK. I wish to remind my right hon. friend that the copies of correspondence with the imperial authorities in regard to the Royal Mint were ordered some time ago and, if it is possible, we would like to get them down at the earliest possible date.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall try.

Mr. DANIEL. Something over a month ago the Prime Minister promised that he would bring down shortly the interim report of the Transportation Commission, more especially with regard to the port and harbour of St. John. I have been waiting for that report and I notice that in a discussion a few days ago the Minister of Railways and Canals referred to it as having been before the notice of the government so long ago as May last year. I do not myself, of course, know any reason why it should not be laid on the table of the House. These commissioners I presume, are appointed not alone for the information of the government but for the information of parliament and of the country and as the right hon. gentleman, when I spoke to him and spoke in the House about it, intimated that there was no objection, I would be glad if he would bring the report down.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I must apologize to my hon. friend. The fault is altogether mine. I am under the impression that this report was brought down last session, but I shall inquire and if it has not been brought down it will certainly be brought down on Monday.

Mr. FOSTER. At this period of reminders, I beg leave to remind the Prime Minister to remind his Minister of Railways that the first part of that cargo of hay intelligence has not yet come down.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Is my hon. friend quite sure of that ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall try to satisfy him.

Mr. FOSTER. The load is not complete.

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

Ocean and river service—maintenance and repairs to government steamers and ice-breakers, $400,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). As regards this service, as will be seen, there is an increase of $75,000. Last year the amount was $325,000 and this year we are asking $400,000. The expenditure on government steamers for 1903 was $306,171. For the six months ending 31st December, 1904, $219,615.19, and up to the first of January, 1905, $264,653. During the current year two new steamers built in Scotland have been added to the fleet, the 'Champlain' and 'Montcalm.' The 'Champlain' arrived at Quebec about the 14th November. This vessel is intended to keep the passage open in winter between Murray Bay and River Ouelle. She will be engaged in the same service in the summer and will connect with the Intercolonial Railway, thus giving communication to the people on the north shore of the St. Lawrence. The 'Montcalm' has also reached Quebec from Scotland. This ship is of large dimensions, about 245 feet in length and 40 feet in breadth and will carry a crew of forty. This ship besides tending the lighthouse service during navigation is intended to keep the St. Lawrence clear of ice between Quebec and Montreal and is expected to keep the channel open and allow vessels to leave Quebec two weeks later in the fall and to reach Quebec two weeks earlier in the spring. This experiment is considered by the shipping interests of Montreal to be of great service to the Dominion.

Mr. AMES. How many vessels are there in the service at the present time ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There are nine ; the names are : The 'Aberdeen,' the 'Druid,' the 'Lansdowne,' the 'Quadra,' the 'Stanley,' the 'Minto,' the 'Lady Laurier,' the 'Montcalm' and the 'Champlain.'

Mr. AMES. How many vessels were there in 1900 ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Six.

Mr. AMES. In 1900 there were six and the cost to the country was $200,000 a year. In 1905 there are nine and you propose to ask for $400,000 ? Can you explain the apparently disproportionate difference ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is at once an increase in expenditure last year of $73,000 for the 'Montcalm' and the 'Champlain.' Of course I have not the figures for 1902.

Mr. AMES. The minister probably has an estimate as to what the several vessels will cost for the coming year ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The estimate is as follows :

Vessel.	Estimated Expenditure.
Aberdeen	$48,000
Druid	36,000
Lansdowne	34,000
Quadra	34,000
Stanley	45,000
Minto	50,000
Lady Laurier	50,000
Montcalm	53,000
Champlain	40,000
Miscellaneous expenditure	10,000

The 'Lady Laurier' last year cost $80,000 on acount of an accident.

Mr. AMES. How much was spent on the 'Lady Laurier' during the last fiscal year ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The 'Lady Laurier' met with an accident when going into Lockport, N.S. Owing to a misplaced buoy she struck a ledge and was badly damaged, and the 'Lansdowne' and 'Tyrian' were detailed for service in Nova Scotia.

Mr. AMES. How much did the 'Lady Laurier' cost last year ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. $80,049.38. This year we ask for $50,000.

Mr. AMES. Then the difference between the $80,000 and the $50,000 represents what?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Repairs.

Mr. AMES. Last year the department was given $36,107 for repairs on the 'Lady Laurier.' How were those repairs made, and when, and by whom ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They were made by day labour. Sometimes it is very difficult to ascertain what damages actually are suffered by a steamer in striking on a rock, or suffering other injury under water. The repairs were made at Halifax under the supervision of one of our best men.

Mr. AMES. Were they made under the supervision of an officer of the department who remained with the vessel during the entire construction work ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, under the supervision of a steamboat inspector who remained all the time at the works.

Mr. AMES. By how much did it exceed the estimate that was made ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There was no estimate made at the time.

Mr. AMES. How long was the vessel laid up on account of this ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. About three months.

Mr. AMES. And during that time were the salaries of all those engaged on the vessel going on as before ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, the salaries were paid, but not of the full crew.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. How many trips did the 'Minto' and 'Stanley' make since they commenced work the beginning of the winter ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have a statement giving, from the 12th of December, each day that the 'Stanley' made a trip. From the 12th of December up to the 24th of January she made a trip nearly every day, and the 'Minto' about the same. After that date they were frequently interrupted by tempestuous weather.

Mr. AMES. The 'Lady Laurier,' I understand, is a new vessel only built about two years ago, well built by Fleming & Ferguson, of Paisley. What did she cost originally ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. $200,000. The repairs became necessary by reason of the accident I have just mentioned. The accident was a serious one. I do not know if it makes much difference whether a vessel is new or old when it meets with an accident, but I should think that if a new vessel were damaged in the hull, or by grounding, it would cost more to repair her than an old vessel because of everything being brand new.

Mr. AMES. Has the hon. gentleman caused his department to make any inquiry as to the causes of this accident ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Certainly I have.

Mr. AMES. Will the hon. gentleman give the committee the benefit of the result of his inquiry ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The result of the inquiry was very much like that in the case of the 'J. Israel Tarte'; it was very difficult to place the responsibility. We might have placed it on the captain as the result of going too fast at a dangerous point, and we might have placed it also on those who were responsible for the buoy at that place.

Mr. AMES. The hon. minister said that one cause of the accident was a misplaced buoy. I understand the department are responsible for placing the buoys; that those they do not place themselves are placed by contract.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This is one of the buoys that had been placed by the department in a proper position but it had been removed or displaced by some cause or other, by the tides and currents which are very strong there, or by another steamer.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I would like to know whether the hon. minister has had a report made to him as to the full causes of the accident and if there is such a report in the department ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is a report on file in the department, but I am inform-

ed by my officer that it is not quiet satisfactory. That it the reason why we should not put the blame on one or other of these officers. We could have placed it on both and dismissed both, but we did not think it proper to do so.

Mr. AMES. The hon. minister has a department for the investigation of wrecks, and casualties that he brings to bear on private shipping. Was that same kind of investigation proposed by him when an accident occurred in his own marine ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No, there was no necessity for it. We had a report from the crew of the 'Lady Laurier' and a report on the misplaced buoy.

Mr. AMES. Was anybody held responsible for the misplaced buoy ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is just as I have described it. We might have, as an example, dismissed both the captain and the agent, but for one reason or another it was not done. Mr. Parsons is the agent at Halifax, but we thought it was more an accident than a matter for which he should be held responsible and we did not act.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. As a matter of fact were not reports made to the agents as to this buoy being out of place and was it not permitted to remain out of place for some time after it was reported to the agent that it was out of place ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The report we received at the department on the complaint made was that the agent had been advised of the buoy being out of place, but that the paper containing that advice had been mislaid for some reason or another. It appears that it was left about the office of the agent at Halifax and got mixed up with some other papers when he was moving from one room or one office to another. The agent gave that explanation to me when I was in Halifax. Whether the facts are exactly as he represented them to be I cannot say. Until the present moment I have not taken the responsibility of dismissing the captain or the agent at Halifax.

Mr. AMES. I certainly think that in a matter of such serious moment as this is, a most searching inquiry should have been made. The government at considerable effort secured a vote of $200,000 to buy a steamer for service on the Nova Scotia coast. This steamer was bought two years ago. She had not been much more than a year in the service before she met with a serious accident that laid her up for three months and put her out of service for that length of time. It cost $36,000 to make the damage good and we do not know to-day if the vessel is as good as she originally was. With such a serious fault on the shoulders of somebody it seems to me that the hon. minister should have made a full investigation to ascertain whether the navigators of the vessel were responsible or whether the proper precautions had been taken or whether the buoy service had been properly looked after. It is not enough that the buoys should be placed in the spring. The hon. minister knows that from time to time buoys become misplaced and it would certainly seem that this buoy had been misplaced. According to the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) to-day a notification had been served on the department that this buoy was out of place.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. The notice was served on the agent.

Mr. AMES. Yes, and the agent carelessly neglected to have the necessary steps taken to have the buoy put in the right place, the consequence of which is that we have this serious damage. In the first place, if the buoy service was defective it might have happened to the merchant marine and in that case we would have heard a great deal more about it than we did when it happened to one of the ships of the country. Apparently the public interest demands that there should be the fullest investigation and this House is entitled to have laid before it the papers showing the evidence taken and that the blame has been put on the shoulders of some one. I would like to ask if it is the hon. minister's intention to have a further investigation in order to be able to place the fullest explanation before the House on this important matter.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I could not make any further investigation into the matter. We have all the facts and they are simply as I have stated. Notice was served on the agent. He admits it himself, but there are many notices served on him that buoys are displaced. Sometimes he gets as many as four or five notices a day. I understand the seriousness of the accident and if I had found the agent really responsible for the accident by reason of his negligence I would have taken action, but I could not consider that there was such negligence as would justify me in dismissing him. He gave his explanation in a very frank way. He said : I remember receiving that notice. I was moving from one office to another and the paper was mislaid. He is a man advanced in years and he forgot all about it. It is unfortunate, of course, that such an accident should have happened, but on considering the whole case, I did not feel that I was justified in putting under oath an old officer of the department who had been there for the last 25 or 30 years, and the matter has remained since in the same condition. The accident was unfortunate, but we could not hold any one in particular responsible.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not, of course, know anything of the circumstances of this particular case, but I do not only know Mr. Parsons in his service of the government in

the position which he now holds, but I knew him intimately as a member of the bar years ago, and he has always been a very capable, painstaking and diligent man. I feel that if he has been guilty of any seeming negligence in this case there has been some very strong controlling reason for it, because the whole course of his life is absolutely foreign to any lack of diligence, industry and painstaking care in anything that he undertakes.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That is exactly the way I looked on the affair. If I had thought that Mr. Parsons had been really negligent I would have suspended him, but I did not think so at the time and so the matter has remained.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Before we pass away from it, I desire to impress upon the hon. minister the importance of the question raised by my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Ames). The question he brings so forcibly to the attention of the hon. minister is indeed a very important one. I reiterate the demand of my hon. friend from Montreal that the minister should inquire into this matter and ascertain who is to blame. For my part I do not think there is much question as to who is to blame, but the department should take steps to place it beyond all doubt as to who is responsible for this accident to the 'Lady Laurier.'

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I cannot refuse to open the case if it is insisted upon, but as regards the evidence we have it all.

Mr. AMES. The repair account for these vessels used in the lake and river service amounts to a very large sum annually. Last year $94,000 was spent in repairing these vessels as well as some engaged in the lighthouse service. Has the minister any regular system of calling for tenders or for doing the work by day labour? Last year the 'Stanley' cost $11,000 for repairs, in what way was that work done?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That work was done by contract at Pictou after a detailed report from her officer as to what repairs were necessary.

Mr. AMES. You say it was done by public contract at Pictou; how many persons were asked for tenders in that case.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It was published in the papers and I think there were three tenders received.

Mr. AMES. Did the lowest tender get the contract?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes. The price was about the estimate made by the officers.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Were any of these repairs done at Charlottetown?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The engines were repaired at Charlottetown.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. What amount was expended in repairs there?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The repairs cost $13,000 and out of that $9,000 was spent at Charlottetown.

Mr. AMES. Were the repairs to the 'Stanley' done under one contract?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There were two contracts, one at Pictou and the other at Charlottetown. The engines cost $9,000 at Charlottetown and the balance of $4,000 was spent at Pictou.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I am informed that no tenders were called for the work done on the 'Stanley' in the year 1904, while tenders were called for the year 1903. I am told that in 1904 three people were waited upon and asked to do the work, but no tenders were called for by publication of a notice or in any other public way. These repairs were given to the friends of the minister alone, and no other person was asked to tender for the work. The repairs were done by the Matthewson Foundry of New Glasgow at Pictou and the Stewart Foundry at Charlottetown.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I am informed by the accountant of the department that during the year 1903-4 there were $13,000 worth of repairs done on the 'Stanley,' and they were made by public tenders called through the newspapers.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. The minister says he 'thinks,' but his officers are in the House and he ought to be able to give definite information.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I did not say that I thought. I have to rely on the information given by my officers and they tell me that public tenders were called for. If the hon. gentleman desires to have these tenders placed on the table of the House I will produce them with the greatest pleasure.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I think that should be done.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I happen to know that in regard to the work under consideration, tenders were called for publicly in the newspapers of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, and that the work done at Pictou was awarded to the lowest tender. I may say further, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. A. McLean) knows very well, that owing to the situation of the 'Stanley,' the parties who would be likely to tender for work of that kind would be confined to these particular localities.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I am informed by my officer that the notices were not only published in the Halifax paper and the Charlottetown paper, but also in Quebec.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Was that for 1904 ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It was a couple of months previous to the time that the repairs were to be made.

Mr. AMES. The minister has not yet answered my question as to what is the custom in the department when it is found necessary to make extensive repairs amounting say to $5,000 or $10,000 on one of these steamers. Are specifications prepared and public tenders called for in all cases ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I thought I had given the information to the hon. gentleman, but I will repeat it. The officers of each steamer make a list of the repairs necessary which is handed to the agent of the department at the port where the steamer is, and the agent sends a hull inspector, or boiler inspector, or steamboat inspector as the case may be to look into the details of the requisition. If he deems it necessary to ask for public tenders advertisements are issued and tenders asked for. If he thinks the different items of the repairs can be done by day's work, with the help of the crew, he does it in that way. If he thinks that the repairs, although not done by the crew, are not of such importance as to justify asking for tenders, he is authorized to engage men to do the work or to distribute the work to others who are best able to do it. He has to certify to the correctness of the work that has been done according to the estimate which he has made beforehand.

Mr. AMES. A considerable portion of the cost of these steamers is incurred for supplies, including coal, and I find from the Auditor General's Report that coal is bought at prices all the way from $3.50 to $4.75 per ton according to the place where the steamers get it. Will the minister kindly explain how the coal purchase, for his department are made ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. All the coal is bought by tender. Public notice is given or circulars are sent to the different coal dealers, especially those at the coaling places; but sometimes a steamer may be out of coal, and is obliged to supply itself at a small port at the market price at that port. This explains why more has been paid at certain places than at others. All the accounts for the supply of coal are certified by the officer in charge of the steamer, and pass through the hands of the agent, who has to see that they are right.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I would like to bring to the attention of the minister the manner in which the coal is loaded on the steamers 'Minto' and 'Stanley.' These vessels land at the end of the wharfs at Pictou, and instead of using a chute for conveying the coal to the steamer, perhaps twenty or thirty or forty men are employed to carry it on in small baskets. I think this is an improper expenditure of public money. A vast quantity of coal is used on these vessels during the season, and proper appliances should be used for putting it on the vessels. I saw with my own eyes men carrying the coal in baskets. I think it is a scandal to have the business conducted in this manner. There would not be two shovelfuls of coal in each basket. The money spent in employing these men is squandered. The coal could easily and at a small expense be carried to the vessel on a trolley and put into it by a chute; but in order, as I believe, to pay some of the supporters of the hon. gentleman who represnts Pictou in this House, a large number of men are employed to carry the coal in spoonfuls.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I am informed that the 'Stanley' was so constructed that the bunkers cannot be filled otherwise than in the way specified. We have a couple of other steamers in the same condition. So that it is impossible to use a chute.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend has pointed out that when the friends of the hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island, constructed the first steamer that provided winter navigation with Prince Edward Island, they took care to see that the steamer should be so constructed that it would be necessary to carry the coal on board, and saw to it that only the friends of their party should carry it. When the government came into power, they took care that the steamer which they constructed should be so constructed that the coal could be put on by a more up-to-date method. My hon. friend knows that it is impossible for these vessels to reach the coal piers so as to receive the coal from the chutes on the wharf, as they have to come in the midst of heavy ice. My hon. friend will see, therefore, on reflection, that he is disposed to be hypercritical when he undertakes to say that nature should be so kind as to enable these steamers to reach the coal piers.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. The present government built the 'Minto,' and I notice that the same means are adopted for supplying that steamer with coal as are adopted for the 'Stanley.' Perhaps the hon. member for Pictou would explain why, if the 'Minto' is provided with the modern means of receiving coal, those means were not employed. This large sum of $400,000 might be greatly decreased if proper means were adopted for putting the coal on board. I would ask the hon. minister how much it costs this country to put coal and other supplies on board those steamers which are constructed in that way.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The men are paid 20 cents an hour. I do not know the amount.

Mr. AMES. It seems to me that the method employed for coaling the steamers of this fleet is antiquated and expensive. It is time that the government, with its rapidly-growing fleet, and with the large quantities of coal it has to purchase, should take steps to secure that coal at wholesale prices delivered, and save money by doing so. Any up-to-date railway would have been doing that long ago; but the Canadian government, in its Marine and Fisheries Department and in its Railway Department, prefers to keep to the antiquated method. If the minister would publicly advertise for 20,000 tons of coal to be delivered at Halifax, St. John, Charlottetown, Gaspé and other stipulated points throughout the Dominion of Canada in the quantities set forth, required for the fiscal year 1905-6, I am satisfied that he would save $20,000 on his coal bill.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am sure that the House would be better pleased with the criticism of the hon. gentleman if he would come to the maritime provinces and learn something of the conditions down there before he undertakes to propound a policy for the Department of Marine and Fisheries. My hon. friend undertakes to say that the methods of the department in dealing with the coal supply are antiquated. As has already been pointed out, some of the larger steamers are so constructed that it is impossible to put the coal on board otherwise than by carrying it. Others are so constructed that it can be received off the coal piers. I happen to know something of this matter, because the coal company that has supplied the department during the last year or so happens to be one of the large companies of my county. That company received the contract for supplying the coal after public competition. There was no favouritism there. My hon. friend says that this company delivers its coal by antiquated methods, but as I pointed out there are certain steamers which can only receive their coal by hand. Those that are fitted up so as to receive the coal through chutes are loaded the same as every other steamer properly fitted. My hon. friend's proposition that coal depots should be constructed at these various points would involve considerable extra cost. I submit that, speaking from the standpoint of Nova Scotia people and those who do know something about these matters, that the department has been receiving coal as cheap as it can be obtained for commercial purposes anywhere in the maritime provinces. So that I am at a loss to see what advantages there would be in carrying out the suggestion of my hon. friend that this department should go to the expense of building storage wharfs and sheds and keeping men at their various points for the purpose of storing that coal and again delivering it. The scheme is an impracticable one. I am sure that if my hon. friend would come to the maritime provinces, he would see that so far as the coal supply is concerned, the results are not deserving of adverse criticism.

Mr. AMES. I am not speaking altogether without having given this matter some consideration or having had the opportunity of visiting the maritime provinces, and being in every one of the places I have mentioned. Further than that. I have not made the proposition without having consulted persons in the coal business who have had the largest experience in the handling of coal. I am assured by persons who have handled more coal than the port of Pictou has handled in the last ten years that the scheme I suggest is perfectly feasible and would save considerable money, if worked as a business concern would work it. My hon. friend spoke of the coal having been bought at Pictou at the lowest market price. Possibly it was, but has the department ever bought more than a few thousand tons at any one time ? My proposition is that the 20,000 or 25,000 tons needed should be let in one contract and the various coal companies be invited to bid for it. They would then, no doubt, furnish the coal at lower figures than the government can buy it at under the present system.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Would my hon. friend indicate what coal company in Nova Scotia would be prepared to do all these things he speaks of ?

Mr. AMES. The suggestion I make is this, that if the government will advertise for tenders in a bona fide manner, it will very soon get the information as to which coal company will supply the coal.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Will the hon. gentleman say that the government is not doing the very thing he indicates ought to be done ?

Mr. AMES. Certainly I will. The government from time to time advertises at certain places for a comparatively small amount of coal, which they get at the lowest price at that one particular place for that quantity. They possibly get the regular bunker price that ordinary ships seeking to have their bunkers filled have to pay ; but my contention is that if you were to bulk your coal order for the ocean and river service and offer a contract for 20,000 tons to be delivered during the space of twelve months, you would make a very considerable saving. As to the contention that it would be necessary to make great expenditures at all these different ports, at nearly every one of them there is at present coal storage capacity for the vessels of the de-

partment. There is at Quebec, and at every one of these points the government have at present wharfs where they can store the coal, so that if it be necessary to spend some initial money in order to equip the department to handle this wholesale coal business, the money would be well invested.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I understood my hon. friend to indicate that he had information from the coal men in the maritime provinces that they would be prepared to supply coal cheaper than it is now supplied. Does he say so? And if he does, would he be good enough to give the name of the company?

Mr. AMES. I have already answered that question by saying that if the government will adopt a businesslike method and advertise for the entire quantity of coal which they require for the next season, they will very soon find out the name of the company that will supply it.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My hon. friend ought not to make a statement which he is unwilling to back up. Is he in a position to state that any coal company in Nova Scotia has intimated to him that it will be in a position to supply coal cheaper than it is now being supplied; and if so, will he give the name of that company?

Mr. AMES. My hon. friend is endeavouring to put words into my mouth that I did not use. The statement I made was this, that I had consulted experts in the coal business.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Where?

Mr. AMES. That is not pertinent to the question. I have consulted experts who have handled immense quantities of coal, and they told me most unequivocally that if this method were adopted the government could save considerable money. If there is any doubt about that, let the government try the experiment.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Then the hon. gentleman admits that the government is now receiving coal as cheap as it can be bought for commercial purposes. He wants it, however, to enter on an experiment, but is unwilling to give the information as to where that experiment will land the country.

Mr. LALOR. What objection has the hon. gentleman to the government trying the experiment?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Because my hon. friend has admitted that the government is now receiving coal at the same rate as is paid for coal commercially in the maritime provinces. I do not know that my hon. friend from Haldimand expects the government to pay less than an ordinary business man would pay. If the government are receiving coal at that figure, why make an experiment which might prove more costly?

Mr. AMES.

Mr. LALOR. We expect the government to buy as cheap as it can, irrespective of what the commercial people pay. If the government could get cheaper rates, it should do so.

Mr. AMES. The hon. member for Pictou has again misunderstood me. I said that any tramp steamer can put into the port of Pictou and buy coal just as cheaply as the government can. But what I claim is that if the government, which has nine boats engaged in the ocean and river service, would bulk its contract for a single season, it could buy the coal at a considerable reduction.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. There are people in this country who buy very much more coal than the Dominion government does and are larger consumers of it, and they are not getting their coal any cheaper. The price which the government is paying is a reasonable one. Are we to understand from the member from Montreal (Mr. Ames) that he desires the government to purchase the coal at a price which would not be reasonable, and which would be considered by people in the trade as unreasonable?

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) if he says that on the 'Stanley' which is 207 feet long, 32 feet beam and 19 feet deep, with a gross tonnage of 914 tons, the only means they have for loading that vessel is by 20 or 30 men carrying coal in baskets containing two shovels apiece.

Mr. MACDONALD. I do not know if my hon. friend was in the House when the minister made the announcement that the 'Stanley' which was constructed by the government in power previous to 1896 was so constructed that it was impossible for her to receive coal through a coal chute, and that the only way in which coal could be supplied was by carrying it in baskets.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman leads us to believe that he endorses that. The 'Minto' is of 225 feet, 13 feet depth, &c., and the same principle is involved in loading her. Are they loaded by baskets in all ports of the maritime provinces?

Mr. MACDONALD. I might point out to my hon. friend—apparently he was not here when the matter was discussed——

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to point out to my hon. friend that I am always here.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend, if he was here, must be very obtuse at times. My hon. friend also should visit the maritime provinces, particularly at winter time. If he went down there he would find that these two steamers to which he refers have been engaged in the winter service between Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. With the greatest possible difficulty they are able to reach, in these harbours to which they run,

some wharf where their passengers and supplies may be landed. It is impossible for them to get to the coal piers in Pictou harbour where the coal is supplied in the summer. My hon. friend will see that in winter it is not a question of construction at all, but it is a matter of necessity that coal if it is to be put on board these boats must be put on board by hand as it is impossible to get to the wharf where the coal chutes are on account of the ice.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it the practice in winter to load all steamers in this way ?

Mr. MACDONALD. There is no other way to do it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are there not coal chutes ?

Mr. MACDONALD. It is impossible for steamers in Pictou to go to the wharfs where the regular coal chutes are.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I understand the situation in Pictou very well, and I think that, if this coal was elevated, as there are side hatches on both of these vessels, there is no doubt that with a very small expense chutes could be erected so that the coal could be put on board at comparatively small expense. The coal could be elevated by two or three men instead of 30 or 40, and from that elevation it could be put in chutes and placed on the vessels at small expense. I think the minister should see to this. I would like to ask the minister what the expense of loading these vessels is ? The minister should be in a position to state the expense of loading. The men who were engaged in this business are engaged in it exclusively, and the cost should be at the minister's command.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that the minister keeps a staff of men for the purpose of carrying coal on vessels at these different points.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon friend says 'no.' Then how is it ? Do you let a contract to a certain man to carry the coal ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We engage the men when we want them, when the steamer is coaling and we pay them 20 cents an hour.

Mr. BLAIN. How frequent is that, say at Pictou ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Whenever they want coal.

Mr. BLAIN. I asked how often that would be.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Once or twice a month; perhaps four times a month; it depends on the quantity.

Mr. INGRAM. I am unable to find out how these vessels are constructed so that they can only use the basket method of loading.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Any one who has a mechanical mind at all could understand this. The bunkers are covered and therefore as has been explained already by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) the vessels being unable to come near the place at the wharf where the coal chutes are, it stands to reason that the coal has to be carried from the pile which lies further on, and be brought to the steamer and put in the bunkers if the chutes cannot be used.

Mr. INGRAM. Is that on account of the ice ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The ice has nothing to do with it. It is because they cannot get near the wharf where the chutes are.

Mr. INGRAM. After all the thousands of dollars we have been spending in Nova Scotia to dredge harbours, you cannot get a vessel near the coal chutes to load it in the usual way.

Mr. LALOR. It is somewhat novel to find large vessels of this kind loading coal with baskets. I have seen a good many boats of various kinds, but I have yet to see a boat that you could not load by some other means than by carrying with baskets, and I would like to ask the minister to explain it.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. If the hon. gentleman will allow me—he is under a completely wrong impression. We do not load these boats with coal ; they are not colliers, we load the bunkers.

Mr. LALOR. I understand that they are not boats which you load with coal, but you put a large quantity on board for their use.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The quantity necessary.

Mr. LALOR. And there are men employed in these particular counties to fill these bunkers with baskets. I never heard of such a thing before, nor do I think anyone else did either. I am informed there is one place where they do it, but I have had no experience there. They say that they do that in China.

Mr. INGRAM. And yet the hon. member from Pictou says that he is quite up to date.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My friends from Haldimand and Elgin will have to come to the maritime provinces to get up to date.

Mr. INGRAM. If that is what he means by being up to date, we will not go there.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I am sorry for you.

Mr. LALOR. My hon. friend from Pictou invites members to go to the maritime provinces to see the conditions there. I wonder if he means the political conditions.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Take them all together.

Mr. COCHRANE. They are all in a basket.

Mr. PERLEY. I notice a large sum of money for wharfs in Nova Scotia, some of which I understand, are of very little use. I suggest that some of this money might be spent for wharfs in places where the steamers could go and coal.

Mr. AMES. A statement was made a few moments ago that the Dominion government purchased coal as cheaply as possible, but if you turn to the Auditor General's Report at page P—12 you will find Jos. Gingras, Que., coal at $5.10 per ton; Geo. E. Boak & Co., Halifax, coal at $5, $4.25, and $3, and if you turn to page P—21 you will find Clarkin Bros., Charlottetown, coal at $4.35 per ton, and at page P—22, A. Pickard & Co., coal at $4.35, $4.25 and $4 a ton. Now I do not think those are prices that this government would have to pay for about 20,000 tons of coal.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I think some coal has been bought at $9, some at $8.75 and some at $8.

Mr. AMES. Where ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. At different places where it was wanted, and all by tender. There is nothing extraordinary about it. But the ordinary coal that has been bought for the service of the steamers in large quantities has been bought at the lowest market price after tenders being asked for.

Mr. FOSTER. How much ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. At Sydney at $3 per ton, from Mr. Hackett; at Pictou, from the Intercolonial Coal Company, at $3.75; from Halifax, at $4.25; from the Reserve Mine, at $3, and so on. All these different quantities of coal were purchased in the regular manner after tenders being asked for. There may be fifty different points where coal is to be delivered, and it varies in price according to the cost of transportation.

Mr. AMES. I want to point out how the minister has verified the statement I have made. He shows how that in some cases the Dominion government have actually bought coal at the Reserve Mine for $3 a ton, and at other places for $3.75, and $4.25. The minister has spoken of some out of the way places ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Is Sydney an out of the way place ?

Mr. MACDONALD.

Mr. AMES. The places mentioned in the Auditor General's Report for 1904-5 have been places such as St. John, Halifax, Pictou and Charlottetown. Now if the Reserve Mine—which we all know produces about as good coal as can be found—if the Reserve Mine coal can be bought at $3 a ton, do you not suppose the Reserve Mine would be willing to give a contract for 20,000 tons ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. To be delivered all along the coast at different points ?

Mr. AMES. Certainly.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In lots of 5 tons, 10 tons, 20 tons, and send a special steamer to make delivery ?

Mr. AMES. You would not have the slightest difficulty in getting men to charter a steamer and load it with 2,000 or 3,000 tons, and deliver it at St. John, Halifax, Pictou, Charlottetown, Gaspe and Quebec; and if you could get it at $3 a ton plus the freight, you would save a lot of money to the government.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I suppose the coal dealers know their own business, they have to compete with each other, five or six large companies dealing in coal, and tenders are asked for coal to be delivered at points mentioned. Surely they must know their own business.

Mr. AMES. The minister knows that the tenders asked for are for small quantities to be delivered at a number of diffierent points.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. At points where it is wanted.

Mr. AMES. No company of any size is going to tender for 1,000 or 2,000 tons.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not know what the hon. gentleman's object is in wasting so much time. Does he mean to say that we should ask for tenders for the whole quantity of coal to be delivered at different points, no matter what the quantity ? Then he would ask the mine owners or the dealers in coal to distribute it in quantities of from 5 tons to 100 tons at perhaps four hundred different places.

Mr. AMES. I would call for tenders inviting the large coal companies who have vessels of their own by which they can deliver, or who are in a position to make contracts for delivery, and I would ask them to tender for 20,000 tons of coal to be delivered at these points.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. And you would ask them to deliver at four hundred points ?

Mr. AMES. The minister does not get coal at four hundred points. Unless a steamer happens to be stranded and runs out of coal at some particular place where she has to be supplied, 95 per cent of his

coal is bought either at St. John, Halifax, Charlottetown, Pictou or Quebec.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No.

Mr. AMES. Well look through the Auditor General's Report. Show me $10,000 worth of coal bought outside of those places.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I know the points where it has to be delivered.

Mr. AMES. Show me in the Auditor General's Report where $10,000 worth of coal is bought and delivered outside of those places, and that will put another phase on the question. The hon. gentleman says we are wasting the afternoon on this matter. It seems to me that if a system can be inaugurated whereby $15,000 or $20,000 can be saved to the country in a single year, this parliament might be well engaged in devising such a system.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. A good deal of misapprehension exists in the mind of the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Ames) as to the way we handle coal in Nova Scotia. I would invite him to visit the barbours of Sydney and North Sydney, where they can load a steamer at the rate of 1,000 tons an hour. The cases where coal is loaded aboard small steamers by the shovelful are so few, and the quantities are so trifling, that the coal kings of Nova Scotia hardly think it worth while to provide any other method. In the harbour of Sydney some of the finest warships in the world are loaded with baskets. Some of the magnificent French steamers come into the harbour of Sydney and load their bunkers with baskets, and English steamers in the same way. The steamers are so constructed, and have to be kept so clean and in such good condition, that the masters don't care to put them under chutes where the coal comes tumbling down from a height of 30 to 50 feet. If the hon. gentleman had a valuable property such as these steamers he would hesitate before putting them under these chutes. That being the case, and as it is only a trifling quantity of coal that has to be handled in this way, there is no trouble about it. I think it is small business to waste the afternoon upon a few tons of coal put upon these steamers in the way that I have mentioned. The hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Ames) is, I think, struggling to cut down the price of coal in the provinces I come from. We do not want to see the price of coal cut down. We have thousands of people in the province of Nova Scotia whose bread and butter depend upon the price of coal, and I do not think it is true Canadianism for us to ask this government to cut down the price of an article of such great importance to our people.

Mr. AMES. May I make just one more suggestion in answer to my hon. friend from Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. D. D. McKenzie). Some years ago I had the pleasure of going to Japan on one of the handsome boats of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which are, as you know, some of the finest steamers in the world, and which are painted perfectly white from stem to stern, everything as clean as new paint. At the Canadian end they loaded coal from chutes, and at the Japanese and Chinese end they loaded it with baskets. I do not like to see the Chinese system in vogue on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the minister, by his explanations, has rather clouded the whole matter concerning coal. It is a fact, I suppose, that coal is used at four hundred different points.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Say three hundred and ninety-nine.

Mr. FOSTER. I mean to say that it is delivered at a very large number of places. Wherever you have a lighthouse, I suppose you have to have some coal, unless it is in a wooded country. Well, how does the minister deliver his coal at those places? It is delivered, as I understand, by supply steamers, there is a very large number of these small places which take a few tons only. Therefore, it is unfair to say that you could not adopt the plan of my hon. friend from Montreal (St. Antoine), because you would have to have this coal delivered at 400 different places. That is not it at all. The hon. gentleman has supply steamers and with these supply steamers and in other ways he delivers the little driblets of coal that are required, a few tons at each place. That is not what my hon. friend has been talking about at all. It is true, on the other hand, that a large portion of the coal which is being used by the department is bought and is deliverable at half a dozen, or eight or ten points at the most, and that is a part of the coal which hon. gentlemen on this side of the House think might be got at a smaller price and a large saving made. An hon. gentleman in speaking in favour of keeping up the price of coal has the laudable view that the workmen shall not be defrauded of their wages, but we are not dealing, in asking for tenders and getting it as cheaply as possible, with the workmen. We are dealing with the mine owners and if they furnish 20,000 or 30,000 tons of coal at a less price than is being paid now, and make their profit by it, as undoubtedly they can, the miners' wages are not affected thereby in the least and their bread and butter are just as secure. The point is as to whether the hon. minister can by changing his method get his coal at a cheaper rate, and I certainly think he can do so. The Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway Companies, who are large consumers of coal—although they are in

some respects different—receive their coal at a very much cheaper rate than the hon. gentleman is receiving his, because he does not buy it in large quanties. He gets local men to deliver the coal at local points and in comparatively small quantities.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I would like to ask the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) if I understood him rightly as saying that the Canadian Pacific Railway boats, the description of which I quite agree with, load at the Pacific end by chutes.

Mr. AMES. I understood it. I know that on the other end they load by baskets, and I thought that on this end they could not load with baskets.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Well, I can tell my hon. friend that they load entirely by baskets on this end.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. To satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite I will try the experiment suggested and ask for tenders in an alternative way. We will ask for them under the old plan and the new, and we will see what difference there is in the price of our coal.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a good idea.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I would not think for an instant of trying the other plan alone because I am sure that we would pay 25 or 30 per cent more for our coal.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the hon. minister installed the Marconi wireless system of telegraphy on the boats yet ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, on the 'Minto' and 'Stanley' but there is a special item for that.

Mr. DANIEL. I notice in looking over the hon. minister's report that there is no mention made except in one case as to the number of crews on these various steamers. In the case of the 'Canada' which is, I understand, really a third-class cruiser and the foundation of the navy of Canada——

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Those vessels are included in the Fisheries estimates. They are in the Fisheries protection service.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the hon. minister tell us then what are the legitimate crews of the vessels which are now under discussion, such, for instance, as the 'Lady Laurier' and these other steamers ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The crews, exclusive of officers, are as follows : 'Druid,' 23 ; 'Aberdeen,' 31; 'Stanley,' 34; 'Minto,' 37; 'Lady Laurier,' 36; 'Lansdowne,' 26 ; 'Quadra,' 20; 'Brant,' 8; 'Champlain,' 28 ; 'Montcalm,' 35; 'Maisonneuve,' 3 ; 'Constance,' 18; 'Shamrock,' 14 ; 'Scout,' 11, and 'Reserve,' 9. The 'Canada' has a crew of 48 exclusive of officers.

Mr. DANIEL. The 'Canada' has 75 including officers in this report.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Oh, well, on the cruise she is making at the present moment she has 75. But the regular crew of the 'Canada' is 48.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the hon. minister aware of the number of the crew on board the 'Lady Laurier' in Halifax about the 3rd November last ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The figures I have given are those of the regular crew, I do not know that the crew was increased in any shape or form.

Mr. DANIEL. I ask the question because I understood that there was a considerably larger number on the 'Lady Laurier' at that time than are usually appointed to that vessel.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They were colonizing, I suppose.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think full information has not been obtained in regard to the question of my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel). The hon. minister tells us that they were colonizing. What does that mean ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I suppose that was what the hon. gentleman had in his mind and I told him that was not so, that the crew was the same as it always was.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is said that there were some 95 of a crew. Is that number necessary to sail this vessel ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No, there never were 95 on the vessel.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is what the record at Halifax proves, I believe.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. What record ?

Mr. HENDERSON. There were some 95 domiciled there.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. What record ?

Mr. HENDERSON. The voters' list ; that is the record. There were some 95 people domiciled on that vessel.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Have you the list ?

Mr. HENDERSON. It is not necessary to have the list. It is a matter of record. It is not a question of dispute.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Quite the contrary. It is disputed. It is not so.

Mr. HENDERSON Well, you dispute your own records

Mr. MACDONALD. There is no such thing as a system of registration in Hali-

fax and it would be impossible to have 95 men whose names are on the voters' list recorded as belonging to the 'Lady Laurier' unless the ship's record indicated that that number of men composed her crew. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries states that there was no such number of men in the crew. In Nova Scotia we have not heard this story of my hon. friend.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is what we honestly believe; we believe that there was no such number as 95, but under different names they were put there.

Mr. MACDONALD. Where ?

Mr. HENDERSON. On the list.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The Department of Marine and Fisheries has nothing to do with the preparation of the list. Anybody can claim to be employed on the 'Lady Laurier' but we cannot help that. The crew is sworn in and articled in the regular way.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then there were not 95 ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, we thought not.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. There had been an attempt made to show that there was some wrong doing in connection with this business, and as a Nova Scotian, I court the fullest possible inquiry. I know that the allegation is absolutely unfounded and false and it should be threshed out here. I do not want any insinuation ; I want the whole truth about the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the minister's plan for buying supplies for these steamers at different points ? What does he do in attempting to get provisions at the most reasonable price as I suppose he does ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. When I came to the department I found a system established for thirty years and I followed it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was Minister of Marine and he knows what it is. It is to ask the prices by circulars from the different traders. These prices are given to the agent who verifies whether it is the regular market price, and then the order is given to the captains of the different steamers to buy supplies at the different places.

Mr. FOSTER. To whom are these circulars sent ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. To the different merchants.

Mr. AMES. To all the merchants ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Nothing of the kind, I followed the custom of the department in vogue for 25 years.

Mr. AMES. And the same merchants ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not think so. It may be that some of them are the same but I do not know.

Mr. BARR. Is it not a fact that the minister has a list of reformers whom he thinks have done good work for the party ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. What harm is there in that. If we buy at proper prices I suppose we have a right to buy where we like.

Mr. BARR. But that is not advertising for tenders.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I never said we advertised ; I said I followed a method that had been followed for 25 years.

Mr. BARR. But you do not use the same list.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Oh, that is too clever.

Mr. BARR. In days gone by we used to hear the Liberals declare, that this very system was bad and corrupt, but now it seems that the Liberals in power have adopted it. Two wrongs do not make a right. If the old government was wrong the present government should not have followed their example. It is a well known fact that the department sends round a list, and that it is only sent to men who support the government, so that there is no guarantee we are getting the goods at the market price.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The prices are there and can be verified.

Mr. BARR. And some of them are pretty high prices.

Mr. FOSTER. For instance, in the city of Quebec the minister would send one to a number of grocers—

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Nearly every grocer in Quebec, because they are all Liberals.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not speaking about that at the present time. When the supplies are furnished according to this list, who checks the goods supplied and sees that they are up to the standard and of the proper quality ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Mr. Gregory, the agent at Quebec, an old employee, has to verify as to whether the prices are the market prices.

Mr. FOSTER. He does not verify that they are market prices as I understand it, because the prices are fixed according to the list he receives.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The master fills out a regular requisition for the articles he needs ; he sends that to the agent who orders the goods at the prices which were tendered for. The articles are sent on board the steamer and checked by the steward and verified by the captain. Then the

account is sent back to the agent who verifies it and sends it to the department here, where it is verified again.

Mr. FOSTER. That is how I thought it might be done. Who makes sure that the goods delivered are according to sample? for instance there are various kinds of tea.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The steward and the captain do that and they will complain very quickly if the articles are not according to quality.

Mr. FOSTER. This system leaves a very wide hole open.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have obtained special information on this question, because I knew from previous experience in passing these estimates, that I would be asked concerning it. I have here a statement which I will read and which is as follows:

With reference to the purchase of supplies by the different transportation companies, the department has been in communication with the Canadian Pacific Railway Steamship Company, the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, and the Charlottetown Steam Navigation Company, and I find that these corporations do not purchase by tender, but purchase in the market as they find that they can get better value and quality than by inviting tenders and getting their supplies by contract.

The Charlottetown Steam Navigation Company purchase nothing but coal by tender, and they obtain their supplies from dealers in the trade.

The Department of Marine and Fisheries purchase their staple articles, such as flour, pilot bread, pork and beef in barrels, salt fish, butter, sugar by the barrel, and tea by the chest, from provision dealers, circulars having been previously sent to them for prices. Fresh meat is purchased from butchers as required. No tenders are asked for the smaller articles of groceries, or canned goods, dried fruit or fruit of any kind, and such like articles. The agents are always instructed to invite tenders for staple articles from provision dealers and the smaller articles of groceries are purchased without inviting tenders. Provision dealers often say that they tender for the staple articles at low prices in order that they may secure the orders for the smaller articles of groceries. This would be all right provided we had only one firm or grocer to purchase from, but it is impossible for the department to purchase at one port, as the ships are continually going from one port to another and require supplies at the port they are in at the time. No tenders are asked for these supplies, as in such cases the ships would be delayed. Samples of supplies are always furnished with tenders. Poor articles are expensive at any price, and therefore, the department buys the best quality of provisions and supplies generally. In some instances it happens that steamers calling at out of the way places, make purchases of butter, condensed milk, and such articles at higher prices than they could be obtained for at any large business centre. The quantities thus purchased may not be very large, but the high price paid appears in the Auditor General's Report, and the department has been subjected to criticism in parliament on account of the prices of these few articles, and has been blamed for purchasing at extravagant prices. The agents at all times are instructed to purchase the best quality of supplies at a fair market value.

I may add that I have consulted the Messrs. Allan in regard to their method of purchasing, and I find that it is the same as that of the other navigation companies; but they do not take all of the precautions that we are taking in the department.

Mr. FOSTER. Do not these companies have a purchasing agent?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They have a purchasing agent, which explains why they do not need to ask for tenders. Mr. Smith, the manager of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, gives a list of the merchants to whom the purchasing agent goes.

Mr. AMES. Do I understand the minister to say that his method of purchasing by circular is exactly the same as that of the Allans, the Richelieu and Ontario, and the other large navigation companies?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The drafting of the circular might be different, but the principle is the same.

Mr. AMES. I suppose the list the hon. member uses is not similar to the list these companies use, for instance, in the city of Montreal?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We buy very little in Montreal, but when we do want something, we go to the best wholesale dealers.

Mr. AMES. I would like the minister to tell me a little more clearly how he prepares this list of favoured people to whom the circulars are to be sent?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have nothing to do with the preparation of the list. Very often in the course of the year people apply, asking: Are we not entitled to get part of the patronage? I give instructions to the agent at the place to which the applicant belongs, to get prices from that gentleman.

Mr. AMES. And whom does the hon. minister consider entitled to have a part of the patronage which he speaks of?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is the best men who are entitled to get the patronage; and I may say—there is no use mincing matters—that when the prices are equal, we consider it only fair and reasonable that the government should favour their friends. I suppose that if hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, they would do the same.

Mr. AMES. I want to draw the hon. minister's attention to what is probably an oversight, so far as he is concerned. I undertook to communicate with Halifax, Quebec, St. John and other places submitting

a list of the persons from whom the hon. minister obtains his supplies. Last year, for example, the 'Lady Laurier' secured its supplies mostly at Halifax. There were fifty-eight persons on the list from whom the supplies were obtained, and I am sorry to have to inform the hon. gentleman that among those fifty-eight there is one Conservative.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. If the hon. gentleman will give me the name, we shall have the list corrected.

Mr. AMES. The steamer 'Neptune' buys its supplies at Halifax. According to my Halifax friend, there are eighty-four names on the list, of whom three are Conservatives. The steamer 'Stanley' obtains part of its supplies at Charlottetown and part at Pictou, and in this case the minister succeeded better, because I am informed that all the people at Pictou from whom the supplies are obtained are, to use my informant's expression, 'hot grits.' In Quebec the steamer 'Druid' obtains its supplies from sixteen persons, all red-hot Liberals, but one only liable to be independent. The steamer 'Aberdeen' buys its supplies at Quebec from thirty-four people, all strong Liberals. Thus, out of about two hundred people who supply the department about half a dozen are Conservatives. This calls for immediate attention.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I will look up the list, and, if the hon. gentleman complains, I will inform these Conservatives that they are not to sell any more goods to the vessels.

Mr. INGRAM. I can assure the hon. minister that, so far as the county I represent is concerned, it is not necessary to look up the list, because only good Grits there get the patronage.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. If my hon. friend finds fault with that, we will endeavour to correct it.

Mr. INGRAM. If I found fault from now till doomsday, I am afraid that I should make very little impression on the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman says that prices being equal, he would give the preference to his own friends; but how does he know that the prices would not be more favourable if competition existed among all the merchants of the place? How does he know that there are not Conservatives in Halifax, Quebec or Montreal who would supply these goods at lower prices? They never have an opportunity to compete, they are not asked to do so, though it is quite possible that if they were, very much better prices might be obtained. The minister has no knowledge of that, for the simple reason that he takes his supplies from his own political friends, who knowing that he will not go outside of that circle, doubtless take care to get good prices. If he is determined to obtain goods at fair prices, he must open the door to all parties, and allow all to have an opportunity of competing. Then, if his own friends are the lowest tenderers, I have no objection to his giving them the contract in preference to political opponents.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I notice that in Prince Edward Island forty-eight who have supplied goods to the department are all Liberals. I do not raise any objection to the list at all, but I would ask the minister to reconsider this matter, and see if he cannot give the Conservatives some little show.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I will make an exception of Prince Edward Island, as the hon. gentleman does not object to purchases being made from Conservatives.

Mr. AMES. There is an item on page P—29 of the Auditor General's Report of which I would ask the minister to give an explanation. It is an item of $1,978.81 for buttons, gold lace, &c. I am sure we are all very anxious that the Canadian navy should present a creditable appearance, but it certainly appears to me that the amount of money which is to be spent in gold braid and trimmings is rather large for a young country just beginning to have a service and which as yet has not many vessels which appear on parade. I notice for instance, the following charges:

1.	33 gross coat buttons..	$ 9	10	$ 300 30
2.	4 gross jacket buttons.. ..	6	10	24 40
3.	20 gross vest buttons.. ..	5	10	102 00
4.	2 jap. uniform cases....	10	00	20 00
5.	24 sword belts..	3	80	91 20
6.	405¼ yards gold lace	0	85	344 46
7.	20 yards gold lace.. ..	2	90	58 00
8.	24 dozen gold cap badges	20	00	480 00
9.	200 pairs shoulder straps	0	45	90 00
10.	48 gold naval sword knots	2	75	132 00
11.	24 swords..	11	50	276 00
12.	24 sword bags..	0	75	18 00
13.	18 dozen hat ribbons..	2	00	36 00
	Cases and tins..			6 45
				1,978 81

Possibly the hon. gentleman will tell us whether this was for some special festive occasion, or what use has been made of the amount of trimmings mentioned here?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Certainly I have not been wearing them. They were bought in the regular way for the different crews, just as was done under the late government. As regards the changes we have made, they are to the advantage of Canadians. We used to buy these articles through the High Commissioner in London at the Army and Navy stores, but we found a firm in Montreal and another in Toronto ready to furnish these articles at the same prices, and we give each year an order to one of these firms. One year we buy from the firm in

Montreal and the other year from the firm in Toronto.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. With regard to this item of $1,500 for the Marconi system which is installed on the 'Stanley' and 'Minto,' I understand that those steamers have been in the harbour all winter, and that this system has not been used in the winter at all, because they have not sufficient power to communicate between the wharfs at Pictou and Georgetown. They can only communicate within a radius of thirty miles.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They will not remain there.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I was told by the man who operates one of the machines that he could not communicate from the wharf at Pictou with the steamer at the wharf at Georgetown. If that is so, it is a mistake. At any rate, the installing of this machinery on board those steamers is of very little use unless it is also installed on the shores, because both those steamers might be out in the gulf and there might be great necessity for the erection of two stations, one on the Pictou side and one on the Prince Edward Island side, so as to enable the steamers to communicate with the shore. So far as the system now installed on the steamers is concerned, I can say that it will be of very little use.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is a special item for the Marconi station, and when that comes up I will give all the explanations required.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an item here for damages allowed to merchants and shippers in Prince Edward Island for losses sustained on perishable goods owing to the 'Minto' and 'Stanley' being ice-bound. The amount is $9,356.66.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That was fully discussed last year. It was a vote by parliament after an investigation was held.

Mr. FOSTER. Has it affirmed a principle ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No ; without affirming a principle in any way. All the reasons and conditions were given at the time.

Mr. FOSTER. If it is a matter past and gone, it is outside of the question now. But the minister informs me that it does not create a precedent or affirm a principle.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No.

Examination of master and mates, $7,000.

Mr. AMES. Who now fills the position of examiner ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Captain Demers.

Mr. AMES. What are his qualifications ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. He has a certificate from the English Board of Trade, and was recommended as an assistant to Captain Salmon.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Who has been appointed examiner at Charlottetown ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Captain Cavanagh.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Was he appointed last year ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is being made now.

Mr. LEFURGEY. At what salary ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. $200.

Rewards for saving life, including life saving stations, $12,000.

Mr. ALCORN. I would like to ask what is the nature and extent of the life-saving service on the Lake Ontario front, in the county of Prince Edward, Ontario. Some years ago we had a very efficient, well equipped and manned life-saving station at Point Traverse ; but owing, I presume to the fact that the people of that vicinity did not support this government as well as was desired, that station was removed. The boat was taken to Wellington, in the same county, and stored there in some person's barn. I recollect that a year or two ago a claim was made against the department for storage in respect of that boat, but whether that claim was settled before the last elections or not, I do not know. The boat, however, seems to have gone out of service. It has no crew and no use is made of it. There was also a boat on Consecon beach, in Prince Edward, but I do not know how that is now. I would like full information as to the nature and extent of the service in that region. The coast is one which absolutely requires a life service, because a number of wrecks occur there yearly, and a good many lives are lost.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I shall be very glad to look into the question. According to the information given me by my deputy minister, the station was abolished five or six years ago as not being necessary.

Mr. ALCORN. Will the hon. minister have the information put in writing, and give the places where the boats are now located in that county, in whose charge, who are the crew, whether such crews are practised or only crews on paper ; and what is the expense of each station, to whom paid, and on what account ?

Mr. INGRAM. What wrecks were investigated last year ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The following wrecks were investigated last year :

SS. 'Vancouver.
SS. 'Kensington'
Barquantine 'Kodan' collision.
SS. 'Athenia'
SS. 'Verax' collision.
SS. 'Vancouver.'
SS. 'Turret Cape.'
SS. 'Turret Chief.'

SS. 'Catalone.'
SS. 'Louisburg.'

Mr. INGRAM. Has it been necessary to engage any wrecking plant in connection with these accidents ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, in the case of the 'Vancouver.' The Davie Company helped to pull the 'Vancouver' out of the mud in which she had stuck outside of the channel. Most of the work was done by the Department of Marine, the ship channel department. We really dug out the steamer which was 11 feet in the mud. A channel was dug along each side of her and when it was thought sufficiently deep she was pulled out by the Davie boats and other boats that we had furnished through the Department of Marine and Fisheries so as to reduce the damages as much as possible.

Mr. INGRAM. In what section of the river was the accident ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Just outside Sorel, near the entrance of Lake St. Peter. She sheered right out of the channel and went about 200 feet into the mud.

Mr. AMES. The minister mentioned the 'Canada' but I do not find in the minister's report pages 99 to 108, any reference at all to the 'Canada.' Why is no report of the investigation as to the 'Canada'-'Cape Breton' affair published here ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We did not think it was a formal inquiry and therefore we did not publish it. This question was entirely threshed out in the House. We did not publish this report because we thought the proceedings were all defective.

Mr. AMES. But you have no report of it at all here.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Whatever papers were collected were put before the House but we never considered that that report was legal and therefore did not publish it.

Mr. AMES. Was it an investigation that differed from the others here ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It differed greatly; it was not according to the instructions at all.

Mr. AMES. Did I understand the minister to say that this was simply a preliminary inquiry ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That is what I said.

Mr. AMES. It was not an investigation at all ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It was some kind of an investigation preliminary to a formal investigation.

Mr. AMES. I would like to refresh the memory of the minister, because I think that the documents of the case contain proof that it was not a preliminary inquiry as alleged.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There are not even written instructions.

Mr. AMES. The minister knows that the papers have just been brought down and laid before the House. The minister will find among the papers a report dated June 13, 1904, which report says :

I beg to refer you to the attached newspaper report of the loss of the above vessel, and to recommend that an investigation be held as soon as possible. From inquiry by telephone this morning I learned that the ss. 'Cape Breton' has proceeded on her voyage to Sydney, and will probably return about next Saturday, so that if the minister approves of my recommendation for investigation it must be postponed until this vessel's return. I would suggest that if possible the minister might hasten the passage of the amendment to the Shipping Casualties Act through the Senate, otherwise the pilot will have to be tried before Mr. Guerin.

This is signed by Capt. R. Salmon, wreck commissioner, and is initialled across the base 'R. P.,' which I believe to be the initials of the minister. It would therefore seem that this was a recommendation on the part of Capt. Salmon asking for an investigation and that recommendation has been initialled by the minister showing that the minister concurred in the demand of Capt. Salmon for an investigation. If we look at the other reports we find that with all other casualties the investigation was recommended in almost identical terms. When the 'Vancouver' was wrecked, Capt. Salmon writes :

I learn that the above named steamer is ashore in Lake St. Peter, about sixteen miles east of Sorel, and in the event of her being detained I recommend that an investigation into the casualty be held.

In the case of the 'Kensington' the same terms exactly were used. In Capt. Salmon's report he says he does not consider an investigation necessary.

In the case of the 'Athenia' and 'Verax' he says :

I beg to recommend that an investigation be held.

And an investigation was held. Again in the matter of the 'Athenia' and 'Verax' he speaks of having ordered an investigation.

Again in the matter of the 'Vancouver':

I recommend that I proceed to Montreal tomorrow in order to make arrangements for this investigation.

Again in the case of the 'Carolina' he speaks of investigations and so in all cases where an investigation was held the form of the report used exactly the same terms as in this. Consequently it will be seen that in the Canada-Cape Breton case the usual recommendation was made and the minister having initialled the usual recommendation ordered the usual investigation.

In this case, which we have been discussing, the minister telegraphs to Mr. Gregory, agent of the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Quebec and he says :

Minister wishes to know if Paul Lachance, St. Lawrence Point, St. John, Island of Orleans, would make a good assessor to sit on 'Canada-Cape Breton' investigation. If you do not know, will you please make inquiries ?

(Sgd.) R. SALMON.
Wreck Commissioner.

Mr. Gregory replies :

If no objection to a pilot acting as assessor on a case where a pilot is concerned, Paul Lachance, who is a pilot and master mariner, might make a good assessor.

Assessors are only used in regular investigations and Mr. Gregory has acknowledged in this case——

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Where is the authority from the minister there ?

Mr. AMES. The authority of the minister is found in the initials of the minister written across the report of R. Salmon, wreck commissioner.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Do you imagine it gave him the power to choose a commissioner in that way without consulting the minister ?

Mr. AMES. And the subsequent telegrams in the department show that in seeking an assessor that was his intention. Now this matter came up in the House and the hon. minister made this statement himself in the House on the 17th day of June, 1904.

I can promise the House that there will be a thorough and complete investigation into this casualty, which I repeat is not due to the river channel.

The minister himself states that there should be a thorough and complete investigation.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It was not a thorough and complete investigation that was held.

Mr. AMES. The hon. gentleman knows that the first six clauses of the law refer only to preliminary inquiry, but from clause 7 onward it is a formal investigation. The latter is what was held, and Captain Salmon during the entire time he was engaged in the matter never once held a preliminary inquiry. That proves that this investigation was not a preliminary enquête.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Because there was none before it.

Mr. AMES. The report of Captain Salmon begins in the same way :

In the matter of a formal investigation held at the Harbour Commissioners' office, Montreal, Quebec, on the 8th, 9th, 10th and 11th of August, 1904——

Now I am citing these documents rapidly, simply because they prove the point that every reference that was made by the correspondence of the department, by the letters of the wreck commission, and by the 'Hansard' containing the minister's remarks—every reference speaks of it as an investigation, there is not one word calling it a preliminary inquiry. It was a formal investigation, and an interference with it was not legitimate. I would like to ask the minister whether any investigation was held when the 'Carolina' got into trouble ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It was not thought necessary.

Mr. AMES. Was there any report from an official of the department asking that the affair be investigated ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Nobody asked for an investigation.

Mr. AMES. Was there any report on the part of an official of the department asking that there should be an investigation ? I must refresh the memory of the minister on that point.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Perhaps Mr. Salmon did.

Mr. AMES. I want to call the minister's attention to some correspondence in reference to the 'Carolina,' which might bear explanation. Here is the letter of Captain Salmon to the department :

Attached hereto is a newspaper clipping giving an account of the stranding of the above mentioned vessel near St. Alphone, on July 15th. I beg to recommend that an investigation be held.

The Wreck Commissioner, on the 18th of July, writes begging to recommend that an investigation be held. Here is the reply which I think the minister will find in the records of the department :

July 26th, 1904.

With regard to the instructions, the minister ——

Mr. PREFONTAINE. What document is the hon. gentleman reading ?

Mr. AMES. I am reading the report of Captain Salmon to the department, and I will ask the minister if he has a copy of this in his department ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. If the hon. gentleman will ask for it in the usual manner, I will look it up and produce it, if it is there.

Mr. AMES (reading) :

With regard to the instructions the minister has written on my previous memorandum, I beg to suggest that perhaps our action in consulting the authorities of the Richelieu and Ontario Steam Navigation Company as to whether they desire an investigation into the above or not, might possibly be misconstrued, and

with deference to the minister's opinion, I venture to think that the company will ask for an investigation if they desire it.

Apparently the company did not want an investigation, and they did not have one. Does the minister remember anything about that? Has he the original in the department?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I will look it up.

Mr. AMES. The point I make is this: I want to know, after the experience of the department in the case of Captain Salmon, whether the method is now adopted that when a wreck commissioner sits upon a case and comes to a decision, he submits it in advance to the minister in order that the minister may read and approve of it before the commissioner sitting as a court gives his decision to the public. Does the minister come first and the public afterwards?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No matter what investigation he holds, he is obliged to submit his report to the minister before he submits it to the public. That is the clear meaning of the law.

Mr. AMES. That is the point I wanted to make. The hon. gentleman tells us now that his wreck commissioner who sits and takes evidence and comes to a decision, dare not give that decision to the public until he has first submitted it to the minister. Now if it happens to be a friend of the minister who is concerned, I suppose that report may never come to light.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The hon. gentleman has a queer way of making insinuations that he has no right to make. I have explained the law already, when this question came before the House on a previous occasion. If I have not explained the law correctly, then I am ready to be corrected. But the law as I interpret it says clearly that the commissioner must first submit his report to the minister, and there is no way of getting round it. This commissioner thought he was not only the law but the public, that he was a judge, a judge of the Supreme Court or of the Privy Council; he had a swelled head and nothing less. The hon. member from Montreal can have his own opinion and can keep it. I have my opinion also, and that is what I follow.

Mr. AMES. Then we are clearly to understand, and the country may as well understand it too, that there is supposed to exist a wreck commissioner, and that commissioner, when sitting upon a case of casualty, hears the evidence and is supposed to come to a finding. But before that finding can be given to the public, before the commissioner can declare what he may have in his heart, he must first make a report to the minister, the minister must read it over, and approve of it before the report can be made public. What is the use of having a wreck commissioner at all? Why not let the minister do the whole thing in the first place?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Then repeal the law.

Mr. AMES. The point I make is this, and it is a point of principle. If the various decisions of our courts had to be reviewed by the minister before they could be given out, where would justice be? Now here is a court, in a certain sense of the word. It is of course a necessity on our St. Lawrence route that when a casualty occurs the blame should be placed in an unprejudiced manner upon the proper shoulders, and that the right people should be punished for it. Here was a case where there was a loss of life, and similar cases may occur. What we need is a wreck commissioner who is absolutely independent of fear or favour, and who feels that when he sitting as a court, and takes evidence, he may come to a decision according to his own conscience. But the minister claims that he has a right to override this decision, and so he may decide that the penalties shall be remitted or that the finding is irregular. But until the finding is handed down, as I read the law, the minister has no right to interfere. But if the minister's interpretation of the law is to hold good, then the public will be able to place a right estimate upon the value of this wreck commission; and if every finding of the wreck commissioner must first be submitted to the minister and have his approval, and if no decision can be given until that approval is had, the estimate of that wreck commissioner for absolute fairness and freedom from political interference will not rank high in the country.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I would like to differ from my hon. friend's opinion. There are cases in the department where the minister has greater responsibility than the responsibility involved in this case. When he sends his officer to make a preliminary investigation, which was done in the case of the 'Canada' and the 'Cape Breton,' the least that can be exacted is that the investigation shall be legally conducted. In this case it was not legally conducted. It was conducted contrary to law and, as I have already stated, contrary to the usage of the Board of Trade in England. We proceed exactly as they are proceeding in England where the wreck commissioner acts under the jurisdiction of the Board of Trade. Nobody can reasonably have any doubt of the guarantee that is offered by such proceedings. The hon. gentleman may have the opinion which he has expressed if he thinks fit, but all I can say is that I have a different opinion. He may, if he chooses, ask us to believe that the responsibility of a minister is not as great as that of his clerk whom he sends out to make an investigation. That is his own way of look-

ing at the question. He thinks that an officer who is paid $2,000 a year, who is sent out to make an investigation and who does not do it legally will inspire more confidence than the minister. Well, he may have that opinion, but I am sure that outside and inside of this House people will have a different view.

Mr. FOSTER. I never had that idea of the functions of a wreck commissioner. The hon. minister may be right. He says he has looked into the law and that is his interpretation of the law, but it comes as a sort of surprise to me. Of course, I never probably very carefully looked into the matter, but I know what the practice was when I was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and while I cannot recollect exact cases of anything of that kind, my impression of the office was that it was meant to have an independent investigation whenever a wreck occurred and it was deemed of sufficient importance that either a preliminary examination or a regular examination should be had, that, if it were a regular examination, then, by means of assessors and the taking of evidence the wreck commissioner who constituted a quasi court would with the evidence and with the aid of the judgment of his assessors, make up his mind as to the rights of the case and give his decision. Now, of course, that decision is subordinate to the ministerial authority in the end. But, the idea I had was that the minister then could exercise his superior power over it just according as the law directs. Well now, the hon. minister says that it is not that kind of an investigation at all, that there is simply a man sent out by the minister to report to him and that before he gives his decision, and consequently at any time during his examination, he is entirely subject to the minister, subject to the suggestions of the minister, subject to the interference of the minister and that his report or decision cannot be given until it has been approved by the minister. Well, that takes away all idea of an independent and unpartisan investigation. The minister may be a superior man intellectually and otherwise to the wreck commissioner, but there are certain things that an independent man even of a less high calibre can do that even a minister cannot do and one of these things is to hold an independent investigation. The minister's power remains. He has the power of revision but in so far as the investigation is made it is done by a man appointed for that purpose who has expert and technical knowledge, who has the advantage of taking the evidence himself, who has the advantage of assessors and being a man without patronage and the like of that and having these aids he is apt to give a decision more nearly representing the rights of the case. If that is not so it seems to me we are open to two things. In the first place the people of this country, in so far as they are concerned in matters that come before the wreck commissioner, cannot have the idea that they are appealing to an unpartisan and independent tribunal. If they have not that idea then they care nothing for that tribunal or very little. It is not their interest to get the proper evidence before the tribunal. It is their interest to button hole the minister, to bring partisan influence to bear, to carry their story to the minister himself and by ways that are well known try to influence him on one side or the other. Is that the best method to pursue? Is it better for the public who are damaged and whose rights are in question? Is it better for the minister or the department itself? I should think the minister would rather have an independent investigator who would take evidence with the proper aid of nautical information and would come to a conclusion upon the matter, subject of course, to a higher revision. I should think he would rather have that and I am quite certain it would be the best practice and it would best meet the wants of the country. Now, if the law turns out to be what the hon. minister says and if this commissioner is not an independent commissioner it seems to me that the law can be beneficially changed, I should think beneficially to the interests of the people and I should think beneficially to the minister himself, who, I should think, would rather be rid of that kind of an investigation than have it saddled upon him. Has the hon. minister had the benefit of the advice of the hon. Minister of Justice upon that? Has he had the opinion of the Minister of Justice that this is the intention of the law as it is on the statute-book at the present time?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Of course, I have consulted many times the Minister of Justice on the matter and especially on this case.

Mr. FOSTER. And the Minister of Justice is of the opinion that the wreck commissioner is not an independent investigator, but that he is on all occasions to be subject to the interference and direction of the minister.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I never put that question because it never came up.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, that is the whole question involved here.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That has not come up.

Mr. FOSTER. The whole question involved is whether while an investigation is going on it is open to the minister and his deputy to interfere with it and to make demands upon the court.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is not a court at all.

Mr. FOSTER. And that court, considering itself to be independent simply had to vacate its position in the end in order to resent the interference of the minister. Yet the hon. minister says he has not presented that phase of the case to the Minister of Justice.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It never came up.

Mr. FOSTER. I should think it would be well that he should give us the advice of the Department of Justice in a case of this kind which I am sure quite reverses the general practice of the department. If I were owner of a vessel and that vessel came in contact with another and there was an investigation to be held, I would not want to go to any deputy minister or minister. I would want to go to an independent court which is not subject to patronage and party ends, and I would want to put my evidence before that court and get a decision. There may be higher courts of appeal somewhere, but I would want to get the decision of the first court and I am sure the shipping interests want that.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Although this case was known to all the shipping interests they never complained. They quite approved of my conduct in the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. There were other things that went to the public; one was that it was not an inquiry but simply a preliminary inquiry. Has the public yet learned that there is no place for a wreck inquiry except before the minister?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. When I think it is required—I am the judge in the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister think he can sit in his office, and in view of the multiplicity of his other duties, be in a position to do justice, without knowing any of the local colouring and not having heard the evidence and the facts as a judge would hear them?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That supposition is not correct. You cannot imagine that the minister, without having information, would set himself out against the wreck commissioner and prevent him from doing his work.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister seems to have done that in this case.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Not at all. I deny that in the most formal way, because I never interfered in this case except to render regular the proceedings that were being held by this officer, and he declined to follow my instructions.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister mean to say that if a wreck taken place on the Nova Scotian coast he goes down there and hears the evidence, or does he mean that he can know all about the case when it incidentally comes before him?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. You cannot suppose that anything of the kind would occur unless the minister would be unfit for his position. In this case I knew of witnesses that the wreck commissioner refused to examine; I knew that the case was taken before another court and that the invariable rule in England is to suspend proceedings under such circumstances. I asked him to suspend proceedings and he refused. He threw himself before the public and rendered a ridiculous and illegal judgment. Does the hon. gentleman imagine that a minister who understands his position would interfere in an investigation without a reason that could be explained? The minister has to take the responsibility, and he should be able to advise his officer how to conduct the investigation so that justice may be rendered impartially to the parties.

Mr. AMES. Allow me to point out the essential difference between the two methods of doing the same thing. As Captain Salmon understood his duty, it was that during the progress of the investigation he was not to have his findings reviewed by the minister, but when the investigation was over and the finding had been given then the minister had a right to reverse it if he desired.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The hon. gentleman misrepresents the case. In this case the interference of the minister began after the proceedings had been taken before the Admiralty Court in Quebec. I produced the letter before the House showing it was the duty of the officer then to stop the investigation. He disregarded my instructions which I had a right to give him under the law.

Mr. AMES. The minister does not exactly understand the point I make.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I understand you are trying to make a case outside of the real case.

Mr. AMES. I can make clear what I mean to say if the minister will allow me. I wish to demonstrate the difference between the old method and the new. As Captain Salmon understood it, the old method was; that while he was a wreck commissioner holding an investigation he was a law unto himself, and that until he delivered his decision it could not be altered by the minister. That is the way Captain Salmon understood the law. The present understanding of the law is that the wreck commissioner, after he has made his investigation, shall submit his finding to the minister and it shall be revised or altered or approved by the minister, and then it shall be made public and have the force of a decision.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. But he did not finish the case.

Mr. AMES. The difference between the two methods is very plain. Under the old method, if the minister wanted to overthrow the decision of the wreck commissioner he had to do it openly and publicly ; but under the new method if he wants to alter the decision of the wreck commissioner he can do it privately, and the wreck commissioner has to take all the blame for it. The result of the new method is that the finding is not the judgment of the wreck commissioner but the revised finding of the wreck commissioner by the minister, and the public must judge as to whether the old or the new method is the better.

At six o'clock, the committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. minister spoke of an accident to the steamship 'Vancouver' at Sorel. Was there not another accident further down the river ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes ; but there was no investigation.

Mr. INGRAM. Surely there was an investigation. The one the hon. minister spoke of was on July 2, 1904. The other was at Matane on May 22, 1904, and the court recommended that the fog signal and the buoy should be changed. If those changes had been made previous to the accident, the chances are that it would not have occurred. Have these changes yet been made ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I could not answer that question off-hand. When the item of aids to navigation is reached. I shall be able to give the hon. gentleman the information. I know that these reports are taken cognizance of by the department ; but I do not know whether we have yet acted on that report or not.

Mr. BLAIN. What course does the department pursue with reference to wrecks that take place ? Who is to determine whether an investigation takes place or not ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The facts are reported to the minister, and if he thinks an investigation should be held, he orders it, whether formal or preliminary. That is according to law.

Mr. BLAIN. How many wrecks took place last year ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Ten.

Mr. BLAIN. At a total cost of how much ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. $4,535.

Mr. BLAIN. Were there any applications to investigate wrecks that were refused by the minister ?

Mr. AMES. I understand that there was only one, the one pointed out by the hon. member from Montreal.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. Before dinner I had intended to give a little attention to the question of the wreck which the hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Ames), was discussing. The observations made by that hon. gentleman and by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) would perhaps create the impression that there was some laxity about these investigations. I am sure that, as a lawyer, I voice the sentiments of every other lawyer in this House, and every fair-minded man, when I say that it would be a very sad thing indeed to have the impression go abroad that investigations of this kind were conducted in a loose or lax manner, or that favouritism or politics was considered in connection with them. These hon. gentlemen seem to discuss the law from their own ideas of what the law ought to be. It so happens that when we are dealing with courts and in courts, we have to deal with the law, not as we might suppose it ought to be, but as it is ; and there happens to be a clear-cut statute governing every step in connection with investigations of this kind. It would be well for hon. gentlemen, before they undertake to put their views on record and give them to the country as to what the law of this country is and how it is being administered, to look a little carefully into the statutes governing those particular cases. The steps to be taken in connection with this matter, as the minister has over and over again explained, are of two kinds. One of them is a preliminary investigation, an informal investigation ; the other is a formal investigation. The first one has no particular consequences, except that evidence is taken, facts are submitted to a certain officer, and he, after taking or collecting the evidence, has nothing whatever to say as to the effect it will have in the shape of a decision ; he simply reports to the minister. A great deal of fault was found this afternoon because he did report to the minister, and did not declare to the world his decision. It so happens that the statute clearly and distinctly governs his conduct, and he would be doing a wrong, and the minister would be doing a wrong, to allow his conclusions to go broadcast throughout the country. Section 7 of the Act says :

> Upon the conclusion of any such inquiry the officer or person who made it shall send to the minister a report containing a full statement of the case and of his opinion thereon.

That is all.

> Accompanied by such report of or extracts from the evidence and such observations as he thinks fit.

That is the whole of his duty, and now the minister says that this man who made the inquiry that was under consideration

had no authority to make a formal investigation at all. I would like this House to consider whether or not an officer can be mistaken as to whether he has the authority to act as performing a preliminary investigation or a formal investigation. Gentlemen of the legal profession will understand that this formal investigation has consequences, that under this formal investigation a captain's certificate may be cancelled, he may be suspended, he may be subjected to a great many punishments, and so may every officer on board, including the engineer, and when he is put in that position, as in any other court, to answer which he has to answer are placed in the captain's hands and he is placed in a position, as any other court, to answer these charges either by himself or by counsel in his behalf. There was nothing of this kind in this case, but this man, proceeding entirely improperly to inquire into this matter, I understand undertook to cancel the certificate of an officer who had a certificate of very high character. He cancelled that certificate without the slightest ground for doing so. The section under which he acted says after setting forth his duties in respect to an informal investigation—

Provided, however, that no formal investigation of any case shall be held until it has been ordered by the minister.

There can be no mistake about the language. The investigation had to be ordered by the minister before it could be held and if this gentleman went on to hold an investigation without being told to do so, I think it was clearly the duty of the minister, as soon as it came to his notice that an illegal and improper investigation was being proceeded with in his department, to stop it, particularly because his officer was proposing to cancel the certificates held by the officers without giving them the protection and rights which they enjoyed under the law. Fault was found here to-day because, forsooth, the report of this formal investigation was submitted to the minister. The statute distinctly says that that report and that decision shall be submitted to the minister. There are no two ways about it; they have no say in the matter at all, they must submit it. Section 25 says:

In any case where a formal investigation has been held the minister may order——

After he gets the report

——may order the investigation to be re-heard, either generally or as to any part thereof; and he shall do so (a) if new and important evidence which could not be produced at the investigation has been discovered, or (b) if for any other reason there has, in his opinion, been ground for suspecting that a miscarriage of justice has occurred.

The minister may then order the case to be reheard by the court by whom the case was heard in the first instance. And he has power, without a rehearing under this statute, to overrule the finding of the court, to restore the certificates which have been cancelled or to give a different kind of certificate in place of the one which was cancelled, and this statute puts the whole business absolutely under the control of the minister. Gentlemen stand up in this House and say that this is a lax political inquiry without ever looking at this law as to what the powers of the minister in respect to this inquiry are, and what must be done in order to comply with the law. I submit that if there is anything wrong about this law, if it is lax, and not a proper system of inquiry, then hon. gentlemen should come here with amendments to the law. If the law is not perfect let us amend it, but do not let us be publishing abroad in the newspapers and in the proceedings of this House, reports that lax, improper and illegal inquiries are being conducted in reference to properties and rights of this kind when in fact every step is being taken in compliance with the law of the country as it stands to-day. Although the minister has made the situation very plain, I thought it was my duty, having something to do with matters of this kind and coming from a part of the country where there is a great deal done about matters of this kind to point out as clearly as I can, that everything possible is being done to show fair play and to show that the rights of every individual, whether the right of property or a certificate or whatever it may be, are fully protected. This is certainly my purpose in bringing clearly before the committee the condition of the law to-day and the steps that were taken in connection with it.

Mr. INGRAM. My hon. friend (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) must not run away with the idea that hon. gentlemen in this House who have discussed this question here to-day do not fully understand the law. They understand the law probably quite as well as the hon. gentleman did.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They did not seem to.

Mr. INGRAM. Some hon. gentlemen say that they did not seem to. I do not think it lies in the mouth of the hon. member for Cape Breton to criticise in that way, because there are men just as capable as my hon. friend. What they were finding fault with was certain interference on the part of the minister and they recommended that the law should be changed, that the minister had too much power in the matter, that he interfered with investigations under the law as it was, and they were recommending that certain changes be made in the law. If this is not the proper place to recommend changes in the law, I would like to know where to go to suggest these changes. Surely the proper place is in the House of Commons where the law is made. In the matter of formal investigations, I have the report in my hand here where investigations

have taken place, and on every page of this report on which the court reports what does it say? It says 'in the matter of a formal investigation.' In every instance 'in the matter of a formal investigation.' Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that members in this House will take up this report and say—

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. Does my hon. friend say that reports take the place of or overrule the statute?

Mr. INGRAM. My hon. friend may be accustomed to the practice of law, but not to the practice of parliament or he would not ask that question.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. I do not think I will take my practice from the hon. gentleman.

Mr. INGRAM. I would not like to hold myself up as a model of the practice of parliament, and I have no fault to find with my hon. friend. He has always conducted himself very courteously since he has been in this House, and I would not desire for a moment to be uncourteous to him. But I am simply pointing out that this is not a new subject, but one which has been fully discussed, and discussed by men just as fully competent to deal with the law as my hon. friend.

Expense of schools of navigation, $7,500.

Mr. FOSTER. What is being done in those schools?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There are four government marine schools—one at Halifax, one at Yarmouth, one at St. John and one at Victoria, B.C.,—and they are presided over by the examiners of masters and mates. The result has been pretty good, but no doubt there is a good deal of room for improvement. However, the department has not thought proper to ask a large amount until this naval reserve scheme is in a position to be put before the House.

Mr. FOSTER. What is being done at those schools?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The pupils are put in a position to pass examinations in order to qualify as masters and mates. All the details will be found in my report at page 111. Lectures are given on the rudiments of navigation, the launching of vessels, the mechanical appliances on board ship, the management of the compass and so on.

Mr. FOSTER. How are the pupils obtained and how many are there?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. At Montreal, Capt. Demers is the head of the school. The minimum attendance is five, the maximum 35 and the average attendance 32. The total number of pupils was five hundred, and twenty-five lectures were given. In Halifax the number of lectures given was 21, the minimum attendance eight, the maximum eight, the average attendance twelve, and the total number of pupils 38. The professor was Commander E. B. Tinling. At St. John the professor is Capt. R. C. Cole. Number of lectures 23, minimum attendance 2, maximum 21, average 9, total pupils 229. At Yarmouth, Capt. J. E. Murphy is the professor. Number of lectures 23, minimum attendance 3, maximum attendance 16, average 9, total number of pupils 203. At Victoria, Capt. James Gaudin is professor. Number of lectures 20, minimum attendance 2, maximum 10, average 6, total pupils 110. I would like to have more of these schools, because we lack marine officers for our shipping. In the inland water we have sufficient mariners, but for sea-going vessels we have not the number of qualified officers we should have, and it was to induce our young men to embrace this profession that these schools were established.

Mr. BARR. Are these schools free for all?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are the lectures given weekly or daily? For instance, I notice in one place that there is a total attendance of twenty-eight and an average attendance of nine.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. An announcement is published in the papers that lectures will be given, for instance, weekly in Montreal, at a certain time and place, and calling upon those to attend who wish to do so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do the pupils go on and take out certificates? Are these preparatory schools?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Those who attend these lectures are supposed to be preparing themselves by acquiring a knowledge of these matters.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are these courses supposed to be followed up by pupils who eventually will take out certificates?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Eventually they will.

Mr. FOSTER. Is no care taken to select the people who attend these lectures, and to see that they come consecutively? Are there any examinations? Is it class work, or is it simply a public lecture?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is more of a public lecture than a regular course. We have not yet reached the point of making these schools a regular course of study. They are a preparatory course to encourage young men who desire to learn the first principles of the profession that they intend to embrace. Then when they get a chance they take positions on board steamers or sailing vessels, which positions they are

able to fill with the knowledge they have gathered in these schools.

Mr. FOSTER. If we are spending money and call them schools, surely all is not being done that should be done if you simply advertise that lectures will be given and anybody who choose may come in, and may not come again perhaps. I do not think that is the system that was intended. It seems to me they were meant to be schools, and that some method was to be taken to find out who were qualified to become members of the class. The idea was that the lectures should be followed up by questions and examinations, that there should be a regular course, and that some sort of certificate should be given. Otherwise you are dispersing your efforts entirely. You had better give ten people a consecutive course and fit them, than to lecture to 200 or 300 people, gathering in some now and some others at another time. It is not a proper school where you simply advertise lectures, and let Tom, Dick and Harry come in and listen one night, and another set come in on another night.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They are established on the same principle as the night schools for the labouring classes. The men who attend these lectures do the best they can, of course, because they have a disposition to come and listen. After following the course, if they are found by the professors to be good scholars and have talents for navigation, the professors aid them to get places on vessels. Of course if we were endeavouring to establish naval reserves we would organize a school more efficiently. But these are only preparatory lectures in order to give these young men some naval ideas.

Mr. FOSTER. But is no care taken to assemble the right kind of people ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Certainly. There is a curriculum, and everybody who presents himself can come in and follow the lectures. If some only come once or twice, we cannot help that. But those who follow the course get a certificate which shows they have attained some efficiency.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister know whether any effort is made to keep tally of those who attend consecutively, and to encourage consecutive attendance ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the object to make what you call common sailors, or is it the idea to turn out men who are fit to be officers ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Their intention is to be sailors. A great number of sailors and mariners have been taken from these schools.

Mr. MONK. Has there been a report made by the professor ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, it is published on page 111 of my report.

Mr. INGRAM. There are five professors, one each at Montreal, Halifax, St. John, Yarmouth and Victoria. What are their salaries ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. $250.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not had the pleasure of reading over the report, the minister read only the bare figures. Does each one of these give a report of the results of the schools during the past year ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No. They keep their notes. What is published in the departmental report is a short synopsis of what has been done, and that is signed by the superintendent of the schools.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister have a report from each one of these teachers of the general results of the teaching ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I cannot give results except what I have read just now. There were so many lectures, and so many attending. That comes from the superintendent of the schools. Of course the superintendent of the schools would not publish over his signature the information which he gets from the professors in these different places without getting reports from them.

Mr. FOSTER. What I mean is that while you may give the number of persons attending you do not give any idea as to what has resulted from the professor's work. He has given a certain number of lectures. He may form an idea as to how his work has resulted. He may think that the year's business may teach him that it is foolish to go on in that way or he may see a tangible result which has given the worth of the money spent upon it.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The hon. gentleman is rather exacting. These schools were established only two years ago. The results cannot be very great as yet. The professor is paid for his services, $250. It is a beginning and I have good reason just now for not thinking it proper to ask for a larger amount to establish a regular system of schools.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend has referred me to this report. Of course, I am perfectly favourable to the establishment of such a school, but my hon. friend must admit that this is not a satisfactory report.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I cannot give more than I have got.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend has been a school commissioner himself.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Not at this kind of school. We paid our professors better than this.

Mr. MONK. The report from the instructor should give some information as to the progress of the pupils. I am entirely in accord with my hon. friend as to the usefulness of the teaching, but we have now had two years of it and surely there have been some results to the pupils to report. For the city of Montreal we have the statement that Captain Demers delivered thirty-five lectures, that there was a minimum attendance of five, a maximum of thirty-five, that the average was twenty-two, and that the total number of pupils was 500. Then, we have the curriculum, which, as far as I could judge, is a good one, but we have no results.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have explained to the committee why there are no results? There can be no results. We have only one professor there. He has 500 attending his school. What do you want him to do? To give certificates of capacity? The schools are not established for that at all. They are established to enable men to acquire such a knowledge of navigation as will fit them to earn their livelihood upon the sea either as masters or in some other capacity.

Mr. MONK. I am quite of the opinion that these schools serve a useful purpose. There was an average attendance at Montreal of twenty-two.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. What can I do? I have no more money. Do you want the schools to be abolished?

Mr. MONK. I would give Captain Demers instructions that we want the results which have been achieved by that average attendance of twenty-two pupils. We must know at the end of the year how the pupils have profited by the lectures given and what the results have been to them. If as my hon. friend says he has succeeded in finding pupils who are qualified and has placed three or four or five of them in the regular livelihood of navigation surely we ought to know it. I find no fault with the institution, but I do find fault because the reports are absolutely barren of results. I myself would think that instead of having one professor at each of these five places it would be better to have either one or two professors, more liberally remunerated, say in Montreal, where there are a great number of young men who would have the aptitudes for navigation, but you should carry on the schools in a more systematic manner and in such a way as to give more definite results.

Mr. DANIEL. I notice that there has been rather a large amount spent for plates of signals and other things of that kind. They appear to be rather expensive. Could the hon. minister give us an idea of the sort of plates these are? I think the amount is over $4,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. These plates were exhibited on the table of the House last year and they were commended by the press all over Canada. They were the most elaborate and finest of their kind. They are necessary for the purpose of instruction in these schools. I would have great pleasure in inviting my hon. friend to come down and see them at the department, and he will be convinced that they are well executed and that they afford one of the most effective methods of imparting instruction to those who are engaged in the study of navigation.

Mr. DANIEL. I rather approve of the method of distributing these schools in different parts of the Dominion. I think it very much better than the mode suggested by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). These men in different parts of the Dominion certainly will be better served by having schools where they can get at them than they would be if there were just two schools at which a smaller number would be able to attend.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. If the question of the organization of a naval reserve had not been under consideration. I would have taken up this school of navigation more thoroughly and I would have insisted that a larger amount be placed in the estimates to carry on these schools at which people could study the science of navigation. But, as the scheme of a naval reserve embodies in itself the establishment of special schools, I did not think it proper to insist on a larger expenditure, but I concluded that the expenditure should be the same as last year so as to give the poorest class of the people the advantage of attending lectures of this kind in different parts of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. minister was very wise in not asking for more money until he could show some tangible results from the expenditure already made. Seven thousand five hundred dollars together with the initial expenditure for plates and other apparatus is a tidy bit of money. No results have been accomplished. You cannot say that results have been accomplished because a man has given so many lectures and so many people have attended. The lectures may have been interesting and a good many may have attended them, but I think the minister should have got from the teachers a report as to what the results were. Does the hon. minister say there has been no system of examination at all so as to make concrete as it were, the instruction which has been given and also to give to the pupil who has benefited by the instruction a certificate by which he can be benefited and which would show the progress he had made? Nothing of this seems to have been

done ; it is class work that is necessary and not lecturing; you can never make a man efficient in navigation unless you put him through a virtual instruction. It would be very much better if the teacher should form a class which would have stated hours for attendance, whose members would be examined and receive certificates when it is found they are entitled to them.

Mr. BARKER. The idea on this side of the House is to find out whether these schools are merely places where lectures are given, or whether they are devoted to practical education. Lecturers can always be found who will deliver any number of lectures in the season at a fixed fee, no matter how many or how few may attend. All we can ascertain from the report is that there have been thirty-five lectures at one particular class, at which the attendance has ranged from five to thirty-five, or an average of twenty-two. I would ask the minister to see that in future the lecturers should keep a record of the attendances of each student, so that we would be able to know whether or not some good is being done. If we could see that twenty or twenty-five had attended regularly, probably some good would be done, but if all we know is that there was a lecture at which twenty-two casuals dropped in for want of something better to do, it may be that the expenditure of this money is useless.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister see that these reports are obtained in future ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We employ our examiners of masters and mates at these ports, paying them an extra allowance of $250, and they report to the superintendent, Mr. Demers, who has replaced Captain Salmon. Mr. Demers then makes a summary of these reports for the report of the department, but I do not think it would be of any use to publish the full report of every professor. About two years ago we authorized these lectures, because we thought we would help poor young men who were desirous of studying the science of navigation. I do not know what happens elsewhere, but I know that in Montreal these lectures are very much appreciated, and quite a number of young men have acquired sufficient knowledge to enable them to enter the naval profession. During these two years, in Montreal, at least fifty young men have been fitted to go to sea with some useful knowledge of navigation.

Mr. FOSTER. The information which the minister has given from his personal knowledge of Montreal is the kind of information we want. There is no opposition to the schools ; what we want to do is to assist the minister in making it effective. We want to know if we are getting results from the expenditure, and that report does not give the least idea of what has been accomplished.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have no objection that all the details should be given.

Mr. FOSTER. We should be told if there is any attempt made to test the result of the teaching by examination ; we should be told as to the number of regular attendants at these lectures, and to what extent they have been useful in fitting young men for positions as ships' officers.

Mr. BARR. The minister tells us that these schools are only in their infancy ; and such being the case, it is the very time for us to begin to make them as perfect as possible. They are undoubtedly of great importance and, if they are properly conducted, they deserve encouragement. The next report of the Minister of Marine should show how many have attended these lectures, the extent of the knowledge the students were able to acquire, and the number of certificates issued for competency. It is quite possible, under good management, to make these schools of the greatest possible use ; and even if we expended more money on them than we do now, it would be well applied, provided, of course, the schools were efficient. But we want something more definite. We do not say that more could have been accomplished than has been accomplished in the past few years ; but what we do urge is that in the future these schools be made more perfect and more important to the class attending them, and then we have no doubt that good results will come from the money expended upon them.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I quite agree with what the minister has said as to the necessity of having these schools, and I do not think any member of this House would object to a vote of even twice the amount for this purpose. I believe these schools should be established at every centre where sailors are to be found. In the province of Prince Edward Island I do not think there is a school of this kind, so that the sailors there have to pay for their tuition at home or go to Halifax or St. John to get education. I observe that only $250 is allowed to each professor. If a school can be established for so small a sum of money, the sailors of Prince Edward Island should be placed on a par with the sailors of the other provinces. There are two schools at Charlottetown which are competent to teach the sailors and to fit them for the examination, and I would ask the minister to consider the advisability of placing in the supplementary estimates an amount sufficient to pay for a professor at Charlottetown. I may remind him that there are from 3,000 to 5,000 sailors in the province of Prince Edward Island, men who go to all parts of the world, and I think these men should receive the benefit of the legislation and the votes of this parliament.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I may say for the information of the hon. gentleman that as

soon as Mr. Campbell, who has the nomination of examiner of masters and mates, is appointed, he will be authorized to open a school at Charlottetown.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the grant to the marine school in Montreal ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I think it was $500. It is paid out of this item, and is for the purpose of furnishing the rooms and paying the rent of the rooms.

Removal of obstructions in navigable rivers, $10,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The regular amount asked for by the department for years has been $1,000, but last year the appropriation was increased to $10,000, for the removal of a sunken grain elevator at section 27, Montreal harbour, and also for the removal of an obstruction of logs in Oxstall river, B.C., so that salmon could ascend the river. The cost of raising the sunken elevator at Montreal has been paid to the Montreal Harbour Commissioners by the company that owned the elevator, so that the department has been put to no expense in the matter. With reference to the obstruction in Oxstall river, B.C., and also the obstruction in Copper river, B.C., these obstructions are caused by logs in the rivers, preventing the fish ascending. The estimated cost is $1,000 each. This appropriation can now be reduced by $5,000. There are other obstructions reported from British Columbia. At the time the main estimates were prepared I thought we might require $10,000, but I will now move that the amount be reduced to $5,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Then there must be a misprint in the report of the minister, because if he looks at page 17, he will find that it states that the amount granted last year was $1,000, whereas as a matter of fact it was $10,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That must be a misprint.

Motion was agreed to.

Mr. ALCORN. I wish to draw the attention of the minister to the fact that I had some correspondence with him last summer in reference to a request for three lighthouses to be placed in the Bay of Quinte, and I think the answer I got was that the finances of the department would not permit it to be done that season. May I ask the minister to make a note of the matter now, so that in the coming season it may receive attention. These lights are highly necessary.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I will give instructions.

Tidal service, including the salary of an assistant clerk beyond $500, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $28,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The increase seems to be for appliances for surveys and for maintenance of vessels. The principal tidal stations maintained in continuous operation day and night throughout the year were : Quebec, Father Point, for the St. Lawrence river ; St. Paul's Island, at the entrance to the Gulf of St. Lawrence ; Halifax, for the Atlantic coast and Nova Scotia ; St. John, N.B., and Yarmouth, N.S., for the Bay of Fundy ; Forteau Bay, in Belle Isle Strait ; Sand Heads, B.C., for the Gulf of Georgia, Vancouver, &c. The secondary tidal stations are : Victoria, B.C., for additional information ; Bamfield and Port Simpson, B.C., Charlottetown, P.E.I.; Pictou, N.S., Souris, P.E.I.; and Trepassey, at Cape Race, Newfoundland, for comparison with currents 1902. The record obtained from the above gauges is reduced, hour by hour, throughout the year, in the tidal survey office. This reduction is submitted to an analysis in the Nautical Almanac Office, London, where the tide tables are calculated by means of a calculating machine specially devised for tidal purposes. This analysis brings the tides into direct relation to the movements of the sun and moon, and eventually forms a basis for the calculation of the tide for all time to come, so long as the oceans and continents remain as they are. It is thus work of the most permanent value which can be undertaken. During the past 12 months, eight complete years from Father Point, St. Paul's Island and Halifax have been thus treated, and six more years are now in hand, which will serve to improve the accuracy of the tidal tables for Quebec, Father Point and St. John, N.B.

Winter mail service, $9,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This is to provide for an ice-boat during the winter between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. When did this service begin during the present season and how many trips have been made.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The service began on January 27th, 1905 and has continued, with some intermissions, up to the present, and I have here a statement showing the number of trips made and the delays that occurred which I will pass over to my hon. friend.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Before this item passes I wish to make a few remarks in reference to the manner in which this service has been conducted this season. The hon. minister has just told us that it commenced on the 27th of January, 1905, and that, with some intermissions of a week at a time, it has gone on up to the present. On the 24th of January last, the trips of the 'Minto' and 'Stanley' ceased, and the only communication between the mainland and Prince Edward Island since then has been by this antiquated system of ice-boats—a

system which was in vogue seventy-five years ago. You are aware, Sir, that when Prince Edward Island entered confederation, one of the provisions of the agreement was that efficient steam communication would be provided by the Dominion for the conveyance of mails and passengers from the island to the mainland and back at all times winter and summer. Well, in no winter season since confederation have the interruptions to this service been so great as during the present winter. These have caused a great deal of inconvenience and loss to the travelling public, and in that connection I want to draw the attention of the minister to this fact. Travellers upon the railway going to Pictou or Cape Tormentine are entitled to receive information either at Moncton or St. John as to the conditions of the service at those points. But nearly every traveller on that road complains that he cannot get any information whatever, or that when information is given him it is misleading, and he is put to extra trouble and expense in order to retrace his steps. As I have said, this is a serious matter for the people of the island. From year to year it has been brought up in this House and from day to day during this session, but is treated as lightly by the present government as it has been by preceding governments. I would like to read a letter which I received yesterday, and which shows the manenr in which the people of the island consider this matter. This is a private letter but I am at liberty to read it to this House and with your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, I shall proceed to do so :

Charlottetown, P.E.I., 6th March, 1905.

Dear Sir,—In view of the blockade of steamers, trains and mails, it would seem to be important that our representatives should make energetic remonstrances in both Houses as to the non-fulfilment of the bond for continuous steam communication with the mainland. The Dominion enforces the union bond to the letter where the terms can be construed against us, and has in that way taken away one-third of the representation which we thought we had for all time. We have been now forty days without a steamer from the mainland. The ice boat service brings us an occasional mail of letters, one two or three weeks old. As for newspapers, they are frequently a month old before they reach us. And there are now tons upon tons of newspaper mail from a month to six weeks old piled up on the other side of the straits awaiting transmission to the island. It would be easy to have sufficient ice boats to bring these papers over. What is the good of a newspaper a month or six weeks old ? And yet thousands of island subscribers to the Montreal 'Star,' Toronto 'Globe,' and other papers printed in Canadian or American cities are left in that position, with island cattle literally starving for want of the hay that is detained at Pictou. The conditions are intolerable. As surely as the sun rises there will grow up an agitation to break out of the union if these things are not remedied. The history of the Tenant League shows what our people can and will do when aroused. At present the bond of union with Canada is looked upon as a galling fetter, a bond of slavery and injustice, and so far as we can see nothing doing, nothing planned to make things any better. A more powerful winter steamer is a first prime requisite till we get the tunnel. I hope you and your fellow representatives in the House and Senate will urge this on the government with all your force. If nothing is done the people of Prince Edward Island will very shortly lay their grievances at the foot of the Throne and demand the abrogation of the union. Certain it is that with all we are paying in federal taxes we would be better out of the union than in it unless the Dominion carries out its contract to give us constant communication. I do not care for my name to be used, but otherwise you can make whatever use you like of this letter.

Every word of this letter, Mr. Chairman, is true. A solemn bond was made with the island, and the Dominion government enforces that bond to the letter when it operates in its favour. It is true that a year or two ago a sort of settlement was made for the lack of communication during some previous years up to 1902, whereby the government of Prince Edward Island receives $30,000 a year for all time to come. But what is the government of Canada going to do to-day ? There were on the 6th of March last between two and three thousand bags of mail matter at Cape Tormentine and Pictou. I took the trouble yesterday to telegraph the president of the Board of Trade in Charlottetown as to the present conditions. In the meantime, between the date of this letter and the 15th of March, an attempt was made to take this mail matter across to the island, and I believe they reduced it by something like 1,000 bags, but the president of the Board of Trade telegraphed me yesterday as follows :

Eight hundred to one thousand bags of mail at Pictou. Papers and samples of goods accumulating since January 27th. Also one hundred and eighty-five bags at Tormentine.

On the 28th January what was the situation at Cape Tormentine ? The government were not in a position to carry the mails and passengers from Cape Tormentine to Prince Edward Island. They had only four boats. I was there on the 28th January last and saw the situation. I saw a boat hanging up in the boat house, and I asked the man in charge there why this boat was not put ino the service. I was told that there were a number of boats owned by private individuals whose services could be obtained if the government desired them. They told me that in order to have outside boats employed it was necessary first to telegraph to the postmaster of the city of Charlottetown, and that he in turn would have to telegraph to the minister in Ottawa. Under conditions as pressing as those which I witnessed on January 27th, I think it was ridiculous that such red tape was necessary. On some occasions there were something like eighty-five

passengers there trying to get across with no boats. Men who own boats there offered to put them in the service of the government to make the round trip for $25 and to furnish all the men. The answer was that the government would not employ any boat except the boats they themselves owned. What has been the consequence? The consequence has been that the business of Prince Edward Island has been imperilled to a great extent. It is true that the Postmaster General, a few days ago, stated that the mail matter which was there was simply commercial. Commercial matter in Prince Edward Island did not make any difference. Commercial matter in the district which the Postmaster General represents would be a matter of great interest to him in his business, but when the difficulty is in Prince Edward Island it does not make any difference; these people live away down in the east and come here year after year to air their grievances. I know that the people of Prince Edward Island are not going to come here many more years to ask to have these grievances remedied. Here is a grievance that could have been remedied by the payment out of the public treasury of a few dollars of public money. The government could have got ten, fifteen or twenty boats to carry the mails over, but they were so near and parsimonious that they refused to employ any boat except the four, five or six boats which they own themselves. It is all very well for the minister to laugh. I have heard of ministers laughing over this situation before, but it is a serious matter for the people of Prince Edward Island, and I wish to impress on the government that this should not occur again; and if it does occur, they will hear more strongly from the people of Prince Edward Island than I am speaking to the House to-day. A mass meeting of delegates from every section of the province of Prince Edward Island met in Charlottetown on the 10th day of March instant in order to bring this matter properly before the parliament of Canada, and at that meeting, which was attended by representative men from one end of Prince Edward Island to another, a resolution was passed. I shall read that resolution to this House as it appears in the 'Island' newspapers of the 11th day of March:

> Whereas, this province of Prince Edward Island entered the Canadian federation under these explicit terms as to communication, 'efficient steam-service for the conveyance of mails and passengers to be established and maintained between the Island and the Dominion, winter and summer, thus placing the Island in continuous communication with the Intercolonial Railway and the railway system of the Dominion.'
>
> And whereas these terms have not been fulfilled, to the great hardship of the people and detriment of the province.
>
> And whereas a tunnel under the straits from Carleton Head Cove to Money Point, as already surveyed and reported on by Sir Douglas Fox, is a possible impletion of said terms of confederation.
>
> Therefore resolved that this meeting of the people of Princ Edward Island in general convention assembled do hereby call upon the federal government to fulfil the said terms of the union forthwith by causing such tunnel to be constructed at the earliest possible moment.
>
> And further resolved that pending the construction of such tunnel we demand the daily communication by navigation by the construction and operation of a third powerful steamer of the most approved ice-breaking type, and that one of the steamers be used on the western route in winter.
>
> Resolved that the provincial government be, and is hereby requested to urge incessantly on the federal government the absolute necessity of impleting the terms of confederation and further
>
> Resolved that our claims for compensation for the non-fulfilment of such terms be yearly served upon the federal authorities.

Here is a plain statement of the case of Prince Edward Island, so far as the present situation is concerned. What do we find? We find that the two boats which ply between Charlottetown and Pictou ceased running on the 24th day of January, and they have not yet resumed their trips. These boats are filled with hay and other goods. I understand that between Toronto and Pictou there are over 350 cars of goods to be taken over to Prince Edward Island. As this letter to me states, during last season there was a shortage of hay in the province, and that hay which is necessary for the maintenance of the animals on that island is at Pictou and cannot be taken over. Why? Because the government have not provided a steamer of sufficient power to break through the ice. I will be told probably to-night that the steamers which are there are powerful enough and as large as is necessary in order to properly do the work. But what do we find when we go to the Mackinaw straits, where the ice is just as thick and the conditions as bad as between Pictou and Prince Edward Island? We find there car ferry steamers 400 feet long, the 'St. Ignace' and the 'Ste. Marie.' These are boats of the same style as the 'Ermaak' in Russia, and go through ice four, five and six feet thick without any trouble, and they never make a miss. If we had boats of similar construction, boats of similar power, probably this situation, as it exists to-day, would not have occurred. I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) to take this matter into his serious consideration. When this matter has been brought up year after year in this House it has been passed upon very lightly. I may tell the minister that we in Prince Edward Island pay one-fiftieth part of the revenues which are collected from the population of Canada, which is something like $70,000,000, so that we pay into the public treasury about $1,500,000. What do we get in return? Not half of that amount, including the construction of the little bit of railway which

they gave us a few years ago ; and still, if we come here and ask for justice, ask for the fulfilment of the terms of the solemn contract made between the Dominion and the island when we entered confederation, we are told : We will consider the matter. In 1903 we were told that it would be a matter of consideration whether a third winter boat would be built or not. I suppose that matter is still under consideration. This matter has been brought to the attention of the minister by my colleagues from the island and by myself, and I think that the government are now in possession of all the facts of the case. The serious conditions which exist there are apparent to them and to every man in this House and to every man in Canada. This does not affect the business interest of the people of Prince Edward Island only, it affects the business interests in Toronto, Hamilton, Montreal and all the manufacturing centres in Ontario and Quebec, but still this matter is left with the members of Prince Edward Island. I would ask to-night the assistance of those gentlemen whose interests are the same as mine, and as the interests of the business men and farmers of the province of Prince Edward Island, I would ask them to come to the rescue of that province and to endeavour to obtain for that province justice from the government of Canada. It is no small matter for the people of Prince Edward Island to be shut up there for two months, as they have been this present season, without any communication. This matter, as I said before, is treated lightly ; it has been treated too lightly, and I want to impress upon the Minister of Marine (Mr. Préfontaine) that it is his duty to lose not one moment in making a contract for the construction of a third winter boat. What will be the situation next year if the contract is not let at once ? I understand that before the model of the present boat was made no effort was made to discover what would be the proper model of a boat for that service. I would direct the attention of the minister to the construction of the boats at Mackinaw, and I think that if none of his officers have seen these boats and their operations—and I understand that none of them have—it would be his duty to send a man up to the Mackinaw straits ; and if he cannot get the information there, he might be sent to the centres in Russia, where these powerful boats are in use, boats which break through ice fourteen and fifteen feet thick, and keep up constant communication with the outside world from such ice-bound ports as Cronstadt and other ports in Russia.

Now, Mr. Chairman, before this item is carried I would like to direct the attention of the minister to the fact that these boats which are used at the capes in the service to-day weigh something like 1,000 pounds each in weight. There are three men on each side to row and pull, six men to each boat, and these boats can only carry 350 pounds of mail. On nearly every occasion in which the mails come down there are only four boats at Cape Tormentine, and they can only take half the mail which reaches that centre. That is not as it should be. There should be a sufficient number of boats to take every pound of mail that comes to Cape Tormentine, and the same condition should apply to Cape Traverse. The service has not been properly kept up this season. It was not equipped in time, and by reason of the neglect of the government the people of Prince Edward Island have suffered a serious wrong and injury, particularly the farmers and business men. Let me give the minister one instance. During the months of December and January when these steamers were running, something like 16,500 dead hogs came over on these boats, But when the boats stopped running what was the situation ? The farmers had to stop killing their hogs and go on feeding them. You can understand what a great amount of money was expended by the people of Prince Edward Island in feeding these animals which, if the boats had been running properly, they would have taken to market. Contracts were made by the dealers in fish, in meats and other commodities with the merchants of the provinces of Quebec, of Manitoba, and all these contracts had to to be cancelled. Take the fresh fish industry alone. From the steamer 'Stanley,' at the wharf in Georgetown, I am told something like 10 tons of fresh fish was thrown overboard, and the fish industry, by reason of the fact that there were no steamers there to carry this fish to market, was very seriously injured, and all the fish which was caught was thrown into cattle pens as manure. Why, Sir, I could stand here talking for hours on the injury that our people are suffering. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows the conditions just as well as I do, and it is not necessary that I should detail them any further. What we want him to do at the present time is to give a contract as soon as possible for the construction of a third winter steamer, one with twice the power possessed by either of the steamers now on the route. Then let us have what the people asked for the other day, let us have a tunnel. In my opinion that is the only proper solution of the difficulty, and it is a solution that the people of Canada owe to the people of Prince Edward Island. The agreement is made. The people of Canada must fulfil this contract, they must fulfil it to the letter. When a bridge was being constructed across the Hillsborough river two or three years ago the government of Canada said, yes, we will build a bridge if the people of Prince Edward Island will contribute one-half the cost, and we did it. We knew that we were entitled to that bridge without any

payment from our province, but in order to get the bridge we agree to contribute one-half of the estimated cost, and we are now contributing over $9,000 a year for all time to come for the construction and maintenance of that bridge. Now I suppose if the people made an offer to the minister to pay one-half the cost of another steamer he would give out the contract to-morrow. But I want to tell him that the people of Prince Edward Island are not going to make such an offer as that. It is our due to have that steamer at once ; and I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I would also ask the Minister of Finance who lives in the maritime provinces, a gentleman who I know has the interests of the maritime provinces at heart—I would ask him also to take this matter up and fulfil speedily the terms on which Prince Edward Island entered the confederation.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. The question raised by the junior member for Queen's Prince Edward Island (Mr. A. A. McLean) is one of vital importance to the province, and also affects the adjacent provinces with which we do the chief part of our trade. A few days ago the island members arranged to bring this matter up on Monday next, when the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) will move a motion he has on the Order Paper. But my hon. friend from Queen's, for some reason or other, has seen fit to bring it up to-night, consequently I will not go into the matter as fully as I intend to do when the motion is moved on Monday next. I may say, however, at present, that the conditions on Prince Edward Island and in the maritime provinces are unusual particularly so on Prince Edward Island. There is practically a famine there to-day in cattle feed. There is a large quantity of hay at Pictou, only a few miles distant, some hundreds of tons I believe, that were brought down there last fall, but we cannot get this hay over, and the cattle are dying by thousands, according to the information we receive. This is a serious condition of affairs. I am also told that many farmers are killing part of their stock in order to save the rest. Our business on the island is chiefly dairying and hog raising. But the dairying industry is probably crippled for years because of the present famine. Of course we cannot blame the government for the scarcity of feed, nor can we blame the government for the unusual severity of the winter. But there is perhaps some blame attaching to some one because there are not more powerful steamers on the Straits of Northumberland, steamers that could keep the passage open, and that could bring over this hay. I understand, from reading the terms of union, that the goverment is not bound to carry freight, but they are bound to provide a continuous communication for passengers and mails. Such a communication I am bound to say has never been carried out to the letter. That agreement was made at the time the province of Prince Edward Island came into the union. Some of our friends in the other provinces think perhaps it was more than fair ; I think I have heard the statement from gentlemen in this House that the government of the Dominion of Canada have been generous towards Prince Edward Island. We entertain a different opinion with regard to that matter, and particularly with regard to this question of communication. Now I want to state that I think the government will have to consider this matter seriously.

While the conditions this year are unusual as far as the snowfall is concerned they have not been very unusual in so far as the frost is concerned. Consequently I am afraid that the ice conditions in the Straits of Northumberland are not much worse this winter than they will be in other winters, and if the steamers we now have there have been unable to keep up communication this winter they will in all probability be unable to do so for the years to come. Certainly the condition of things that we have had this winter should not be permitted to continue. I may say that when the people of Prince Edward Island were invited to link their fortunes with their brethren in this part of the world and join the confederation, there was no argument held out to them that appealed so strongly as this, namely, that their isolation would be overcome, that the disadvantages and difficulties under which they were placed, because of their insular position would be things of the past, and that they would have continuous and efficient communication by means of the Intercolonial Railway and other railway systems with the rest of the Dominion. Well, we have not had that, according to our way of thinking at all events, and when I go into this matter a little more thoroughly as I intend to do on Monday next, when this matter will come up again, I think I will be able to prove that contention. That is all I have to say at present on the matter. I just desire to suggest to the government that this is a matter that requires very serious consideration particularly on the part of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The matter that has been brought to our attention by my hon. friend from Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. McLean)——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Louder.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. You will hear me presently if you keep quiet. The matter that has been called to our attention by my hon. friend from Queen's is one that demands the consideration of the committee. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, the hon. member for King's (Mr. Hughes), could not see his way to going so far against the government as to back up my hon. friend from Queen's in the

way he should have done. I think the situation that my hon. friend has depicted is quite serious enough, and there seems to be a disposition on the part of this government to treat this small province without justice. If there has been a bargain made, and there appears to have been such at confederation that uninterrupted communication should continue between the main line and the island during the winter, it is certainly a very serious thing that the farmers of the island should to-day be in the position of seeing their animals starving to death because of the lack of fodder. I believe that to be an actual fact. I saw in the press a few days ago that animals on the island were starving to death for the lack of hay and other fodder which is now on the mainland and which cannot be carried over owing to the break down in the transportation arrangements. Surely, if there has been an agreement entered into between the Dominion government and Prince Edward Island, it should be carried out. If the island is expected to carry out its obligations to the Dominion it is not reasonable for us, being a much stronger body, being as it were almost an overshadowing power, to cripple this poor small territory, comparatively speaking and to deny it the justice that it undoubtedly merits at our hands. I am sure that the appeal that has been made by my hon. friend from Queen's is such that it must touch the sympathies of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. There is a real hardship being endured in Prince Edward Island. The people are being robbed of their hard earned means by reason of the failure of this government to carry out the obligation that they are called upon to carry out. It is useless to say that it is going to cost too much and that the business will not stand it. That is not the question. If we have entered into an obligation with the population of Prince Edward Island to keep communication open during the winter then undoubtedly we are bound to do it. I think that no hon. gentleman on either side of this House should say that the island is too small to receive our consideration. The matter of transportation between the mainland and the island is one of sufficient importance to demand that this House shall give it its best consideration. I trust that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Prefontaine) will have something more to propose than the taking of this question into his serious consideration. My hon. friend from Queen's has asked him, I think with great force and with great justice, to see to it that communication is immediately established. If you cannot run a boat through the ice you must run one over the ice. You must run ice boats. If you cannot run them over, run them under as an hon. gentleman suggests. I think the hon. minister has submarine boats.. The 'Lady Laurier' was a submarine boat for a short time as we heard to-day. If you cannot get over the ice you must get under the ice and if you cannot get under the ice by means of a boat you must get under it by means of a tunnel. There are various ways of overcoming these difficulties, and we must see to it that this small piece of territory receives justice at the hands of this Dominion. We have entered into an obligation. We have asked them to fulfil their obligations. Why is it that the obligation of the Dominion government towards Prince Edward Island has not been carried out? It is very detrimental to business interests at large, an injustice is being committed against the people of the island and I do trust that the appeal of my hon. friend from Queen's will not fall upon deaf ears to-night. I think it is the duty of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to see to it that communication is established and maintained in a way different from that which has heretofore prevailed. Almost ever since the House met in January we have day after day had this question brought before us and there appears to be no remedy, Hon. gentlemen opposite say they cannot control the weather. We know they cannot control the weather, but these difficulties can and have been overcome and there is no difficulty that cannot be overcome if proper means are adopted. I think it is to be regretted that hon. gentlemen should sit there and be muzzled when an appeal such as that which has been made by my hon. friend from Queen's is being addressed to the government. The hon. member for King's appears to have handled this question with kid gloves. I do not know whether his constituents will approve of that or not. I think it was his duty as a representative of that island to say whether or not the statement of the circumstances given by my hon. friend from Queen's is correct, whether the appeal is just or right and if it is just and right it is the duty of the hon. member for King's to get up and say to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that communication should be opened and kept open and that the island should not be starved out. I think it is not right that we should cripple a small and feeble province. If we ask them to carry out their obligations surely it becomes us to carry out ours. I trust that these obligations will not be lightly set aside.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Louder.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. You are hearing, now, are you not?

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Not hearing?

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Well, you have a pretty dull understanding. You apparently are not open to have the truth enter.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Order.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I think I am quite in order.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Address the chair.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I think I am in order. I have a right to be heard in this House as well as other hon. gentlemen. If any hon. gentleman wishes later to go into this question it is open to him to do so. I am endeavouring to show to hon. gentlemen opposite that it is their duty to remove this cause of complaint which is backed up by truth and justice, and I say that hon. gentlemen in this House, be they on that side or this side, should join with the oppressed, with those who are suffering, and see that a sufficient measure is brought down to enable the government to carry out their obligations to the people of this little province. I do think it is time that hon. gentlemen opposite listened to the cry from Queen's and other parts of the island of Prince Edward. Day after day the Postmaster General has told us that the mails cannot be got across to the island, and now we hear from the Minister of Marine that he cannot get his boats across with supplies to keep the animals on the island from starvation—probably we will soon hear that the men, women and children may be lacking supplies as well, for all we know. It is the duty of the government to see to it that the obligations which rest upon the Dominion in connection with Prince Edward Island should be carried out quickly and effectively. It is their duty to see that Canada carries out the terms upon which Prince Edward Island came into the confederation. I hope the appeal of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. McLean) will not longer fall on deaf ears, and that something will be done by the government to rectify this grievance.

Mr. MACDONALD. I do not know that my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. McLean) who initiated this discussion, can congratulate himself upon the assistance which the hon. member from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) probably thought he was rendering the cause of Prince Edward Island. This hon. member (Mr. Cockshutt) seems to have taken everybody in this country under his wing from the wildman of the west, down through the other provinces of the Dominion, to the people of the little island province by the sea. But, before he entered on this discussion it would have been perhaps wise on his part had he informed himself as to what the present government has done in the matter of carrying out the terms of confederation with Prince Edward Island. My hon. friend from Brantford was so anxious to attack the present government, that he altogether lost sight of the fact that for eighteen years his Conservative friends were in power, and that all they did was to furnish one boat to solve this problem of winter communication, whereas the present government has furnished an additional boat much better adapted for the service than the single boat which plied in former years. For the past six or seven years, the ferry service to Prince Edward Island have been performed by these two steamers in a fairly satisfactory way, as every unprejudiced man in the maritime provinces will admit. But, this winter has been an abnormaly severe one in the history of the maritime provinces, and even those of us who live on the mainland have suffered great inconvenience. Even so we do not think there is anything in that to justify this scold from our hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt). I presume that if any objection should be raised to the government carrying hay on the Intercolonial Railway in order to relieve the fodder famine which existed in eastern Nova Scotia, the member for Brantford will not be found criticising the government on that account. We have had some indications that gentlemen on the opposite benches intend to condemn the government for their action in that respect, and now that the member for Brantford has become the champion of the people of Prince Edward Island, I trust he will champion the people on the mainland who laboured under similar stress. When this question comes up, if it should come up, I hope the hon. gentleman will be found disassociating himself from his party friends. I think my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. McLean) will agree with me that the climatic conditions in the maritime provinces were abnormal this winter, and that being so it is unfair to charge the government with neglect. It will be conceded by every hon. gentleman who understands the matter, that the solution of the problem of winter navigation must be worked out in face of the variable conditions as they exist from year to year. I have no doubt there is distress in Prince Edward Island, I am sorry it should be so; but, it is not fair to argue that because of that we should have a steamer that will accomplish wonderful things and overcome the forces of nature. Such talk as that will not settle the question. The hon. member from Queen's (Mr. Martin) has been threatening the House day after day that he will produce telegrams complaining that the people of Prince Edward Island have not had a regular mail delivery, but I may tell him that we in Nova Scotia have had the same difficulty with our mail service although we have not cried out about it so vociferously, because we have been fair enough to see that the extremely severe winter was the cause of this inconvenience. Living in a contiguous province, I am interested in

Prince Edward Island, and I desire to see the question of winter navigation satisfactorily solved, but I can quite see that my hon. friend from the island province (Mr. McLean) is not going to help his case in the slightest degree by hysterical appeals because of peculiar conditions existing this winter, which were due to the abnormal severity of the weather, and which it was difficult if not impossible for human ingenuity to overcome.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Judging by the manner in which the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) approached this question, it is quite evident that it was not his desire to help the people of Prince Edward Island, but rather to try and make a political question out of it. I can tell him that the people of Prince Edward Island do not want anything of that kind, and if that is the only kind of assistance the member for Brantford can give us we would much rather be without his help. This is not a political question at all, and we do not want to get it into politics. But, since the policy of the two political parties has been referred to, it is nevertheless a fact that since the Liberal government came to power in 1896, we have had a better service to the island than we ever had before. We have two steamers now when previously we only had one, and I may say that all the other branches of the public service have been greatly improved under the Liberal regime. We believe, however, that the existing conditions can be further improved, but as has been already said there is no need for approaching this question in an hysterical manner or for making any extreme or rabid statements. I am quite convinced, judging by the remarks of the hon. member for Brantford, that he does not understand the question at all although he doubtless knows something about the aborigines in his own part of the country, and we know that he is exceedingly willing to air his views before the House upon every possible occasion. He has been good enough to lecture me on my duties as a representative from Prince Edward Island. Well, I do not claim any particular ability, but I do think that I endeavour to do my duty towards the people of my constituency and the people of my province, and when I think I need a lecture from the member from Brantford I will be humble enough to ask him for it.

An hon. MEMBER. You will not get much information from him.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES Perhaps not. We in the island province are anxious to have the assistance of every member in this House of Commons, and we will be thankful for it provided that whoever should be good enough to assist us shall show by his manner and disposition a real desire to advance our prosperity. I am sorry to think that the manner and the method of the gentleman from Brantford did not indicate that such was his object this evening. I may tell him that an hon. gentleman who occupies a prominent position on his side of the House has repeatedly stated that Prince Edward Island was getting too much. I do not know that that gentleman represents the opinion of our friends on the other side of the House, and I hope he does not.

Mr. INGRAM. To whom does the hon. gentleman refer?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. He is not present to-night and I would prefer not to mention his name, unless my hon friend (Mr. Ingram) insists that I should.

Mr. INGRAM. It would be just as well to mention his name so that he may be in a position to defend himself if he wishes to.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I refer to the former Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Haggart).

Mr. INGRAM. He is able to answer for himself.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I may say that the conditions this winter are abnormal. I hope we shall not have another winter like it for many years to come. I may state that the three representatives from Prince Edward Island who are here now had arranged to bring this matter up on Monday next and go into it thoroughly. We hope to have a representative House on that occasion, and I have asked the Minister of Marine to be present. I did not expect that the subject would come up to-night.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. As the hon. member for Queen's alluded to myself, he will perhaps permit me to say that he drew a somewhat erroneous impression from what I said. He said that I had explained that the detained mails from the mainland consisted only of merchandise and papers, and that while I might think that merchandise and papers were important to other parts of Canada, I evidently thought the people of Prince Edward Island had no desire to obtain merchandise and papers. If the hon. gentleman refers to my remarks, he will find that I did not speak of the articles detained in any such spirit. I stated as a simple fact that we had endeavoured to transport to the island the mails, but not being able to send them all, we had sent the letters and newspapers addressed to individuals, while the class of mail that we thought the people could, with the least inconvenience do without was the merchandise and the unaddressed newspapers ; but I certainly said nothing to indicate that I did not think the island was as anxious to

obtain its merchandise as all other parts of this country would be. With that exception I thought the hon. member for Queen's presented his case fairly and well from his standpoint, and I think we are prepared to give him credit for that. The only gentleman who seemed to think that the hon. member for Queen's could not plead his own case sufficiently well was the hon. member for Brantford, and he may be right and all the rest of us wrong. My hon. friend suggested that the true way to solve this problem is to construct a tunnel. Perhaps that is so. The question then becomes a question of cost. Can the hon. gentleman say offhand what the cost of a tunnel would be? I believe there have been estimates. He said that the island had with business enterprise contributed towards the cost of the Hillsboro' bridge. Perhaps the island would be prepared to join with the Dominion in a like spirit and in contributing in the same proportion towards the construction of a tunnel. If so, we would be approaching the subject in a practical way.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I am very glad that the Postmaster General has put the case as he has with respect to the manner in which this matter was brought up by me. It was not my intention to deal with it as a political question at all. The contract which I read to the House was clear and distinct, that the government of Canada should furnish communication winter and summer for mails and passengers. This they have not done. So far as the tunnel is concerned, that was before this House before, and I believe an estimate was made by Sir Douglas Fox. I do not remember what the estimate was. It can be found, I suppose, in 'Hansard.' But we think we have a contract with the government of Canada which is enforceable, and we wish to enfore the contract against them. I believe it is the duty of the government of Canada to obtain an estimate of what the tunnel will cost, and it is not the duty of the people of Prince Edward Island to contribute one cent towards the fulfilment of a contract which should be fulfilled by the government of Canada.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My hon. friend misunderstands me. I understood him to suggest as an alternative that there should be a tunnel. There is no contract, as I understand, on the part of the government of Canada to build a tunnel. The contract is to maintain steam communication. Does the hon. gentlemen think that it is possible to maintain unbroken steamship communication between the island and the mainland across the straits at all seasons of the winter, with all the appliances that can be brought to bear? What thickness of ice forms there?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I am asking simply that the government of Canada fulfil their contract.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I ask the hon. gentleman as a lawyer if he thinks it is possible to carry out the contract specifically in all its details?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I know it is, or the government of Canada would not have made the contract. They must have known that it could be carried out, and I think the men in the government of Canada at that time were business men enough to know that that contract would be enforced against them.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman may be perfectly right. I speak from lack of information—what is the thickness of ice that at times has to be broken in order that the steamer may cross the straits? Does the hon. gentleman know?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I do not know. Perhaps the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would be able to tell. That would be part of his duty. I have crossed the straits, but I never made a study of that matter. But the matter that I have studied very much is this, that the government of Canada have not fulfilled their contract. That is something I know as a positive fact, and I know that if the government of Canada spend money enough, they can fulfil that contract, and it is their duty to fulfil it, no matter what it costs. We were told years ago that the contract they made with British Columbia could not be fulfilled; but it was fulfilled. We were told that it would take the whole resources of the British Empire to fulfil it. It did not, and the undertaking is a paying enterprise to-day. We might as well say that if it took the whole resources of the Dominion of Canada, it is the duty of the government of Canada to fulfil that contract. If a tunnel were built, I believe the value of the farm lands of Prince Edward Island would be increased one-half. What is the amount of money expended on the present service? The interest on the winter boats is about $8,000; wear and tear, about $20,000; running expenses, about $75,000; average deficit on the Prince Edward Island Railway, about $90,000; subsidy to summer steamers, about $12,500, ice-boat service, about $8,000. There would be $210,000, which you would strike off the account if you built a tunnel. Suppose it cost $15,000,000. What would that be at 3 per cent, at which rate this government can borrow money? It would be something like $450,000 a year. You would have then only $240,000 a year for the government to supply, and the extra trade which would be brought by that route would amply repay the government for that expenditure.

Mr. FIELDING. Any argument based upon the general view that we should improve transportation facilities in any part of Canada would be deserving of our consideration and attention; and if, owing to

the isolated condition of the island, we find it necessary to do something more in order to improve her communications, by all means let us try to do it, and any reasonable argument to that end may well be brought before the House. But since my hon. friend put it entirely on the ground of a contract, I wish to say that no such contract exists which has not been fulfilled to the letter. Every contract made with the people of Prince Edward Island has been fulfilled. If there be any doubt upon the point, you have only to look to the statute of several years ago when, in consequence of the difference of opinion said to exist, an allowance was made, the amount of which, it was distinctly declared in that statute, was to be in full and final settlement of the terms of union. Let my hon. friend put this thing on a fair ground. There is no portion of this Dominion which has been more liberally treated—I do not say too liberally—in the distribution of public money for some years past than the province of Prince Edward Island. Let our friends recognize that fact and not come before the House in a complaining spirit and say they have not been treated justly. Let them put their claim on the other ground, on the ground that the world is moving, and that they should have the benefit of better ships, if better ships are built. Any argument of that kind will have my warm sympathy. Anything in reason which can be done to improve communication between the island and the mainland will have my hearty sympathy and support; but I do hope that the case is not to be put before the House of Commons for ever on this old ground that the terms of union have not been fulfilled, because there is no justification for any such statement.

Mr. W. ROCHE. An observation has just been made by my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) to which I wish to call attention, and that observation revived a remark or two made this afternoon in the course of the debate at which I was not present. I regret I had not the opportunity then to refer to the same observations made by the hon. member for St. Antoine division of Montreal (Mr. Ames) and which were endorsed, I am informed, by my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson). These gentlemen alluded to the immense number of electors in the city of Halifax who apparently had emanated from the steamer 'Lady Laurier.' My hon. friend from Halton, I am informed, said there were some ninety-five seamen of the steamer 'Lady Laurier' represented as electors and as having their domicile in that steamer. My hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) alluded to that just now in a jocular and somewhat sneering way. To relieve the apprehensions of my hon. friend from Halton, and to some extent prevent those apprehensions being communicated to my hon. friend from Brantford, I shall read a list of the electors on the 'Lady Laurier' irrespective of the officers. The officers are householders and well known and entitled to vote on their own holdings.

Names on electoral list of Halifax having address SS. 'Lady Laurier':
Sullivan, Jasper, 3c.
Goodwin, A. G., 4a.
Blois, J., 5a.
Calderwood, J. W., 5a.
Gallagher, S., 5a.
Jones, M., 5a.
Mitchell, E., 5a.
Nicholson, A., 5a.
Pelletier, E., 5a.
Pelletier, E. S., 5a.

Ten in all. These are the men in buckram to whom my hon. friend from Halton alluded this afternoon. He only multiplied the number by nine, and I have no doubt his mind will be greatly relieved to know the exact number of electors of the city of Halifax who were on the books of the steamer 'Lady Laurier' at the expense of our great and growing and common country.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I regret that I cannot agree exactly with my hon friend the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) In his statement that the Dominion government had entered into no obligation.

Mr. FIELDING. I said they had fulfilled the obligation.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I think this was the statement, that the Dominion government had entered into no obligation with the province of Prince Edward Island which it had not carried out to the letter.

Mr. FIELDING. That is right.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Let me mention one fact which disproves that statement. In 1901, this parliament granted to Prince Edward Island a subsidy in perpetuity of $30,000 a year, equal to $1,000,000, as compensation for the non-fulfilment of the terms of the union up to that time

Mr. FIELDING. That is the compensation.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I understood my hon friend to mean that the terms of the union had been carried out all along, whereas a money payment had to be made as compensation because of the non-fulfilment of the terms of the union.

Mr. FIELDING. And was paid.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Here is the clause:

That the Dominion government shall assume and defray all the charges for the following services.

Then there is a list of the services and among them we find this one :

Continuous efficient steam service for the conveyance of mails and passengers to be established and maintained between the Island and the mainland, winter and summer.

Thus placing the island in continuous communication with the Intercolonial Railway and the railway system of the Dominion. But we have not enjoyed that continuous communication during this winter for forty-four or forty-five days. I agree with the Minister of Finance that we need not put our claim in legal form. I hope that the people of Canada will be prepared at any time to treat every province in a fair and generous spirit and that we need not go to law for redress. I agree with my hon. friend that we should not put our claim on that basis until every other means have been exhausted. I would rather put it on a commercial basis and appeal to the good sense, the commercial instincts and the generous and fair impulses of the members of parliament and the people of the Dominion as a whole, and I believe that we shall not have to make that appeal in vain. The conditions on the island this year and a year or two ago have been practically intolerable, particularly this year. And if some steps be not taken to provide a more powerful ice boat, these conditions will be met with again. I have a sugestion to make, which I would make now as there are some members here to-night who will not be here on Monday. I think my hon. friend the Postmaster General asked if any boat could be built which could overcome the difficulties of winter navigation in the Northumberland straits. Well, in the 'Scientific American' I read a few weeks ago, the statement that the 'Ermaak' could meet and successfully overcome an ice pack of from 20 to 35 feet in thickness. If that statement be true, a vessel of the strength and power of the 'Ermaak' or perhaps a less powerful boat, would be able to meet and overcome all the ice packs between the island and the mainland.

An hon. gentleman asked me what is the thickest ice we ever have. I do not know, but I presume the captains who have been crossing there for so many years would be able to give a full and complete answer to that question. I presume there is no ice in the straits of Northumberland which would be anything like twenty or thirty feet thick, although I know the ice sometimes packs there very heavily. This is the proposition which I have to make to the members of this House : I believe that within a very few years Hudson bay will be open to navigation for commercial purposes. I understand that the Canadian Northern is about to build a railway to Fort Churchill, and probably within a few years that magnificent inland sea will carry on its bosom a mighty commerce. That route may perhaps, probably will be, the great commercial route for four or five months of the year from the great west to the markets of Europe, and a powerful ice breaker there in the early and late summer to assist these vessels which may and probably will be trading in that part of Canada would be a very great assistance. In mid-summer such a vessel might be used for surveying and other purposes. Such a vessel built for that purpose could be successfully used on the straits of Northumberland, between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, in winter, and could leave these straits in time to arrive at Hudson bay in plenty of time to give assistance to the merchant marine that we expect to find in a few years in that part of Canada. If Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Russia, these northern countries in Europe, find it profitable, from a commercial point of view, to build such ice breakers as I have seen described in the papers which I have read on the subject, it might be profitable for Canada to have such a vessel in the higher latitudes in this northern sea. That perhaps might be a matter worthy of the consideration of the committee, and particularly of the Minister of Marine. If that can be successfully carried out, every province in this Dominion would have an interest in it. It would not be Prince Edward Island alone that would be benefited, but the great west particularly, and those provinces that would have ports on Hudson bay—and it is likely that in the near future Quebec, Ontario and Manitoba will have extended railways to that great inland sea. I make that suggestion to the committee for whatever it may be worth.

Mr. McISAAC. I think every member on this side, as well as on the other, will heartily sympathize with the people of Prince Edward Island in their efforts to improve the communication between that island and the mainland, and I think also that we may safely say that every government of this country for the last thirty years, whether Conservative or Liberal, have made every honest effort to give facilities to the people of Prince Edward Island. The late Conservative government gave them, as has been mentioned by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), one steamer, which is not sufficient for those purposes. As everybody who has had a seat in this House for many years well knows, when the Conservative party were in power we had appeals day after day from the other side of the House to the then government for better communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. When that government was succeeded by a Liberal government the conditions were simply reversed, and our Conservative friends from the other side have continued winter after winter, session after session, and week after week, to bring up this worrying question in this parliament.

We all sympathize with these people, and whilst I am free to admit that all governments have made every effort to do the best in their power, yet that problem has not been fully solved, although the conditions have been very much improved. We have to-day two steamers instead of one. Some years ago a second steamer was secured by the present government, and, as every one knows, it is superior in every way to the steamer which was there before, but every effort has not yet been exhausted. I want to call the attention of the Minister of Marine to a matter in connection with this subject which I have brought, not only to his attention, but to the attention of several other ministers who preceded him. That is, that there are other routes, particularly one other route, which would afford far greater facilities for this service than the route which has been tried for many years. The present route is between Pictou on this side and Georgetown on the other side. The whole trouble, it seems to me, is owing to the selection of that route. Mariners of experience will tell you that the conditions in the winter are such that the tides in St. George's bay will drive the ice westward into Northumberland strait, and it will pile up there exactly in the route where these steamers run. The result is that the steamers are caught in bad weather, whilst if the Cape George route starting from Georgetown or Souris on the island and landing on the mainland at Cape George, in the county of Antigonish, which I have the honour to represent, were employed, the conditions will, I say, and I challenge contradiction, be entirely changed. There has not been a day in this whole winter when the steamer could not have landed on the mainland at Cape George. This has been the case every year for thirty years. Two or three years ago, during the great blockade, when the steamer was ice-locked for five or six weeks and unable to make land anywhere, it was at last landed at Cape George. The sea there is open generally all the year round. Some one may ask me why. The conditions are such and the tides along the strait of Canso and the narrow entrance beween Prince Edward Island and Cape Breton are of such a nature that the current is so strong that the ice keeps continually moving either northward or southward or else backs westerly into the Northumberland strait. This is a matter which the marine officers should take up at once; they should have experiments made by competent sea captains, and I undertake to tell the minister that he will in this way get a route which will enable the present steamers to go to the mainland every day in the year. That would have been possible even in the bad winter we have had this year.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. What is the distance ?

Mr. McISAAC. Cape George is about fifteen miles from the Intercolonial Railway. The year before last the mails and passengers had to be landed there, when they had been struggling for six or seven weeks in the ice in Northumberland strait. I know there are objections to this plan; the people of Pictou do not like to see the steamers cross between Prince Edward Island and the mainland down there. The people of the western part of Prince Edward Island would not like to see that change either, but when it is a matter of fulfilling the terms of confederation by making an effective communication, winter and summer, between the mainland and Prince Edward Island, I would urge that any point on the mainland which would give you a continuous communication all winter would fulfil to the very letter the agreement referred to to-night. The only thing, therefore, which I ask the minister to do is to make the experiment. Let him to-morrow telegraph to the captain of the 'Stanley' or the 'Minto' and ask him, if he is unable to make land anywhere else, to try Cape George. I undertake to tell him that before forty-eight hours the steamers can land at that point. There is deep water and a fine wharf, and all that is necessary is to make the experiment and he will find that everything is all right. Once that experiment is made, and my contention proved, as I am sure it will be, it will be necessary, of course, to build a short line of railway in a part of the country where it is very easy to build a road, for some fifteen miles, and you will have then the last link connected, and I undertake to say that this will be the easiest and the least expensive way of carrying out the terms of the agreement mentioned in this House to-night.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The remarks that have just fallen from the hon. gentleman opposite I think have justified fully what I said when speaking before. If the hon. member for King's (Mr. J. J. Hughes) had made the same speech at the outset as he has made in his third speech, I should not have found it necessary to interfere in the debate. I was requested to do so, however, owing to the tone of the first speech the hon. gentleman made. I have no desire to interfere in the affairs of Prince Edward Island, if by so doing I am in any way hurting the interests of that island. But I want the hon. gentlemen who find fault with me to say whether their politics are confined to any particular county or province. Mine are not. I profess while in this House to be representing the Dominion as a whole, and not confining my attention to any particular county. If hon. gentlemen opposite think that they can put me down on a question of that kind they are quite mistaken, I am not so easily downed as they may think. They may call me hysterical if they please, or any other term they wish to use, but those will not answer arguments. The hon. gentleman

from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) took a great deal of glory to himself because the present government, he said, had three boats while the old government only had one. What credit does the hon. gentleman take to the government for having three boats if they do not run them ? It has been shown that these boats are not running, and the more is the shame if they have three boats to do what one used to do. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. McLean) said there had never been so bad a breakdown in the service since confederation. Now if that is the case when they have three boats, what credit is it to the government to say that they have got three boats where the Conservative government only had one ? Then the Minister of Finance says they are under no obligation to keep up uninterrupted communication with Prince Edward Island.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not say that.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Now the hon. member for Queen's has shown conclusively that there is an obligation resting upon the government in that respect, that the Dominion is obliged to keep up communication with the island, that that is a part of the terms of confederation. Therefore you are not allowed to take into account the question of the cost, it is the fulfilling of the obligation that should count. Now the hon. gentleman said, what business is it of mine to say anything with regard to Prince Edward Island ? I may say that I happen to be a member of a firm that ships to Prince Edward Island, we also ship to all other provinces of the Dominion, and therefore we are interested in keeping up communication with all the provinces of the Dominion, when it is possible to do so. Whether that is a justification for my having spoken the hon. gentleman can say himself. He says that I am always taking people under my wing who have any grievance. I wish I could make the same charge in regard to the hon. gentleman, that he is taking the weak under his wing. I merely endeavoured to help my hon. friend from Queen's who was receiving no assistance from the other side, that was the reason. I do not profess to be an angel, and that is the only kind of person that has wings, so far as I know. But the hon. gentleman says that I am taking all people under my wings, and he goes back, because I spoke of the red men some weeks ago in the House, and casts that as a slur upon me because I had taken them under my wing. I have a perfect right to defend the cause of the weak or the cause of the oppressed wherever I find them in this Dominion. It is not a slur that should be cast upon me, and if that is the only accusation the hon. gentleman has to make, I will shoulder it and consider it rather in the light of a compliment than an accusation. I think the case which my hon. friend from Queen's has made to-night must appeal to the hearts of everybody in this House. There is a province that should have communication with the mainland and has not got it. It has been shown that the communication is deficient, and nothing is being done. Now I thing this discussion has done good, and I thank the hon. member from King's (Mr. J. J. Hughes) for that last speech of his. He was looking after the interests of his own constituency, of his own province in particular ; and I care not whether this government is concerned or any other, where the obligation is entered into by the Dominion by a clause in the Confederation Act with regard to the admission of a province, that obligation should be carried out no matter how much it is going to cost. That is not the question, so long as the money is well expended. It is no credit to buy more boats and not run them. I was not wishing to make political capital, I never rose with that intention. The idea is absurd, I never intended to make political capital, but what I did say was to back up the hon. member for Queen's, who made an impassioned appeal here to-night, one well reasoned, and delivered with good judgment, and apparently backed up with facts; yet there was no one from the other side of the House to assist him, and I was requested to speak. The hon. gentleman opposite did not take up the cudgels for him, and in the discussion it came out that the main reason was because my hon. friend had forestalled the members for Queen's by a couple of days, as it was his intention to bring this question up next Monday. The case was well presented by my hon. friend from Queen's, and it was the duty of all concerned to do what they could to assist him in endeavouring to get justice for that island.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) seems to resent the few remarks I ventured to make in regard to his style of address in dealing with this subject. He reminds the committee that I had said that this government had placed two boats upon the route. While he disclaims all desire to make any political capital, he wants the committee to believe that though the government have to put two boats on the route where there was only one before, this government do not know how to run any one of the boats. Well, I think that the remarks which I made in regard to the hon. gentleman are quite justified by that utterance of his. Of coures he claims the right to take under his wing—to repeat the phrase—all the weak, distressed and oppressed people of this country, not only of Canada but of the whole empire. Of course nobody objects, if he wants to do so. Such missionary enterprise on his part is rather to be commended. But when he rushes into a discussion he ought at least to know something about the things he is fighting for. When I ventured to point out

to him that we had had a winter in the maritime provinces this year such as has never been seen before in the memory of many of the inhabitants, he says that does not make any difference whatever, that though the boats cannot run on account of the winter, yet this government should run the boats, and inferentially this government ought to be blamed because they are not running the boats. Well, I am sure the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. McLean) appreciates the value of the services of this gentleman who has taken under his wing all the weak and oppressed in this country. My hon. friend, I am sure, will find that when the people of Prince Edward Island come to read his remarks they will conclude that they would have been much better off if he had not ventured to discuss this subject, about which he knows so little. I am not going to discuss this question at any length, but I want to say to our friends from Prince Edward Island, when they come to this government or to any government asking for a consideration of this question, they should not come and say, we have not been getting the mail for ten days at a time in Prince Edward Island, and therefore Prince Edward Island is entitled to special consideration. I may tell him that in Nova Scotia, the farmers in many districts have had to kill their cattle the same as they have done in Prince Edward Island. Our people in Nova Scotia have not been able to have communication with the country districts for ten days at a time, and my hon. friend from Hants (Mr. Black) says, for fourteen days. These conditions are general all over the maritime provinces, and if our friends from Prince Edward Island want to make a case, let them put it upon a sound basis. I agree with the proposition made by the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac). The proposition which has been made in regard to the possibility of maintaining winter communication between Cape George and Georgetown is one which is well worthy of the investigation of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I would join with my hon. friend from Antigonish in asking that the matter be fully investigated.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In answer to what my hon. friend from Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) has suggested I would say that the day before yesterady instructions were given to Captain Brown to try that route. We have had no report from him yet but if it is possible there is no difficulty about accepting that line. As to the difficulty created by the ice it is well known, as it has been repeated again and again, that this winter is one of the most extraordinary that we have passed through. We are not through it at the present moment because the steamers are yet blocked in the ice. we have instructed our men to use dynamite. They have tried dynamite to break the ice but they have failed. How can reasonable people imagine that what dynamite will not do a boat will do ? You might have had the most powerful boats in existence such as the 'Ermaak' and the 'Mackinaw' but they would have done very little more than those which are engaged in the service at the present moment. The ice was packed to the extent of 50 feet at certain places—solid ice no water to be seen—and even two days ago the two steamers failed to break the barrier at a certain point. After they had failed dynamite was resorted to but it had no effect. Under these circumstances I would like to know if it is possible to blame the government and to use the expressions that the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) has used to-night because the effort to open a passage has so far not been successful. In a sneering way that hon. gentleman says : If you have three boats you should use them. We have not said that we have three boats. We have two. Formerly there was only one boat but now he says that if you have three you should use them and not boast of them if you cannot run them. It is not in that way that the question should be approached. When it is impossible to operate railways you must submit to the circumstances. When the ice is packed to a depth of 50 feet any one in his senses must admit that it is impossible to run these boats ; yet that is what some hon. gentlemen in this House are blaming the government for. Father Burke, a great friend of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, while addressing the meeting that took place on this question at Charlottetown, I think, claimed that no steamer built could keep up communication this winter and that a tunnel was the only solution. Every one of their own friends admit that no steamer built could have gone through the ice this year, and if it is a fact that no steamer could do so what is the use of finding fault with the department ? We have two powerful boats, one of 2,400 horse power and one of 2,000 horse power. We have tried an experiment this winter on the St. Lawrence with the 'Montcalm' in ice from 20 to 25 feet thick and all we could do was to cut pieces 500 to 600 feet in length. Owing to the current the steamer was enabled to cut a channel about three miles up the St. Lawrence. It was only by working at it sideways and allowing the chunks of ice to float down that it was possible for her to do some effective work But. where you have to deal with packed ice 25 to 30 feet in thickness which cannot be moved even with dynamite I would like to know from the hon. member for Brantford what means could have been adopted to remedy such a state of affairs. Reference has been made to the steamer 'Ermaak' built for the Russian government some few years ago. I read all about that vessel, not lately but in former years, and I knew what she can do. That vessel cost $1,200,000 and all she can do is to go through floating ice four and a half feet thick in the sea, no packed

ice of any kind, and if we have succeeded in getting, here in Canada, boats that will go through ice from 10 to 25 feet in thickness I think we have succeeded pretty well and that without spending $1,000,000 or $1,250,000. Of course, I am entirely in sympathy with the people of Prince Edward Island in the difficulties under which they are labouring this winter. Everybody sympathizes with the people who are placed in such a position. But, as is well known a somewhat similar state of affairs has existed more or less throughout the maritime provinces. Trains have been suspended for weeks and at certain points traffic is still suspended. As regards the supply of hay or other necessary produce the department has given instructions to the captains of the boats to carry as their first freight the hay that has accumulated at Pictou and they intend to carry that over according to the instructions given. Now, as regards communication by ice boat; my hon. friend—because I passed the document to him—could at least have rendered the department the justice of saying that the ice boat service has not been so bad. There were only three consecutive days of suspension of the service by ice boat. I have here a statement of the trips that were made from day to day by the ice boats.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Leave it for the present.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No, I want to place it before the committee. It is as follows:

Capes Winter Mail Service.

Winter 1904-1905.

Crews assembled at Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine on January 27th, 1905. No crossing, heavy northeast snowstorm.

January 28.—Crossed from Cape Traverse with 49 bags of mails, weight 1,500 pounds, 2 passengers.

January 28.—Crossed from Cape Tormentine with 44 bags of mail, weight 1,400 pounds, no passengers.

January 29.—Crossed from Cape Traverse, 4 boats, 21 bags mail, 2 passengers.

January 29.—Crossed from Cape Tormentine, 4 boats, 31 bags mail, 1,600 pounds, 1 passenger.

January 30.—Crossed from Cape Traverse, 4 boats, no mails, 1 passenger.

January 30.—No crossing from Cape Tormentine, strong head wind and storm.

January 31.—Crossed from Cape Tormentine, 4 boats, 33 bags mail, 1,500 pounds, 1 passenger.

January 31.—Captain Allan left Cape Tormentine 2½ hours after Captain Campbell with 4 boats and had to return, caught in northeast snowstorm.

February 1.—No crossing, gale and snowstorm.

February 2.—Crossed from Cape Traverse, 5 boats, 25 bags mail, 600 pounds, 4 passengers.

February 2.—Crossed from Cape Tormentine, 4 boats, 50 bags mail, 1,600 pounds, no passengers.

February 3.—Crossed from Cape Traverse, 4 boats, 47 bags mail, 1,500 pounds, no passengers.

February 3.—Crossed from Cape Tormentine, 6 boats, 55 bags mail, 2,200 pounds, 2 passengers.

February 4.—Crossed from Cape Traverse, 6 boats, 23 bags mail, 600 pounds, 2 passengers.

February 4.—Crossed from Cape Tormentine, 4 boats, 47 bags mail, 1,600 pounds, no passengers.

February 5.—Sunday, crews on both sides refused to cross although 108 bags delayed mails at Cape Tormentine. Captain Campbell with 1 boat taking Postmaster Weir and 18 bags of mail from Cape Traverse.

February 6.—Captain Campbell stayed at Cape Tormentine, but Coxswain Bell, in charge of 3 boats, crossed from Cape Traverse, 19 bags mail, 600 pounds, 3 passengers.

February 6.—Crossed from Cape Tormentine, 6 boats, 73 bags mail, 3,100 pounds.

February 7 and 8.—No crossing either way, northeast gale and snow.

February 9.—Crossing from Cape Traverse, 6 boats, 23 bags mail, 500 pounds, 5 passengers.

February 9.—Crossing from Cape Tormentine, 4 boats, 50 bags mail, 1,500 pounds, 12 passengers.

February 10.—Crossing from Cape Traverse, 4 boats, 4 bags, 150 pounds, 1 passenger.

February 10.—Crossing from Cape Tormentine, 5 boats, 39 bags, 1,800 pounds, 8 passengers.

February 11, 12 and 13.—No crossings, gales and snowstorms.

February 14.—Crossed from Cape Traverse, 4 boats, 26 bags, 750 pounds, 6 passengers.

February 14.—Crossed from Cape Tormentine, 4 boats, 36 bags, 1,500 pounds, no passengers.

February 15.—Crossed from Cape Traverse, 5 boats, 55 bags, 1,400 pounds, no passengers.

February 15.—Crossed from Cape Tormentine, 5 boats, 53 bags, 1,850 pounds, 7 passengers.

February 16.—No crossings, gales and snow.

February 17.—Crossing from Cape Traverse, 5 boats, 31 bags, 900 pounds, 4 passengers.

February 17.—Crossed from Cape Tormentine, 7 boats, 70 bags, 2,550 pounds, no passengers.

February 18.—Crossed from Cape Traverse, 7 boats, 42 bags, 1,660 pounds, 11 passengers.

February 18.—Crossed from Cape Tormentine, 5 boats, 50 bags, 1,850 pounds, 5 passengers.

February 18.—On 17 and 18, 2 opposition boats crossed with Captain Campbell from Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine with mails.

February 19.—No crossing, Sunday.

February 20.—Crossed from Cape Traverse, 5 boats, 33 bags, 1,000 pounds, 1 passenger.

February 20.—Crossed from Cape Tormentine, 5 boats, 70 bags, 2,000 pounds, 6 passengers.

February 21.—Crossed from Cape Traverse, 6 boats, 23 bags, 1,000 pounds, 3 passengers.

February 21.—Crossed from Cape Tormentine, 5 boats, 47 bags, 1,850 pounds, no passengers.

February 22.—Crossed from Cape Traverse, 5 boats, 25 bags, 800 pounds, no passengers.

February 22.—Crossed from Cape Tormentine, 6 boats, 95 bags, 2,400 pounds, no passengers.

February 23.—No crossing from Cape Traverse.

February 23.—Crossed from Cape Tormentine, 5 boats, 50 bags, 1,850 pounds, no passengers.

February 24.—No crossing either way, all boats at Cape Traverse.

February 25.—Captain Campbell left Cape Traverse, had to return.

February 26.—Captain Campbell left Cape Traverse, had to return.

February 27.—No crossing either way on account of lolly.

February 28.—Crossed from Cape Traverse, 11 boats, 80 bags, 4,000 pounds, no passengers.
March 1.—No crossing, northeast snowstorms.
March 2.—Crossing from Cape Tormentine, 6 boats, 95 bags, 2,400 pounds, 11 passengers.
March 2.—Captain Allan waiting at Cape Tormentine for crossing on 3rd, so as to have boats divided up again.
March 3.—Crossing from Cape Traverse, 6 boats, 92 bags, 2,200 pounds, no passengers.
March 3.—Crossing from Cape Tormentine, 5 boats, 61 bags, 1,850 pounds, 6 passengers.
March 4.—Crossed from Cape Traverse, 5 boats, 22 bags, 850 pounds, no passengers.
March 4.—Crossed from Cape Tormentine, 6 boats, 57 bags, 2,400 pounds, no passengers.
March 5.—No crossing.
March 6.—Crossing from Cape Traverse, 6 boats, 34 bags, 1,500 pounds, no passengers.
March 6.—Crossing from Cape Tormentine, 5 boats, 70 bags, 1,850 pounds, no passengers.

This shows that on two occasions there was a suspension, once for two days and once for three days. The opposition boats could not cross over either, so that it would seem that the men employed by the government on the ice-boat did the best in their power and were not neglectful of their duty. I do not know what could have made the crossing under such conditions unless it would be a balloon.

Mr. LEFURGEY. It was understood between the members from Prince Edward Island, that this matter would not be brought up until Monday next when the motion on the order paper would be fully discussed. In consequence, I do not propose now to answer the minister in many of the statements which he has made, but on Monday next, according to the agreement, I want the Minister of Marine and the Prime Minister to be present so that they may hear the debate on this matter which is of such importance to the people of Prince Edward Island and of the people of the Dominion generally. I trust also that the front benches on this side of the House will be well occupied.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And the gallery ?

Mr. LEFURGEY. I never speak to the galleries, but I want the ear of this House on one of the most important questions that this country has to deal with. We are a small province down by the sea but we desire fair consideration, and the fulfilment of the terms under which Prince Edward Island came into the confederation, one of the most important of which is winter navigation between the island and the mainland.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. It is quite true that it was understood among the representatives from Prince Edward Island that this matter would not be brought up until next Monday, and I carried out faithfully that arrangement, but the hon. gentleman from Queen's (Mr. McLean) brought up the matter and he was energetically followed by the member for Brantford. I am glad that my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) does not complain of any one on this side of the House.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. It is necessary I should offer a word of explanation. When this item came up for discussion my colleague Mr. Lefurgey was not present. There was some kind of misunderstanding, as I was of the opinion that this item was to be discussed to-night but that seems to have been a mistake. However, I did not bring this question up for my own glorification ; it is a very important matter and I do not see why the member for King's should take exception.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. It is your colleague who takes exception.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. There is nothing to prevent this matter being dealt with on Monday or any other day, and the grievance is so great that it should be brought to the attention of the government day after day and every day, until the government see fit to do justice in the matter. On every occasion on which the representatives from Prince Edward Island have the opportunity, this is a question which should be pressed on the attention of the government and the parliament of Canada. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) said that he thought the manner in which I brought up this question would not receive the sympathy of some gentlemen on the other side of the House. I am not asking for the sympathy of the hon. member for Pictou nor any other man in this House; I am asking for clean, pure justice for the people of Prince Edward Island, and I hope the gentlemen who run the government of this country will see that justice will be done.

Mr. INGRAM. As I will not be present next Monday to hear this important discussion, I want to thank the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. A. A. McLean) for the able and moderate way in which he presented the case for Prince Edward Island. My hon. friend stated to-night that he did not endorse the policy of the Conservative government with regard to Prince Edward Island ; a statement which proves conclusively that he was not discussing the question from a partisan standpoint. Nothwithstanding the remarks of my hon. friend from Pictou, I think the House will believe that the hon. gentleman from Queen's in treating this matter as he did, only discharged his duty to his constituents.

Mr. LALOR. I heard the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) tell the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to-night that there never was forty-eight hours when there could not be communication between Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. If such be the case, and the statement is made by a supporter of the government, I am surprised that the Minister of Marine has not

long ago found out that there is the port of St. George from which communication can be constantly maintained. That statement coming from a supporter of the minister will I have no doubt be accepted as true, and I hope it will induce the minister to look about him for a solution of this winter navigation problem.

Meteorological service, $100,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the hon. gentleman explain the increase of $3,197 ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is on account of the opening of the new stations in the Northwest, British Columbia and the Yukon.

Hydrographic surveys, $45,500.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This year hydrographic survey which used to be done by the British government passes under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. This amount will not cover the whole expenditure, and we expect a further vote in the supplementary estimates. Every one understands that it is one of the most important services for those interested in shipping.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it inland or seacoast or both ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It takes in everything.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What works are you carrying on in the inland waters ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We have completed lake Manitoba and lake Winnipeg, and we hope to complete lake Superior this season. The department has to take in hand the surveys made by the British government on the Pacific coast as well as those on the Atlantic coast. We did not know at the time the main estimates were prepared what the work would cost, and we are in communication with the British government with a view to getting some of their boats in order to lessen the cost.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The work will consist of surveys and the preparation of charts as well ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. R L. BORDEN. Is the department creating a new staff for the purpose ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We took over from the department of Railways and Canals last year and from the Department of Public Works a few employees, and have been carrying on the work on the St. Lawrence between Montreal and Quebec. Then, some work will have to be done between Quebec and the gulf.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is work of the very highest importance, there is no doubt about that.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. And I may say that we have one of the most competent men at the head of the department, Mr. Stewart, who is a graduate of Kingston, a gold medallist, and who has been engaged in this work a considerable length of time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As the minister states there will be a supplementary estimate for this service, I will not detain the House very much in regard to it to-night ; but I think it is a matter that is deserving of somewhat extended explanation by the minister, and discussion when it comes up. and I hope the supplementary estimate will be brought down long enough before the close of the session to have it discussed, because I realize very much the importance of it, not only on the Pacific coast, but on the Atlantic coast as well.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I may be able to give a programme of what it is intended to do, and which will show how well the work has been done. I do not claim credit for that, because they were prepared three or four years ago partly by the Public Works Department and partly by the Department of Railways and Canals; but the Department of Marine and Fisheries carried on the work last season.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business may we expect to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. We will continue in supply, with the estimates of the Marine and Fisheries.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 17, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS.

Mr. R. G. MACPHERSON (Vancouver City). In presenting a petition, I rise to a question of privilege. The petition is signed by Daniel McLean and forty-one others, declaring themselves to be electors of the electoral district of Vancouver. I may say that not one of the forty-two names is on the voters' lists in my constituency of Vancouver.

Mr. BENNETT. They will be there next time.

Mr. MACPHERSON. They are not residents of the city of Vancouver.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I am speaking to a question of privilege. This petition has been sent to me——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The rule is that if there is any question of the authenticity of the signatures, a member presenting a petition may call the attention of the House to that fact. But he is not at liberty to make a speech in presenting a petition.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I do not wish to infringe the rules of the House. But I have always understood that a member presenting a petition is responsible for the authenticity of the signatures unless he disclaims that responsibility. I know, as a positive fact, that not one of the forty-two names signed to this petition is on the voters' list of the electoral district of Vancouver.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 122) to incorporate the Grand River and Western Power Company.—Mr. Zimmerman.

Bill (No. 123) respecting the Board of the Presbyterian College, Halifax.—Mr. Sinclair.

Bill (No. 124) respecting the Farmers' Bank of Canada.—Mr. Miller.

THE TELEPHONE QUESTION—COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General) moved :

That a select committee, composed of Messieurs Burrows, Smith (Nanaimo), Johnston (Cape Breton, South), Grant, Demers (St. John and Iberville), Monk, Maclean (York), Boyce, Roche (Marquette), and the mover, be appointed to inquire into and report regarding the various public telephone systems in operation in Canada and elsewhere, as the committee shall determine ; and to consider and report what changes, if any, are advisable in respect of the methods at present in force for furnishing telephone service to the public. Such committee to have the power to send for persons and papers, to examine persons under oath, to engage stenographers, clerical and other assistance, and to report from time to time.

He said : Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary, I think, for me to occupy the attention of the House at any length in order to induce it to adopt, as I trust it will unanimously, this resolution. Although the telephone is of recent invention, yet, the wide extent to which it is in use throughout the civilized world testifies to its usefulness to the public and demands from a representative institution such as this its best consideration in order to discover whether, and if so, in what manner its further usefulness may be accomplished. In its inception the use of the telephone was confined chiefly to cities, towns and centres of population connected together by degrees by trunk lines. Of later years it has found its way into rural districts, into comparatively sparsely settled districts, and it seems that the time has arrived when we might study the question with the view, if possible, to making the telephone as widespread in its usefulness in connection with the people as the post office itself. I can conceive of no utility that more touches the people, leaving aside the post office, than the telephone. At the present time in Canada we have one great company. There are many other smaller companies and there are telephone systems conducted as private enterprises. Of late years the subject has received attention at the hands of the imperial parliament and in the course of a few short years that great system will, in England, pass under state control. I do not at this stage indicate what should be our decision. It will be premature to prejudge the case, but I do think that a careful and thorough inquiry into the conditions in Canada and in other countries might furnish us with a useful and safe guide and after the information is gathered together by a committee that will, I feel assured, give every attention to the subject, the House will then be in a position to make some substantial progress with this measure. There are some who have already made up their minds as to what should be the future destiny of the telephone. There are others whose minds, perhaps, are yet in an unsettled state. Some perhaps are of the decided opinion that the government should have nothing to do with such a service. With all these conflicting views it is right, I think, that the public should be put in possession of evidence and arguments collected after careful, thorough and impartial study to enable us to reach the safest conclusion. I shall not prejudge the subject myself, although, perhaps, if I must confess to a bias as regards the telephone, that bias would be that I cannot see why it is not as much the duty of the state to take charge of the telephone as it is to conduct the postal service. However, as I say, I will endeavour to approach the subject judicially notwithstanding that bias which I think it my duty to announce in advance so that I may not be allowed to give a too unlimited rein to that view in the committee if others should feel that I was proceeding rather to carry out a view of my own than to investigate the case judicially and then reach a conclusion. Some people are willing to rush at conclusions even where large interests are involved. It is the duty, I think, of the House to be careful and guarded and safe so that we may take wise, safe and prudent steps. I do not think it is necessary for me to do more than observe that these existing systems in Canada, although they have been of very great use and have rendered great public service, still have occas-

ioned friction and dissatisfaction as is always more or less, perhaps, the outcome of conflict between consumer and producer, and so in this case it is possible that the committee may find grievances existing that their inquiry will help to remove. I have nothing further to add except to state that I would be glad to be allowed to suggest another name to the committee, that of Mr. Zimmerman, of Hamilton.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, I think I can congratulate the hon. gentleman who has introduced this motion (Sir William Mulock). I can congratulate him on his own view. I think he has long held that view but I think I can congratulate him also that he has converted the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who sits alongside of him. The right hon. gentleman, not very long ago was very much afraid of state ownership in any form, but now that he has consented to this motion being presented to parliament, I suppose I am to assume that he has changed his mind. The test of the value of this committee will be the work accomplished by it. The extent of the investigation and of the information elicited, and the report which the committee may make will be a matter of deep public concern. I have no doubt what the result of a full investigation will be; I have no doubt the committee will recommend some kind of public ownership; some kind of public control of the telephone system in this country. Public ownership and public control of the telephone has succeeded in Europe, in Australia, in New Zealand, and I do not see why it should not succeed here. Only the other day the Postmaster General of England, a young man whom we knew in this country, succeeded in presenting a Bill there to nationalize the whole telephone system, and that Bill is said to have the merit of doing justice to the public and justice to the existing companies. I trust we will be able to adopt some such scheme in Canada. The statement of the Postmaster General that he regards the telephone system as a natural portion of the Post Office Department of this country, is good sound doctrine. Let me suggest that when he applies that doctrine to telephones he should follow the example of the mother country and take in the telegraph lines also. I trust that during his tenure of office we shall see him adopt a national telephone system and a national telegraph system as they have it in England. All these things are in the line of progress, and I trust that the hon. gentleman will organize the committee at once so that this very session a Bill may be presented to parliament.

Mr. HANCE J. LOGAN (Cumberland). I also desire to congratulate the Postmaster General upon his action in reference to the telephone system of this country, but I must express my regret that he does not include in this investigation the telegraph system as well. It would seem to me that if it is in the public interest that the government should enter into the ownership of the telephone system, it is even more important that they should own and control the telegraph system of this Dominion. Those who use the telegraph know that there are exhorbitant rates charged in many parts of the country where there is no competition, and it seems to me it is high time that the matter should be inquired into. I do not understand that the government in proposing this motion is committing itself to the public ownership of telephones, and that being so it seems to me there would be nothing to prevent this inquiry including the telegraphs as well. Government ownership of telegraphs is in existence in the motherland, and I believe for my part that we should investigate the whole matter here at an early date so as to arrive at a conclusion as to whether it is not in the best interests of Canada to make the telegraph system a government owned institution.

Mr. J. BARR (Dufferin). I am very much pleased indeed that this motion has been made. I believe that the time will come when telegraphs and telephones will be taken under the control of the government, and I believe further that it is one of the most important questions we have to deal with in this parliament. If we could have a telephone in every post office throughout the rural districts of Canada, it would confer a greater benefit upon the farmers than perhaps even a rural mail delivery would. If there was a telephone in each post office, farmers could ascertain the state of the market, and learn of the most advantageous time at which to bring in their produce. This would be a great boon to them. One advantage which the telephone has over the telegraph is, that the person in charge of a post office can attend to the telephone whereas the telegraph requires an expert operator, and consequently the telegraph could not be used to the same extent throughout the rural districts as could the telephone. Private companies have found the telephone a paying institution, but one great difficulty under present conditions is that one telephone company has a monopoly of the connection with railroad stations, and other companies are consequently deprived of this advantage. I have no doubt, however, that this difficulty will be overcome in the near future. I believe that a government-owned telephone system in Canada, extended throughout the entire Dominion would not only be one of the greatest benefits that could be conferred upon the farming community, but that under proper management it would be a revenue producing concern for the government as well. The

farmers would have telephone communication with the villages, towns and cities, and there would be complete machinery for easy intercourse between the people of the Dominion. I trust that some good will come out of the appointment of this committee, and that it will be able to devise a scheme under which the government of Canada shall become the owners of the telephone system.

Motion agreed to.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Minister of Railways when he intends to make the statement which he foreshadowed the other day in the Railway Committee in reference to the acquisition of the Canada Atlantic Railway by the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). On the third reading of the Bill that was then under the consideration of the committee I shall be in a position to make an announcement.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX. Some time ago I asked the hon. Minister of Railways in reference to a report from the Board of Railway Commissioners, and he informed the House that he had spoken to the commissioners and that a report would be brought down ; but he was not able to tell us at what time he expected that report. I presume that in the meantime the minister has been able to ascertain, and can tell the House whether the report is ready or when it will be ready.

Mr. EMMERSON. The report has been promised, and I hope to have it within a few days.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would again ask the hon. Minister of Railways how soon we may expect a return to an order of the House issued on the 20th of February with reference to the Bell Telephone case, especially with reference to the Port Arthur and Fort William agitation ? The last time I referred to the matter the hon. gentleman stated that he was waiting the return of certain documents, I think, from the Railway Commission. As these documents will probably now be in his possesison, I presume that the return will shortly be brought down.

Mr. EMMERSON. I spoke to the officials of the department this morning with reference to the matter, and I hope to have the papers laid before the House on Monday.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think something definite was promised yesterday with regard to the budget, but apparently that expectation was disappointed. I am mentioning it now because I know that some gentlemen on this side of the House desire to discuss certain matters which might very well be discussed in connection with the budget. They have been suggesting to me that these matters might be brought up at once, and I have been suggesting that they should be held back. As soon as the government is in a position to make an announcement, I shall be very glad to know the date at which the budget may be expected.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will consult the Minister of Finance, and I think I shall be able to make an announcement on Monday.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Care of sick seamen in the marine hospitals in the maritime provinces, and building and repairs to marine hospitals, $50,000.

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). This amount is the same as that of last year. The expenditure last year was $49,786.68. The expenditure for the present fiscal year to the 31st of December was $30,265.32.

Mr. BERGERON. How many hospitals are there in the maritime provinces ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In Montreal the total amount paid last year to the General Hospital was $2,905 and to the Notre Dame Hospital $2,370. The rate per day was $1.20. In Quebec we paid $135 to the Hotel Dieu and $810 to the Jeffrey Hale Hospital, the rate being 90 cents a day. At Chicoutimi we paid $73.80 at the rate of 90 cents. At Rimouski we paid $59.50 at the rate of over $1. At St. John, N.B., we paid to the General Hospital $1,298.70 at the rate of 90 cents. At Halifax we paid to the Victoria General Hospital $7,221.10.

Mr. BERGERON. Instead of being for marine hospitals in the maritime provinces, this should be for marine hospitals in Canada, because three or four are in the province of Quebec. The item is misleading.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I think the hon. gentleman is right, but the title has been the same for twenty-five years. There are no dues collected in Ontario. I will make a note of the hon. gentleman's suggestion, and have the title changed to fit the facts.

Mr. BLAIN. How many were taken care of last year, and paid out of the treasury ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. 1,830 in the hospitals.

Mr. BLAIN. How does that compare with former years ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. About the same number.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it not time that the government should take into consideration the reduction of the amount of the fees on

vessels coming into Canadian ports, seeing that the amount thus obtained is more than sufficient, as I understand, to supply all the needs of the sick mariners? I know that in my port the amount of fees that are taken from vessels every year is much greater than the amount required for looking after sick seamen. I would like to hear an expression of opinion from the minister on that point, and if possible, get a reduction of those fees.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Representations have been made to the department during the last few years in favour of the abolition of hospital dues. It is an important question, and I am rather inclined myself to favour the abolition. But as it would involve a pretty large amount, and we have not yet devised any mode of obliging the masters of vessels to take care of their sick men, we have not yet come to a decision. I understand that a delegation from the shipping federation is coming to Ottawa in a few days to lay their views before the members of the cabinet. It is possible that during this session I may announce what will be the policy of the government on this question.

Mr. AMES. What is the surplus that has accumulated in the hands of the government in connection with the sick mariners' fund?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That goes into the consolidated fund.

Mr. AMES. It is kept separate, is it not?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is every year a certain surplus that goes into the consolidated fund.

Mr. AMES. I understand the surplus now amounts almost to $200,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is no surplus, I mean to say that though the government has collected more than it has expended in that service, the surplus does not appear in the books of the Finance Department, because it has gone into the general fund.

Mr. AMES. Then to put the matter in another way, it is more a matter of bookkeeping than anything else. The minister states in his own report at page 19 that every year a considerably larger sum has been received than expended. For example, in 1904 about $50,000 were expended and $61,778 were received. The previous year, $48,000 were expended and $64,800 received. Now the minister says, that it is difficult at the present time to bring in legislation such as has been asked for by the Shipping Federation and by the Montreal Board of Trade, in reference to the sick mariners' dues. But is there any difficulty in reducing the amount of the dues?—because every year he collects about 25 per cent more than is needed.

Mr. DANIEL.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It may be done by legislation, and it may be done by abolishing the dues altogether.

Mr. AMES. But in Montreal there are difficulties in the way of abolition, and no difficulties in the way of reducing the fees. If you collect $65,000 a year and only need $50,000, there can be no difficulty in reducing the rate of fees so that you will only collect about $50,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I agree that the reduction by 25 per cent would make a great difference, but that is not what the Shipping Federation are asking for, they are asking for complete abolition. That is a serious matter to be decided off-hand.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I would ask the minister if the money spent on capital account for the construction of hospitals to take care of sick seamen, is taken into account in comparing the receipts and expenses?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. AMES. Then the minister is not prepared to say when we can hope for legislation with a view to abolishing this system?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. If it is to be abolished, it will be done during the session.

Shipwrecked and distressed seamen, $3,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This, I suppose, is for seamen belonging to Canadian steamers all over the world?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, and for foreigners also who have become stranded here.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is any part of it recovered?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. A sum has been recovered from the Board of Trade and from the Newfoundland government.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Board of Trade in England used to send out claims against ship-owners in this country for moneys advanced to seamen left behind or shipwrecked in foreign countries; and I suppose we have the same practice in recovering from ship-owners in Great Britain and other countries?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. LOGAN. I understand there is some regulation in the department in reference to the burial of British seamen dying in a Canadian port. I do not know whether it is confined to British seamen. But when seamen die at our ports, I believe, there is a regulation in the department that only $10 is to be allowed for funeral expenses of such seamen. I desire to inform the minister that this sum is absolutely inadequate; I do not think it is a credit to our country or to our government. A case came under my attention not long ago, where a British seaman died in the town of Spring-

hill, in the hospital, and the very least the undertaker could bury him for was, I think, about $37. And yet, the department will not allow this undertaker more than $10, and he is compelled to lose the balance of the amount. I do not think that at this day decent burial can be given a white man for $10.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I quite admit the force of the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Logan); but, unfortunately, the Sick Seamen's Act does not provide for the burial of the deceased in these cases, and so it is only by grace that we give even $10 toward the expenses.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask whether the Minister of Marine (Mr. Préfontaine) has anything further to report regarding the seamen imprisoned in Montevideo pending, as I understand it, arrangements on the part of the authorities there to pass a law to punish them. It seems a very peculiar situation that British subjects in a foreign country should be awaiting, in imprisonment, the convenience of people to pass a law to punish them for an act which was not originally a crime.

Mr. LOGAN. They have not passed the act to punish them yet.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am endeavouring to get some information as to what progress is being made with that proposed statute.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We are in correspondence with the home government and with the British consul at Montevideo. So far, we have not received a satisfactory answer. The members of the crew who were imprisoned have been released. But it appears that they were released with the intention of sending them away so that they might not be witnesses in favour of the captain at his trial. Discovering this the members of the crew have remained in Montevideo in order to give their evidence before the court when the case of the captain comes up. The latest communication we received was to the effect that they are waiting for the judge who has had under consideration certain points of law, and who was absent from Montevideo. We were told that as soon as the decision of this judge was rendered we should be given more information. It is one of those cases in which the law seems to be obscured. There seems to be no law by virtue of which these men can be detained, but the prosecution, I suppose, are applying to the judges there to have the men detained, with what intention I do not know, except, certainly with the intention of discouraging any fishing in their waters.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. I am very much obliged to the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) for bringing this matter up again, and I hope that everything is being done that can be done by the minister on behalf of these sailors. There is another matter to which I referred a few evenings ago when the estimates of the Department of Agriculture were going through. It was a matter relating to public health, I believe that it would therefore come within the control of the Department of Agriculture. I am sorry to say, I got very little satisfaction from that department in regard to the matter. Possibly I cannot get any satisfaction from the department under the present state of the law. But I am pleased to learn that there is a surplus of the fund to provide for seamen. That being the case, I think it is a pity that any town on the seacoast should be called upon to pay the expenses of seamen coming into the harbours of Canada. Two years ago an American vessel came into the harbour of North Sydney with small-pox aboard. The town had to incur the expense of $1,000 or more to furnish clothing, food, and protection of every kind for over twenty-five men for five or six weeks. I think it rather an unsatisfactory state of the law that a town should be obliged to provide for those coming into it in this way and I think that some provision should be made by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or some other department of government, by which American vessels could be obliged to provide for their own men, or else to bring these men under the operation of the sick mariner's fund. I submit to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine), with all due deference, that it is the duty of some department of the government to repay the town of North Sydney the money expended in this connection, and, if possible, recover that money from the government of the United States or from the government of the state of Massachusetts from which these people came. If no law existed to cover the case, there should be such a law, as this is clearly not a matter that should be dealt with by the municipalities.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The question referred to by the hon. gentleman (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) is important enough to be taken into consideration. I will make a note of it. Of course, I remember the case to which the hon. gentleman refers. If the law can be amended to provide for such cases, I will see what can be done.

Mr. SINCLAIR. There is a good deal of difficulty connected with the matter referred to by my hon. friend from Cape Breton North (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) along the whole coast of the province of Nova Scotia from which I come. During the small-pox epidemic in eastern Canada, there was no provision to take care of sailors who became ill on coasting vessels. The place where the vessel happened to be at the time the sailor was taken charge of by the authorities it was said, had to bear the expense. There was a good deal of uncertainty whose duty

it was to look after the sailors who became sick on coasting vessels.

Mr. W. ROCHE. I wish to say a word or two with reference to the detention of the British seamen at the port of Monte Video by the government of Uruguay, which subject was originally brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Cape Breton North (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) and which has been referred to by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). I think that the treatment by the British government of the goevrnment of Uruguay in this case has been very lax. I understand that seventeen British seamen were confined for a long time in jail, but have now been released ; and I understand also that the captain of that vessel is still in jail until they can make a law to punish him. Now, if that kind of treatment by any foreign government had been meted out to British seamen previously, Great Britain would have taken steps to protect her subjects. If we have any connection with the British government whatever, if they have not entirely abandoned North America, I think that this government should take steps to press upon the British government that they should represent very strenuously to the government of Uruguay that this is not the kind of treatment that British seamen and British subjects have been accustomed to receive at the hands of foreign governments, and also that these men, who have been illegally lodged in jail for a long time and their enterprise broken up without law or without any pretext for any municipal or international law, should be compensated for their losses. If they had belonged to Great Britain itself, that demand for compensation would have been made long ago. If they had been seamen who had their domicile in England or Scotland there would be a claim made by the British government

Mr. LAKE. Why not Ireland ?

Mr. W. ROCHE. Because Ireland has no seamen. Because they are colonial seamen, it may be that it is inconvenient for the British government to make any earnest representations. As this matter has come before the House, this is a fitting occasion to impress on our ministry to represent to the British government that the maritime people of Canada are not accustomed to have their sons imprisoned in foreign countries without any offence having been committed by these seamen against the laws or regulations of a foreign country. If that representation is earnestly made and pressed upon the British government, these unfortunate men will receive compensation for the breaking up of their enterprise, and also some kind of solace for their long confinement in the South American dungeons.

Mr. LOGAN. Perhaps we do not understand the circumstances of this case. It seems to me that if the circumstances are as I am led to believe they are, this case should not be passed over in a light manner by the parliament of Canada. Would it be asking too much to request the minister to state the case exactly ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I must state that the correspondence is rather voluminous, but I have no objection whatever to laying it before the House on Monday. The case is very plain. As is explained by the consul at Montevideo, the authorities have made up some kind of a case against the captain and crew. They were arrested and a charge was made against them of infringing the fishing laws of Uruguay. The contention of those interested in defending the case, and those who have interested themselves in favour of the captain and crew, is that there exists no such offence ; but in order to ascertain that there was no such offence, the matter was brought before the courts, and, as I explained just now, the court, before the case was heard, but after the argument on the preliminary objections, absented itself, and until the present moment there has been no adjudication upon these preliminary objections. In the meantime the crew was liberated, but they kept the captain. Of course, we understand by the circumstances that it is one of the most serious and unjust cases. There was, in fact, no infringement of any law, but there seems to be a kind of justification on the part of the authorities for detaining the men until they have had an adjudication from the judge. The last correspondence we had from the British government was at the end of February. The matter was followed up day by day by this government, and representations were made in answer to the replies that we received from the other side. The case, to our mind, is not very much more advanced now than it was in the beginning. Of course, I do not know how we can help it, except after the judgment has been rendered. It seems to be an unreasonable thing to keep a man in jail who is arrested without any infringement of the law. It might be unjust and might cause his ruin, and cause great loss to the owners of the boat, but, all the same, it is difficult to find a way unless we were able to send a man-of-war to Uruguay and get these men liberated.

Mr. W. ROCHE. The British government has plenty of men-of-war.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is no doubt about that, but the British government does not seem to consider the case as a hardship or unfair or unjust, or I have no doubt they would have acted more promptly and taken more vigorous measures than they have taken. The captain is defended, he is represented by a lawyer, and has communicated through the British consul at Montevideo and the Colonial Office at London, and, of course, all that takes a long time.

Mr. LOGAN. Is the captain still in jail ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the minister any knowledge as to whether or not the alleged offence was committed within the territorial waters of the country referred to, or was it committed on the high seas ? I think that is a very important question.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We have no means of ascertaining that, but the information we have is from the lawyer defending this captain, who says that the accusation is not founded ; but, as I have stated, the case has not been tried, except that preliminary objections have been argued but not adjudicated upon by the judge owing to his absence. Of course, I understand perfectly well the unfairness and injustice of the case, but we have no means at our disposal to ascertain the facts precisely. The captain, of course, contends that he is not guilty of the offence as charged against him, but I suppose the authorities there say that he is. They say that they are going to try him for that offence.

Mr. LOGAN. Is there a British consul at this place ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes ; the papers will show all that.

Mr. LOGAN. There is a British consul there. It does not seem to me that we should depend on the information of the attorney for the captain as to whether or not there has been a breach of the law if there is a British consul there. I would think the British consul would report to the home office as to whether there has or has not been a breach of any law in existence. Of course, there may be explanatory circumstances in connection with this case, but it seems to me that if ever there was a case in which a man had a very serious grievance, this captain, who has been confined in a South American prison for six months, has a grievance. I have no doubt that the government are paying the best attention they can to the matter, but it seems to me that if nothing has been done it would be well to very quickly ask the Home Office to move in the matter. It is the boast of British citizenship that wherever we are, wherever the sun shines, we will be defended by British power. If a Canadian, who is as much a British subject as a man in England, is not defended in a South American republic and is wrongfully detained in a South American jail, the sooner we in Canada find it out the better. I really think that the circumstances of this case, as we have them before us, justify very much harsher language than I am using, but I understand that there may be explanatory circumstances which might make us regret using any stronger language. As the case stands before us now, it is a matter of serious hardship, and it does not make for the betterment of the relations of the empire to have such a condition of affairs exist.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The correspondence which we have had with the British consul at Montevideo I will place before the House as I stated, and the committee will see that no time has been lost by the department in trying to get to the bottom of the case and to come to the relief of the captain and the crew. We are in constant communication with the Home Office with regard to this matter, and the answers that we have received were, of course, unsatisfactory, because they did not mean that these men would be discharged, except that the crew was released, as I stated. The department has done all it can do in the matter. Another despatch was sent last week, and we are waiting for an answer to that despatch.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) asked the circumstances of this case. The captain of this vessel is a constituent of mine, a native of Bras d'Or, in the vicinity of North Sydney, and I am in direct communication with him. He writes me that the vessel was under full sail, moving along slowly in a light breeze with all her boats aboard and all hands aboard. No fishing of any kind was being done. There were no seals caught, nothing whatever could be found, nothing was there to be found and there was no offence on the part of the vessel. She was captured four miles off the coast and therefore, I suppose, on the high seas. Not a particle of evidence of any kind could be gathered either on board or anywhere else to show that there was an infraction of any law even if there had been any law. These are the circumstances and I wish to give them for the benefit of the hon. leader of the opposition in view of what he says. Nothing has since been discovered and there is nothing to discover. These are the facts. There is nothing further that can be found out about it. I am sorry to say to the House that the captain complains very bitterly of the conduct of the British consul at that place who seems to take very little interest in his case and to do very little about it. He is also very sorry that the matter has been received with such indifference on the other side of the water. I am very pleased to find that such an interest is taken in the case by both sides of the House, and I hope that the question will be speedily dealt with, because the situation of these men is a serious one. There are 19 or 20 men down there out of work. They cannot come home, they have no money, their vessel is gone and hon. gentlemen will understand what the condition of these men must be. They have no money, they are in a strange land and they have no way of getting home. I think this matter is as serious as anything that could possibly come before the House and it should certainly receive the prompt attention of the government.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The hon. gentleman will see by the correspondence that we have on record that there is nothing to show that the British consul was negligent in the matter. He is paralyzed to a certain extent, because these men are detained there pending inquiry into the case.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. At the same time if the vessel were seized outside of territorial waters——

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The contention on the part of the government is that it was seized within territorial waters.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If it is clear that an unlawful act has been committed within territorial waters that is another thing. However, if the government of Uruguay should undertake to pass laws and regulations permitting British vessels to be seized near the coast outside of its territorial waters we would have exactly the same class of cases as those which arose in connection with the Behring sea seizures when the United States government claimed jurisdiction in Behring sea on the ground that it was a mare clausum, because it was practically surrounded by their territory. Of course that contention was not made good and eventually there was an inquiry as to the damages sustained. If the facts are as my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) states, there should not be much doubt as to what should be done. It is a very serious act for an armed vessel of any country to seize a ship carrying the flag of another country on the high seas outside of territorial waters and I quite agree with those who have spoken on the subject that this is a matter which might well engage the attention of the House when we have seen the correspondence which the hon. gentleman promises to bring down.

Steamboat inspection, $36,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Explain.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There are 20 steamboat inspectors employed including the chairman of the board.

Mr. BARR. How long do they continue their work during the year ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They are supposed to work all the time. Their names and residences are as follows : Edward Adams, chairman steamboat inspection, Ottawa, salary $1,900 ; J. A. Thomson, Victoria, B.C.; J. Samson, Quebec ; Wm. Laurie, Montreal; L. Arpin, Montreal ; John Dodds, Toronto ; E. W. McKean, Toronto ; T. P. Thompson, Kingston ; J. P. Esdaile, Halifax ; C. E. Dalton, St. John, N.B.; G. P. Phillips, Rat Portage ; Frank M. Richardson, Vancouver; J. B. Stewart, Collingwood ; A. Rondeau, Sorel ; M. P. McElhinney, Ottawa and Douglas Stevens, Halifax ; There are besides this, five inspectors of hulls and equipment : L. J. Olive, St. John ; S. R. Hill, Halifax ; Wm. Evans, Toronto ; M. R. Davis, Kingston ; and Philippe Duclos, Quebec. Mr. R. Collister is the inspector of hulls at Victoria, B.C., and is paid by fees according to the number of vessels he inspects.

Mr. BLAIN. Were there any new ones appointed during last year ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I think there was one appointed at Sorel.

Mr. BLAIN. What qualification is held by those gentlemen who are appointed ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The statute provides for the establishment of a system of steamboat inspection and also prescribes the way in which the inspection is to be made.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose that statute was passed some years ago and I assume that the hon. minister will require a better qualification and a higher grade of certificate in these advanced times. Are we to understand that the gentleman who was appointed last year was appointed with the same qualification as was called for by the statute passed many years ago ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The same qualification. The rules are changed from time to time according to the improvements that are going on. For instance, last year we amended the statute. We provided in that for the inspection of boats propelled by oil gasoline, electricity and so on. As modifications and improvements are made in the construction of boats and in machinery the rules are changed and made more strict to meet the changed circumstances. Every one who is appointed passes a very rigid examination, one of the severest examinations possible. He is examined by the chairman of the board assisted by two other inspectors and a great many have failed to pass the examination. I know many who are unable after two or three trials to pass the examination.

Mr. BLAIN. What position did the person appointed last year occupy before he entered the service.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. He was mechanical engineer employed for many years in a machinery shop at Sorel ; he passed one of the best examinations ever passed.

Mr. INGRAM. Was there an increased number of explosions in the smaller vessels last year ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The published report of Mr. Adams gives a list of accidents, but I do not think there were any explosions.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I wish to draw the attention of the minister to a complaint that is made by shipowners, that vessels that have been inspected by Lloyds in Great Britain are subject to Canadian inspection

when they trade in Canadian waters. It is contended that this is altogether unnecessary. It is well known that Lloyds is one of the most reliable associations in the world, and their inspection and classification will be accepted almost anywhere except in Canada. It appears that a ship which holds a first-class at Lloyds, which is for instance carrying coal between Cape Breton and Montreal, is subject to a special inspection in Canada and the owners put to annoyance and trouble. If this be the case, I draw the attention of the minister to the matter in the hope that the regulation may be amended.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There are two sides to that question. Formerly when there was a fee charged there was no Canadian inspection, but three years ago the fee was done away with, and a regulation was passed obliging such vessels to be inspected here. Most of these vessels are what is known as tramp steamers, and it was thought better that we should keep track of them while they are plying in Canadian waters. The inspection does not cost anything. There may be a little inconvenience in it, but the inspectors are always within call, so that there may be no delay. I think it is a good regulation.

Salaries and allowances to lighthouse keepers, $238,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. How many lightkeepers have been dispensed with on account of the change in the system of lights ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We had formerly 35 lighthouse keepers in the Kingston—Montreal division ; we have dispensed with 11, leaving the present number 24.

Mr. BARR. Has the expense decreased as well ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There has been a reduction in that division of $2,360 per annum. That has been offset partially by an increase of $70 to Manly Cross who is in charge of the Gananoque group of lights and $250 to Thomas Leger who is in charge of the Lachine group of lights, leaving the net reduction $2,040. The idea of the department in changing the system of lighting was the strengthening of the lights, but the reduction naturally followed.

Mr. TAYLOR. How many lights have been changed from the old style to acetylene gas ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Forty-three.

Mr. BARR. What reduction in cost was brought about by the change ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The acetylene costs about $30 a year more.

Mr. TAYLOR. When the hon. gentleman proposed to make this change he said that it was going to effect a great saving; but now we find him asking the same amount as before. There is no saving, and the services of very few employees have been dispensed with.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It was not so much the saving that I was counting on. There was a little saving, but the most important point was to make the lights more efficient. It must be remembered that the number of lights has increased considerably and that we are constantly increasing the number for the satisfaction of the shipping people.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does the hon. gentleman include in this amount the sum paid for the steamer 'Scout' and crew, used exclusively in looking after the lights ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The expenditure on the 'Scout' is not included in this, but in the item for government steamers under the heading of 'Ocean and River Service.' The 'Scout' has three officers and a crew of eleven men.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. May I be permitted to make a suggestion on behalf of a deserving class of people, the light keepers throughout the country. The salaries paid to these people, especially to the keepers of the smaller class of lights, are very small indeed. Those salaries remain at the same figures at which they were placed many years ago, though the conditions along the coasts have changed. The question of fuel itself is a very important question to many of the smaller light keepers. I hope the minister will take into his most favourable consideration the claims of this deserving class of people, and make some effort to grant to them some advance of salary.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I wish to add a word to what my hon. friend has said. The salaries of these light keepers are so absurdly small that no man can be expected to live on them. For example, I had a letter the other day from a light keeper at Port Felix on the coast of Nova Scotia, who is getting $250 a year. He is living on an island, where he has to buy his fuel and everything else that he requires for his family. Every gentleman in this House knows that it is impossible for a man to keep soul and body together for 365 days, and feed and clothe his family, with $250 in any part of Canada. That man is expected to be at his post night and day, and to see that his light is burning when the rest of us are sleeping. He is not allowed a holiday. He has to be there day after day from year's end to year's end, and he gets $250 a year. I applied to the Marine Department for an increase, and I got the usual letter to the effect that the department could not afford to grant any increase to that class of light keeper.

Mr. BENNETT. Is that all the year round ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. All the year round. I think something ought to be done on behalf of these people.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I sympathize entirely with what the hon. gentleman has stated. I found the state of affairs to which he has referred when I arrived in the department. Since I have been there I have been trying to render justice to the light keepers, but I could not do it all at once. We have not been able yet to render justice to one-quarter of them. We have about 800 light keepers distributed all over the country. I have tried to provide a fair salary for the new ones that have been appointed; but it is difficult to increase salaries without being charged with favouring one class of people at the expense of another. Although I have increased the salaries of a large number of the light keepers during the two years that I have been in the department, I have been unable to do justice, I am quite sure, to a great many. I shall probably bring a supplementary estimate to enable me to render more justice to these deserving people.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to draw the hon. minister's attention to some people who I consider have had cold justice served out to them. They have worked at a low salary for a number of years, expecting that they would continue to receive it during their lifetime; but my hon. friend promised, with the change that he was making to acetylene gas, that he would save the country a large sum of money, and would dispense with the services of a great many light keepers. He dispensed with the services of two or three in my neighbourhood without giving them a day's notice. He just told them that their services were dispensed with, and gave them no pension and no allowance of two or three months of salary. He simply threw them out on the world without notice. I want to hold the minister responsible for the promise he made to the people of this country when he introduced this change. Two years ago the hon. minister stated his reasons for changing the old system of lighting to the new system in the following words:—

> The ten new ranges of gas lights will require no keepers, saving an annual charge of $3,000, and the proposed conversion of the lights from an oil to a gas basis will enable the keepers to be dispensed with as opportunity offers, at a saving of $7,000 per year, or a total saving in cost of maintenance of $10,000 per year.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. But all have not yet been changed, and the saving could not be shown.

Mr. TAYLOR. But the hon. gentleman has changed thirty-five of them between Montreal and Kingston.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have dispensed with eleven of them, and have saved $2,700.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then to that is to be added the expenditure on the steamer 'Scout' that I see patrolling the river the whole season. She was not there before, and she is there now.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. She is doing buoy service.

Mr. TAYLOR. But the buoy service was done before out of this sum asked for, and the steamer 'Scout' is there lying at our docks two or three days at a time, with her captain, engineers and a crew of eleven men, all in brass buttons and gold lace; and I presume their outfit is furnished by the country. I want the minister to tell me what the expense of the steamer 'Scout' has been for the season?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. About $7,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does the hon. gentleman say that $7,000 pays the wages of the crew, including the fuel and all expenses for running the steamer one season?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That is the information I get from the gentleman in charge.

Mr. TAYLOR. At what page in the Auditor General's Report is the item shown giving the expenses of the steamer 'Scout'?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The Auditor General's Report only gives the expenses for the crew, the cost of supplies is not shown. But the officer tells me that $7,000 is the average cost per season.

Mr. TAYLOR. For wages, fuel and all expenses?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, and gold lace, and so on.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now what is the expense incurred in running the factory at Prescott, together with the cost of fitting up and completing it?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The total cost is $49,280.50.

Mr. TAYLOR. $49,000 there, and $7,000 for the 'Scout,' and we have so far had a saving of only $2,040, and the minister informs us that the gas costs more than the oil did. So where is this great saving that the minister promised when he introduced his new system a few years ago?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The Prescott depot was established for the benefit of the whole Dominion. We are manufacturing there lamps and other appliances for the lighthouse service all over the Dominion; so the hon. gentleman sees but a small portion of the advantages of the change. The change does not consist in merely substituting an acetylene lamp for an oil lamp, there are a great many other improvements that have been made, improvements demanded by the

shipping federation, marine associations, and so forth. For instance, that section of country has been lighted and buoyed in such a way that navigation can now be carried on during the night. Those improvements were recommended by every one interested in navigation, and we are still increasing them as time goes on, to the great satisfaction of every one engaged in navigation. We have done the same thing for a stretch of sixty miles in the St. Lawrence channel between Montreal and Quebec, which we have equipped with gas buoys, and with lights of the most approved pattern, so that those sixty miles can now be navigated both night and day with perfect safety. All these improvements cost money. The hon. gentleman should not blame the department for spending money in making improvements asked for by every one connected with navigation. No one engaged in navigation will find fault with the expenditure made on the St. Lawrence in improving the lighting and buoying of the channel at various points. The fact is that we have demands every day from persons interested, for more lights, more buoys, and more improvements all along the St. Lawrence route from the lakes to the sea.

Mr. BENNETT. Are they asking you to take out oil and put in carbide ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, and they have passed resolutions commending the government. If the hon. gentleman will read the resolutions passed by the Board of Trade of Montreal, by the Shipping Federation, and all others connected with navigation—I will not read them because they are so complimentary to myself personally—but if the hon. gentleman will read them he will see that every one interested in navigation highly commends the improvements made by the government, and are asking for still more. I may say that in the supplementary estimates I intend to bring down a large amount, nearly as much as I am asking in the main estimates, in order to satisfy the demands of the shipping interests. Of course if we had more money to expend and more time in which to do it, we could make more improvements. The work can only be done gradually, because some of the machinery is very expensive, and it takes a good deal of time to manufacture it and put it in position.

Mr. TAYLOR. But when the hon. gentleman started this scheme and made the change from oil to acetylene gas, he promised there would be a saving to the country annually. But instead of carrying out that promise he is making an annual increase, and according to his own statement he is going to bring down another large amount in the supplementaries. Now I am acquainted with the whole route from Montreal to Kingston, and have been for the last forty years, the route that he says has now been so greatly improved. During all that time I have supplied steamers with wood at Gananoque, and I never knew the time yet when the steamers could not travel by night between Gananoque and Montreal and back again, with the old style of lighthouses and the old style of lighting. True, the Department of Railways and Canals has charge of some of these things, they have lighting plants put on the canals, and look after their lighthouses and their light keepers ; and we have heard of but few if any accidents on the route between Montreal and Kingston. My hon. friend promised to make a large reduction in the expense by changing from oil to acetylene gas, and by putting in a plant belonging to the government. But he has not done so, and the whole thing from start to finish shows merely a desire to make government purchases from the manufacturers of acetylene gas, some of whom are members of the government, and are interested in the manufacture of this acetylene gas and are selling it to these light houses. But it will be an increased expenditure, and is an increased expenditure every year. And yet we do not see any improvement in the lights. In fact, there was more complaint during the fly season last year than ever before. Formerly there was a man to attend to each light, and he kept the glasses clear. But now, the government has its gas lights in charge of one man, Mr. Manly Cross, and he only goes around once in a while to see if they are running. The minister dispensed with the services of faithful men on a few days' notice, and started these new lights to use up the acetylene manufactured by members of the government and sold to the government.

Mr. U. WILSON. Will the minister please state who is the light keeper at Brothers light, in Lennox county, when he was appointed, what his salary is, and whether he is allowed fuel and light ? The man who formerly kept the light died, and I would like to know about his successor.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The light keeper at Brothers light is Mr. Daniel Wendt. His salary is $200 a year.

Mr. U. WILSON. I suppose the lighthouse keeper is not obliged to give his whole time to this service.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I should suppose not.

Mr. U. WILSON. Under the former government, the man was expected to stay there the year round, and, because he would not stay they dismissed him.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Mr. Wendt was appointed on the 9th of January, 1901.

Mr. U. WILSON. The minister has not stated whether he is allowed light and fuel.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I should suppose so. But I can get the information if the hon. gentleman (Mr. U. Wilson) desires it.

Mr. U. WILSON. I do not need to trouble the minister on that point. Is it usual for these men with small salaries to have fuel and light allowed them ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I should suppose so.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. minister stated to the member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) that about $7,000 is the cost of the maintenance of this boat the 'Druid.' Is any portion of that charged to the buoy account ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is all charged to the buoy account.

Mr. INGRAM. As I understand it, there is one charge for maintenance of boats in the service, and there is also what they call the buoy account. Is there any portion of the boats charged up to the buoy service ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have just stated, on the information of the engineer in charge of the lighthouses, that the expense of the 'Scout' was charged to the buoy service above Montreal.

Mr. INGRAM. I thought there was another account for the maintenance of these two boats in this service.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is no special vote.

Mr. AMES. Will the minister please explain in a word or two how these lighthouses are grouped, and something of the system of inspection.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The number of lights above Montreal is 194; in Quebec below Montreal, 174; Nova Scotia, 246; New Brunswick, 118; Prince Edward Island, 50; and British Columbia, 37; total, 809. I was mistaken in the answer I gave a little while ago. Some of the keepers have two lights, and there are also a number of gaslights for which there are no keepers.

Mr. AMES. I do not care so much about these details, and do not wish to take up the minister's time. But I would like to know something of how the districts are co-ordinated. And what is the system by which they are inspected. The minister states that there are 174 lights below Montreal. What is the system by which these are inspected ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They are under an inspector, Mr. O'Farrell.

Mr. AMES. Has he a steamer at his disposal ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, he has a steamer—the 'Aberdeen.' And he is kept busy inspecting the whole time, looking after supplies and so on.

Mr. AMES. And if the apparatus of a lighthouse breaks down, how are steps taken to have it immediately repaired ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is a signal service. We know at once where anything has gone wrong and immediately give instructions about it.

Mr. INGRAM. I would draw the attention of the minister to page 6 of his own report, where the statement is made that the cost of these vessels is not charged to th buoy service :

> A large number of whistling, bell and other iron buoys are maintained along the coast of the several provinces by Dominion steamers, particularly on the Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and British Columbia coasts. These buoys are called coast buoys to distinguish them from the harbour buoys. The cost of this maintenance by the steamers is not charged directly to the buoy service,——

The minister said it was.

> —but is included in the cost of maintenance of the steamers which frequently perform the double duty of attending to lighthouses and the coast buoy service, on the same trip.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That may be east of Quebec, but in the upper district it is not. But whether it is charged to buoy service in one section or in another it does not make any difference.

Mr. INGRAM. I am not contending that it does. But the minister says that the $7,000 covers the whole cost and it is charged to buoy service. But it does not appear to be so.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That is the information I have from Mr. Fraser, who is in charge of the division where the 'Scout' is employed.

Mr. BERGERON. In Lake St. Louis, the department has, within the past two years, been replacing the old lights with revolving lights, which, I think are very much appreciated by navigators. I wish to know if the same system will be extended over the whole of Lake St. Louis. The new buoys have been only on the western part of the lake, but on the lower part the lights are those formerly used ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I am glad the hon. gentleman differs in opinion from the hon. gentleman from Leeds (Mr. Taylor). The hon. gentleman has been scolding me a good deal just now for spending so much money in making these changes. Of course the lesson has no effect on me, because the programme has been arranged by my predecessor and we intend to continue the improvements that were commenced a few years ago and to continue them as fast as the money will be voted because we know that in making these improvements we are doing good to the country, to navigation, to trade generally, and as fast as we can do it we will

change these lights in different parts of the country. We are trying to keep abreast of the demands that are made to the department and to improve the lights in different parts of Canada.

Agencies, rents and contingencies, $25,000.

Mr. AMES. I understand there are now six agencies.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. AMES. An agency has recently been established in Montreal and I suppose the minister has personal knowledge of that agency? Would he kindly give us some idea as to the departments that are installed there, the number of rooms and the number of employees?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The employees are, Mr. E. V. Bouchet, who is not a new nominee, he was in charge of that part of the River St. Lawrence before; Mr. LeBelle assistant engineer to Mr. Bouchet, Mr. Morin, messenger, and Mrs. Brunet, the caretaker. The branches of the department which have offices there are: The two cattle inspectors, Mr. Pope and Mr. DeLong, the steamboat inspectors, Mr. Laurie and Harper, who are old employees. There is also the pilots' court with Captain Reilly in charge. He has a clerk there and a stenographer. The stenographer attends to the investigations when there are any. There are also rooms for the hydrographic survey and a drafting room for Mr. Bouchet the engineer in charge. There are offices besides that for the deputy minister and myself.

Mr. AMES. That makes in all how many rooms?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Twelve or fourteen.

Mr. AMES. Are there any other departments in the same building belonging to the government?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No, the other rooms are taken up by merchants and we have rented only these rooms.

Mr. AMES. The minister, I suppose, has a lease for these premises?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. A lease for five years with the privilege of renting.

Mr. AMES. I had some curiosity in looking over the cost of equipping those offices. I find that the equipping of the offices cost $6,340 which seems a pretty heavy expenditure for a suite of offices that are only leased. I also find heavy expenditures for fittings, furniture, &c., about $1,700 in accounts for furniture for the various offices. I suppose the rooms of the janitor are furnished as well?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, I have not seen them, I think they live under the roof.

Mr. AMES. Otherwise it would be difficult to know where the bed clothing and parlour furniture, &c., was needed.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It may be called parlour furniture, but it is the usual furniture for an ordinary office. I do not suppose for instance that it would be expected that the minister would go there, and occupy a room without a carpet or furniture, and there receive people, the best merchants of Montreal, the representatives of the Board of Trade, &c. I must say that the building was in a very bad state of repair. There was no electric light in it, there were scarcely any gas pipes for the lighting, and the heating apparatus was in very bad condition. On acocunt of the expenditure that it was necessary to make to put these apartments in good condition we got it at a very cheap price. The property is worth from $60,000 to $75,000 and the rent that we pay is only $2,500. This expenditure was taken into consideration when we rented the apartments. It was the only building that could be got at the time near the harbour. It is directly opposite the harbour.

Mr. AMES. The minister said that he had only rented portions of the building, that other parties had the rest.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There are three other rooms occupied by some other parties. We did nothing in these departments and it is mentioned in the lease also. I can furnish a copy of the lease to the hon. gentleman.

Maintenance and repairs to lighthouses and lightships, $500,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That is the same amount as last year.

Mr. AMES. Would the minister give us the details of how that item is made up?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The expenditure for 1903-4 for the maintenance of lights was $382,178.36. In that year the lightships placed on the Lurcher shoals and Anticosti island were not in position and not under maintenance. Considerable repairs are now required to the lighthouses throughout the Dominion to put them in good condition, and owing to the increased number of new light stations the cost is increasing. There are now under maintenance in the Dominion 960 lights all told, some of which were built soon after confederation. Extensive repairs are now required in order to put them in good condition. A number of them are in such shape that practically new towers will have to be built and it is important that the service should be kept up to the highest standard. This cannot be done without a large expenditure of money. In British Columbia there has been a large addition to the number of aids to navigation.

It must be borne in mind that provision must also be made for a number of new

light stations, which are now under construction. The expenditure on current account for maintenance and repairs was $487,311.53. If the hon. gentleman will refer to page 3 of the report of the department, he will find the following information :

The lighthouse service of the Dominion is divided as follows : The Ontario division, embracing all lights from Montreal westward to the Northwest Territories ; the Quebec division extending below Quebec and including the river and gulf of St. Lawrence and strait of Belle Isle ; the Nova Scotia division, including St. Paul's Island, Cape Breton, Sable Island and Cape Race, Newfoundland ; the New Brunswick division, the Prince Edward Island division and British Columbia division, each including lights within the provincial boundaries.

The several districts, with the exception of the district above Montreal, are in charge of agents who receive instructions from the department, and report annually in addition to communicating with the department, in connection with all matters relating to their agencies.

The total number of light stations, lightships and fog-alarm stations in the Dominion on June 30, 1904, was 796, and lights shown 996 ; the number of steam whistles, fog-horns, bells and guns 99; the number of light keepers and engineers of fog-alarms with masters of lightships was 783.

Mr. AMES. The hon. minister has not quite given the information I asked for, although he has given a great deal of information which we were already in possession of. The information that I am anxious to get from the hon. gentleman is how he proposes to expend this $500,000 during the next year. He has been in the habit of laying before us some detailed statement of the way in which this estimate is made up. We have the figures in the hon. minister's report showing how the money was spent last year, but we want to know what he intends doing with it during this coming year.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The item reads :

Maintenance and repairs to lighthouses and lightships, $500,000.

The expenditure for maintenance is something which is perfectly well known. We spent last year $487,000 under that item. This is all shown in the Auditor General's Report. I do not know what is going to happen next year. I suppose that maintenance and repairs will cost about the same amount. As it goes on year after year maintenance is a fixed charge. Maintenance costs $300,000 and some odd a year, and the rest is spent on repairs. I do not know what will be the expenditure next season until the reports of the inspectors come in, but I suppose it will keep about the same.

Mr. AMES. If I may make a suggestion, it would be that when we are going to deal with an item of half a million dollars we should have some details as to the manner in which that is to be divided up. I think if we consult 'Hansard,' we will find that previously the minister has laid a statement of that kind before the committee.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Never for maintenance.

Mr. W. ROCHE. I would like to ask the hon. minister if any provision has been made for the construction of a lightship off Halifax harbour ? There has been an agitation going on for some time, and I think an indirect promise has been made by the hon. minister that his attention would be given to that matter at the earliest possible moment. This is not an isolated work, but it is in connection with the general improvement of lights in Halifax harbour. Numbers of petitions have been sent in, and the opinions of nautical men have been given as to the best locality for it, and I would like to know what determination the hon. minister has arrived at on the subject.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. When I entered the department three years ago I found numerous petitions requesting that improvement in the Halifax harbour. I found also at the same time that it had been decided to build a lightship for the Lurcher shoals and one for the east point of Anticosti. These have cost about $200,000. The lightship at Halifax is estimated to cost $500,000. It is a very large expenditure, and until the present moment, although we admit—I would not say the urgency—but the necessity of having this light, I have been unable to obtain the necessary amount to go on with this important improvement. We have improved the lights, as the hon. gentleman will admit, but we have not yet come to the conclusion to accede to this fair and just demand of the navigators. I would, personally, be in favour of the work being done, but we have had many demands. The Shipping Federation have made representations in regard to this lightship and they have made representations about a great many other lights, and it would cost up in the millions if we were to satisfy all the demands that have been made. I hope that in a short time we will be able to satisfy the city of Halifax and construct that lightship.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand the hon. minister to admit the necessity of a lightship off the mouth of Halifax harbour. I am very glad that the department has come to that conclusion. I brought the matter to the attention of the House on a great many occasions, first when Sir Louis Davies filled the position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries. At that time the policy of the department seemed to be against it. I was answered with some reports of officers of the department which were not at all favourable to the idea of establishing a lightship there. On that occasion, or on the following occasion when I brought the matter to the attention of the House, I produced statements and opinions

from several persons who were familiar with navigation, and especially familiar with the harbour of Halifax, and they all declared that it was very essential that this work should be carried out. That seems to be the view now concurred in; and if it is, as the hon. minister says, regarded as important or even necessary to absolutely safe navigation in the harbour at Halifax, that this lightship should be provided, I sincerely trust that there will be no great delay about bringing down the necessary appropriation and proceeding with the work. It is absolutely important in the interest of the whole country that this should be done. We know that every wreck which occurs anywhere along the coast of Canada, or within a thousand miles of the coast of Canada, is posted up against our account when we endeavour to make arrangements in regard to insurance rates. For that reason and many others, it is absolutely essential that a matter of this kind, the importance of which is admitted, should not be postponed. I do not think there is any work coming under the Department of Marine which is more important, especially as we are now promised a somewhat faster steamship service by the new Allan boats, which, I suppose, will run to Halifax, and possibly another port on this side, during the winter months.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) that I am fully alive to the position to which he has referred, it is purely and simply a question of expenditure. It will require $500,000 and we have been unable to get that amount voted yet. If it depends on me I will have it done within the shortest possible delay. I recognize that with the fine harbour which exists in Halifax, this improvement would probably make it the easiest of access on the coast, and I hope to see the work done soon. In the meantime we are trying to improve the entrance to the port of Halifax by installing gas buoys and submarine bell.

Mr. W. ROCHE. I am very much pleased that the minister has announced his resolve to pay some attention to the port of Halifax. He has mentioned that such a lightship as he contemplates will cost a large amount of money, but if that has any influence in deterring him perhaps he could suggest a modification in the size of the ship and the capacity of the lights which would reduce the cost. If a first class lightship be not obtainable at once because of its great cost, would it not be desirable to place a lightship there that would have a range light of thirty miles say, as against the range of forty miles which the highest class lightship has, and which might be in excess of the requirements.

Mr. AMES. Where are the depots situated, at which the supplies for the lighthouse service are delivered, and from which they are distributed ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The supplies are distributed by the steamers of the department. These supplies are all bought under contract at Quebec, Halifax, St. John and Montreal, although at Montreal we buy very few supplies. Everything that can be bought by contract is bought in that way.

Mr. AMES. I am to understand that the supplies for the lighthouses are purchased and collected at the six agencies from which they are distributed.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The goods are bought and delivery taken at certain points indicated, and then they are taken to the place where the work is going on.

Mr. AMES. Where is the carbide for the lights purchased ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. At Ottawa.

Mr. AMES. Is it shipped from Ottawa to the various points where it is needed ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. AMES. Who pays the freight?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The department pays the freight.

Mr. AMES. I suppose the steamers call at Quebec and Sorel for carbide.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. At Prescott, Sorel, Quebec and Halifax.

Mr. AMES. What price is paid for this carbide at Ottawa?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. $65 per ton ; the same price as the Canadian Pacific Railway pays, and they take a larger quantity than we do.

Mr. AMES. Have you any idea what is the freight per ton from Ottawa to Quebec?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is the ordinary rate; I will have to look it up.

Mr. AMES. The department buys lumber in large quantities at Montreal for repairing these lighthouses. One entry in the Auditor General's Report speaks of $2,500 worth of lumber being put on the 'Scout' at Montreal and taken to Ontario.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The 'Scout' could not take that quantity of lumber all at once ; I suppose that represents the whole year.

Mr. AMES. Was that lumber bought by contract ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. When it is a large quantity and specified it is bought by contract, but otherwise it is bought in the ordinary way; they go around to the different lumber yards and get the price and buy it.

Mr. PERLEY. Are any steps taken to see that this lumber is bought at a reasonable price?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. When there is a large quantity required the officer has instructions to report to the deputy minister and prices are asked by public tender or by circular.

Mr. PERLEY. The reason I asked you is that I see the following account in the Auditor General's Report of J. C. Robert & Company, of Montreal, from whom the department purchased $2,267 worth of lumber. The prices in that account are as follows :—

Montreal, July 6th, 1903.

The Dominion Government,

To J. C. Robert & Company, Dr.

Department Marine and Fisheries.

530 feet 2-inch pine, 1st quality, wide kiln dried, planed 2 sides, dressed extra, 1,060 at $100..	$ 106 00
560 feet 1½-inch pine, 1st quality, wide, kiln dried, planed 2 sides, dressed extra, 790 at $100..	79 00
2,090 feet 1-inch pine, 1st quality, wide, kiln dried, planed 2 sides, dressed extra, at $100..	209 00
3,491 feet 1-inch pine, 1st and 2nd quality, wide, kiln dry, planed 2 sides, dressed extra, pieces at $90..	314 19
1,000 feet 1 and 2-inch pine, rough, 2,000 at $35..	70 00
2,000 feet 2-inch pine, 4,191 at $60.. ..	251 46
1,000 feet 2 x 6 x 20 pine, 2,000 at $35.. ..	70 00
3,000 feet 2 x 4 pine, at $60..	180 00
1,000 feet 2 x 10 x 20-22 pine, 3,333 at $40	133 32
25 pieces 10 x 10 x 20-23 pine, 4,167 at $40	166 68
1,000 feet 1-inch 'T' and grooved and beaded..	60 00
2,320 feet 3-inch pine, 6,950 at $35..	243 25
42 pieces 10 x 12 x 12-13, 5,320 at $35.. ..	186 20
84 pieces 8 x 8 x 12-15, 5,680 at $35.. ..	198 80

Here we have common pine charged at $35 a thousand, and these items are all from twenty to thirty per cent more than they should be. Surely the minister ought to take some steps to see that prices of that kind are not paid by the department. I also see by the Auditor General's Report that 81,000 feet of rough pine were purchased at $40 a thousand. I am sure that the hon. minister, if he makes inquiry, will find that $40 a thousand is an exorbitant price to pay for rough pine lumber. I think he should see that in future tenders are obtained from a sufficient number of people to prevent this occurring again.

Mr. AMES. I wish also to call attention to the fact that these advanced prices are not referred to in the Auditor General's Report. It simply mentions advances on account of lumber to J. C. Robert & Co. of $2,250. If we had not had a little experience of the prices of this company we would perhaps be inclined to pass that over ; but having found that item, we took the precaution to ask the Auditor General to bring down the statement, which showed that the prices quoted are 30 per cent above the regular market prices for the very best quality of goods.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is not a single one of these items that has not been certified by the proper officer. As this matter has been brought to my notice, I will look into it, and furnish all the information in regard to qualities and quantities.

Mr. AMES. The money seems to have been all paid to the contractor before the itemized account came in.

Mr. BENNETT. I wish to ask the minister if he is fitting out a plant at Parry Sound for the manufacture of gas ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We have not done anything yet, because the parties who offered a property at a certain price have backed out, and we are negotiating with the Bank of Ottawa for a site.

Mr. BENNETT. What price is the Bank of Ottawa asking for the site ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. $5,500. We have a vote of $12,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Did some other person make an overture to the department for the sale of the property now owned by the Bank of Ottawa, on behalf of the bank, and if so, who was that party ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, that is the trouble. We found that the property was held under an option given to a man named Clarke, and this man wanted to increase the price. So we withdrew our offer, and the matter remains there.

Mr. BENNETT. As I understand the minister, the Bank of Ottawa are now offering the property at $5,500. Might I ask what is the area of the land proposed to be purchased ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is between two and three acres, with buildings, wharfs, engine, boiler and machinery.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it near what is known as the steamboat dock, or is it on the opposite side of the bay, at Parry Harbour ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The engineer informs me that it is on the Parry Harbour side.

Mr. BENNETT. I know something of the locality, and I have been advised that the price asked for by the Bank of Ottawa is a very excessive price for this property, and that adjoining property that would be equally suitable for the purpose might be acquired at a much less price.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We have withdrawn our offer, and we will try to buy on the best possible terms.

Mr. BENNETT. I presume it is possible for the government to expropriate this land ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We have done nothing. The price asked at the time was considered in the locality a very low price, but the price having been increased, we have declined to go on, and are trying to get a property at a cheaper price.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the feature of this property that made it desirable ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. On account of the machinery and the buildings and we thought the price asked by the bank was a fair and reasonable price.

Mr. BENNETT. What property is it ? Who owned it prior to its acquisition by the Bank of Ottawa ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Kerr & Harcourt. But we did not buy it, and if it is too dear, we will not buy it.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the minister promise that he will ask by public advertisement for offers of a certain area of land which will have the feature that it abuts on the water ? I understand that certain other parties are anxious to sell their property to the department. I am informed that the department was approached by Mr. Clarke and offered this property for $7,000, that the department very properly declined to purchase it at that figure, and that the original owners are now offering the same property for $5,500. Is it a first condition that the property which the department proposes to acquire shall abut on the water ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Then, from what I am advised I think the minister will be able to acquire land equally suitable at a much lower price.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Will the hon. gentleman let me know the name of the owner ?

Mr. BENNETT. I am not just in a position to state the name of my informant.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Will the hon. gentleman give me the name privately ?

Mr. BENNETT. Let the hon. gentleman do what he would do in an ordinary transaction of his own—advertise for offers of property.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. If the hon. gentleman will not give me the information, I will try to get it.

Mr. BENNETT. It is quite plain that the minister has anticipated trouble in this matter with the owners, the Bank of Ottawa. They have given an option to a gentleman named Clark, and his offer was so high that the minister declined to accept it. That offer, I am informed, was $7,000. Is that correct ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I think it is.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Clark, who is a friend of the hon. gentlemen opposite, not being able to put through his deal for $7,000, they are now dealing with the Bank of Ottawa for $5,500 and I am informed that that price is a very excessive price. Do I understand that the Bank of Ottawa has now withdrawn their offer ? Will the minister make a promise that he will call by public advertisement notice to the fact that he wishes to acquire so much land in the town of Parry Sound for this purpose ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It will be pretty well known after this discussion, there will be no need of advertising.

Mr. BENNETT. We will resume the discussion after six o'clock.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

NORTHWEST TELEPHONE COMPANY.

On the order :

Third reading of Bill (No. 28) to incorporate the Northwest Telephone Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). Stand.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What is the reason for allowing this Bill to stand ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I myself asked the gentleman who has charge of it not to press it just now, because it appeared to me that the more telephone companies were incorporated the more it might complicate the situation.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. All right.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That was the only object.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. That is a good reason.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I should have no objection to it going through and remaining——

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. No ; I think the hon. gentleman (Sir William Mulock) is quite right.

Order allowed to stand.

OTTAWA ELECTRIC COMPANY.

On the order :

House again in committee on Bill (No. 12) respecting the Ottawa Electric Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Mr. GALLIHER. By mutual arrangement, Mr. Speaker, this Bill stands until Wednesday next.

Order allowed to stand.

MOOSEJAW AND EDMONTON RAILWAY COMPANY.

House went into committee on Bill (No. 20) to incorporate the Moosejaw and Edmonton railway Company.—Mr. Scott.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems to me that the capitalization of this company is pretty heavy—securities of $25,000 a mile and a capital stock of $2,000,000. There are provisions also under section 12, authorizing issue of paid-up stock for service, &c., to which I have already objected on a previous occasion in this House in connection with another charter. The Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) will observe that for a railway to be built in the Northwest, not a difficult country, this capitalization is pretty heavy. Of course, reasons may have been given before the Railway Committee in support of these proposals. But I do think that the promoter of the Bill ought to be here to answer objections of this kind.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am not able to throw any light on the subject, as I was not present in the Railway Committee when the Bill was discussed. If my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) wishes the Bill to stand over until the gentleman who is in charge of it is here, there is no objection.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think that where there is a probability of any questions of this kind being asked, it is as well to have the promoter of the Bill here. It may be that a satisfactory answer can be given. I would rather have the Bill stand. I suppose it will not delay its progress.

Progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 89) respecting Monterey Electric and Gas Company, Limited, and to change its name to 'Monterey Railway, Light and Power Company.'—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 61) to incorporate the Lebonk and Thunder Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Bole.

Bill (No. 78) respecting the Macleod, Cardston and Montana Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 85) respecting the Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—Mr. Harty.

Bill (No. 94) respecting the Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Railway Company—Mr. Derbyshire.

Bill (No. 68) respecting a Patent of the Paper Goods Company, Limited.—Mr. Macdonell.

ONTARIO AND MINNESOTA POWER COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 86) respecting the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company, Limited.—Mr. Campbell.

Mr. GALLIHER

On section 6,

Mr. BARKER. Mr. Chairman, in regard to section 6, I wish to make one remark, particularly as regards subsection (i). I have protested before in this House against the issue by the directors of any company of stock as paid up stock for the purpose of compensating certain classes of people. I have had some experience with companies and corporations. If any company wants to pay a promoter, or a solicitor, or any person whatever who serves the company it ought to pay him in hard cash, and I think it is an improper thing and one that leads to a great deal of mischief that companies, and especially companies in the condition that promoters' companies are ordinarily in, should be enabled to issue large quantities of stock to officers, promoters, engineers, or any other persons serving that company as if they had subscribed for the stock and paid one hundred cents on the dollar upon it. I know all the arguments that are ordinarily used in favour of allowing such a provision as this. A gentleman wants to get up an insurance company, or a railway company, or any other kind of a company. He is a particularly active gentleman and he employs a solicitor, or an engineer, or some other person to assist him. These two or three gentlemen go to work and organize on paper their company. They then go to parliament and get a provision of this kind put into the charter. The result is that these gentlemen form a company and for the purpose of placing its stock on the market they buy perhaps a small property. It may be worth $100,000, but the company takes it over at $1,000,000. If any question is raised about the real value of the property, people are told that the promoters and solicitors and engineers must be compensated with part of the 'paid up' stock for services. I think there is not a gentleman in this House, but who has had some experience of what I am now speaking of. The promoters buy the property which they really pay $100,000 for, and it is transferred to the corporation at perhaps $1,000,000, and paid up stock is given to these promoters for $1,000,000. Then, these gentlemen place upon the market $1,000,000 perhaps of paid up stock and another $1,000,000 to be sold to the public. That first $1,000,000 is really worth $100,000 and there is $900,000 of watered capital in the company. I do not see as a matter of honest and fair dealing why a clause should be put into a charter to enable promoters to foist upon the public a company with an assumed capital of $1,000,000 paid up when there really is only $100,000 paid up. The result of the using of this kind of a clause in all these charters has been to enable a large number of people throughout the Dominion to trade in companies. I would venture to say that if you abolish that clause you would

reduce by 50 per cent the applications to this parliament for charters. The whole effect of the clause is that a number of gentlemen get some little property—it may be a patent for some invention, it may be a mere project for a railway or a canal or anything of that kind—they buy a little property at a fictitious value and they transfer it to the company they have incorporated at an enormously increased value or rather at a price that there is no pretense of any value in. They take that stock and place it on the market and a large number of people who subscribe and pay in hard cash really believe that the amount at which the property has been put in, represents the actual value. Now, I am speaking to hon. gentlemen who know whereof I speak, and these hon. gentlemen know as well as I do that in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred these companies are floated upon terms which enable the promoter to put a lot of money into his own pocket that he has never earned. Why should any stock be issued as paid-up stock when it is not paid-up stock? What is the object of putting into an Act of parliament that stock may be issued as paid-up stock which is not paid-up stock? If it is paid-up stock you require no provision in the statute; if it is not paid up, by putting that section into the charter you are simply enabling a number of people who are promoting companies to humbug and cheat the public and to pretend that services have been performed and fairly estimated for when services have never been rendered. On more than one occasion I have protested against the insertion of such a clause and I do so again.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This Bill was very fully discussed before the committee——

Mr. BARKER. My remarks do not apply to this particular Bill; they apply to all Bills in which such a provision appears.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I differ altogether with the hon. gentleman. I do not think the public can be so easily cheated and humbugged as he seems to think. This provision has been inserted in Bills for years and years, and there is no reason why an exception should be made in this case. In fact, if you put such a provision in any Bill, this is an undertaking which would justify it above all others. This is a very large undertaking; dams have to be constructed and an enormous expense incurred before you can get any benefit from your investment. Rainy river is the boundary line between the United States and Canada; a large portion of this power is to be developed on the Canadian side, some of it on the American side, and the undertaking is one which will be of tremendous advantage to the people of this country. Sawmills, flour mills and pulp mills will have to be constructed in order to make the investment pay and this development will entail vast expenditure. If some persons desire to secure an interest in the company by taking paid-up stock instead of cash I do not see how there can be any reasonable objection to that. Every day in the Railway Committee we pass such a clause, and engineers and contractors are enabled to become partners in these enterprises by taking paid-up stock for their work. I can see a good deal in what the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) says if he confined his remarks to insurance companies and such like concerns, but in the case of a great enterprise of this character where there has to be an enormous expenditure of money before any advantage can be reaped on the investment I do not see any objection whatever to this clause.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The magnitude of the enterprise does not affect the principle in any way. There is a great deal in what my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has suggested. Be the enterprise ever so great the stock can be taken up at par and the persons who do the work can be paid in cash. The fact that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) has suggested that this enterprise would be a very important one for the people of the Dominion is not a reason for departing from what is a good principle. Is the Minister of Finance committed to the idea that we should continue this system of conferring powers of this kind? The minister knows what it results in. For example, I have in my mind a company which was capitalized to the extent of $15,000,000 or $20,000,000, placed its stock on the market at ten cents, the stock went up to an enormously high price and afterwards receded causing a great many people in this country to lose very heavily. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) would no doubt say that this was due to their propensity for going into the stock market in order to make money. I admit all that, but if the company had been legitimately capitalized in the first instance that opportunity would not have been afforded to so great an extent. I do not think the prinicple is a good one; I understand of course it has been very often acted upon, but it seems to me the sooner we get rid of it and adopt the principle which my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) has advocated, the better it would be for all of us in this country.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY. Has any one in the committee ascertained how far this section exceeds the general law in the Companies Act, or whether it has exceeded it at all?

Mr. FIELDING. I have not had this particular Bill under consideration; it came before a committee of which I am not a member. I know that abuses at times arise from over capitalization of companies, but

there is just the danger that in guarding against these abuses, you may place restrictions on an enterprise which cannot be promoted without some such arrangement For illustration, take the case of a corporation being formed to acquire some existing property. In order to acquire that property they issue bonds probably of a sufficient amount or nearly so, to pay the entire cost of acquiring that enterprise. But, by combination, by uniting the various interests, by improved arrangements in business ; in other words by the application of brains and industry to the enterprise, they would be able to make that property valuable in the future, and believing in that they issue the common stock which at the moment is not worth anything. It does not deceive anybody because at the time of its issue you could hardly sell a cartload of it for $1,000 ; but it has a prospective value provided the enterprise turns out as is hoped. If you do not allow the promoters of an enterprise like that to issue stock which may have a value in the future and which value it will receive from the intelligence and industry of the management, you may not have that enterprise carried on at all. I know that abuses have arisen, but I would almost fear that in attempting to cure them we might restrict industry and enterprise. I can conceive that it may be perfectly legitimate to issue stock paid-up and non-assessable upon which a hundred cents had not been paid, and yet you would deceive nobody because at the moment of issue it would have no substantial value. But it would have a prospective value, and that is all that the holders count on. If through the development of the concern the stock acquires a higher value, that is a legitimate profit to the people who carry on the enterprise. I am not denying that over-capitalization has led to difficulties ; but let us be careful that in trying to apply a remedy we do not place a restriction upon enterprises which but for these facilities might not be carried on at all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No one can disupte that there is something in what the hon. Minister of Finance says ; but do not let us suppose that these people will not get the profit of their brains, although the company is moderately capitalized. The stock will reach its higher value in due course, and those who hold their stock will in the end get the return of their brains and industry.

Mr. FIELDING. As a rule, the men of brains do not possess the hundred cents to pay on the stock.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It is a gamble.

Mr. FIELDING. No, it is not a gamble. It is betting on their intelligence and their brains.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think every one who has any knowledge of the position of affairs at Fort Francis will understand that a very large amount of money is required to build a dam and to develop this work. The capital stock is only $3,000,000, which is a very moderate amount for the work to be done. Then, the borrowing powers are very limited—I think only $100,000. From the information I have, I believe it is a bona fide work. The Ontario government controls the power on this side and the state of Minnesota controls the power on the other side. The Ontario government requires that fully one-half the power developed must be developed on the Canadian side, and the state of Minnesota requires the same on the other side. It is a work of great magnitude, and will employ a very large amount of capital.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman has just spoken of the character of this work, and I would like some information as to the reasons which induced the committee on private Bills to declare this a work for the general advantage of Canada. It seems to me a most extraordinary declaration to make in regard to a work of this kind. I should think this Bill ought to be before the Ontario legislature.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY. It is on international water.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If it is, you do not want that declaration, for that is a good ground for jurisdiction. There is no recital on the face of the Bill that it is an international water. Let that be recited in the Bill, and let us proceed regularly, and not stultify ourselves by making a declaration which, so far as I can understand, cannot be supported for a moment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Rainy river is a navigable stream for four hundred miles.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There should be a recital in the Bill setting forth the grounds for this declaration that it is a work for the general advantage of Canada. The Bill does not set forth that this is an international water. I for one object very strongly to the passage of the Bill with the bald declaration contained in it. The power conferred by the British North America Act of declaring works to be for the general advantage of Canada has been abused in the past, not only during the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, but I believe before that as well, and I am not disposed to pass without protest a declaration of this kind.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think there is much in the observation of my hon. friend that the parliament of Canada has in the past been too careless in seizing or usurping jurisdiction by declaring works to be for the general advantage of Canada without having some inquiry to justify that declaration. Nevertheless, that practice has grown up, and it might not be fair in the present instance to intercept this measure further than by this timely protest, and to direct the

attention of the committee and the House to the matter, so that hereafter applicants will not think they are meeting all the requirements of the case by simply getting the committee, from good nature or perhaps carelessness, to do what the facts might not warrant. I entirely approve of the point—a point which I raised many years ago, in 1883 or 1884, when parliament practically seized jurisdiction over all local railways by a sweeping declaration without any reference to the question whether the facts would justify such a declaration. Perhaps it would be safe to have such a declaration in this Bill. The work itself is entirely within a province except in so far as it may be on the waters of the Rainy river and on the south bank of it, which is in the state of Minnesota. It is not a public work concerning two provinces. It is purely local, so far as the Dominion is concerned, within one province; and if it were held to be purely local as a matter of law, and this declaration were not in the statute, then the Act would be a nullity. Therefore, as a matter of safety to those who invest capital in a work purely local in itself, if the company is to be incorporated here, that declaration would be necessary.

Mr. BARKER. To state a falsehood in order to make it sure.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not know whether it is a falsehood or not. I do not know anything of the merits of this case. I do not think the hon. gentleman is stating it fairly in suggesting that the declaration is a falsehood.

Mr. BARKER. I do not see any great difference between stating what you do not know to be true and stating a falsehood.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not know why the hon. gentleman is so excited over this particular measure as to use such strong language. According to my hon. friend's contention parliament has been stating falsehoods for the last twenty years.

Mr. BARKER. It has.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. This is the first time I have heard an hon. member so express himself. I think the point is well taken, and I think this discussion will be very helpful in preventing the abuse of this power in future. We should recognize the jurisdiction of each legislature of this Dominion and should not assume that jurisdiction by this method unless the facts warrant it. But it does not follow, because the committee has not reported the circumstances, that this declaration is a falsehood. My hon. friend assumes it to be a falsehood, but I do not think that is a fair inference to draw. He says the case has not been proven, and therefore it is a falsehood. We do not know what was proven before the committee. Statements were made, I presume, as is always the case, and the committee, being satisfied with those statements, has arrived at a conclusion and given a judgment. We have not the evidence, we do not know from what statements or on what information the committee arrived at that conclusion. I would like my hon. friend to say upon what ground, so far as he knows, he makes the statement that this declaration is a false one.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I appreciate some of the remarks of the Postmaster General, but when he points to the Acts of this parliament in the past with regard to railways——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. And other works.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am particularly dealing with railways. When you point to Acts affecting railways, you come into a different class of undertakings from this. A railway is exercising what has been described by eminent authorities as governmental or public functions. You might conceive very good reasons why parliament should declare a railway to be a work for the general advantage of Canada, although situated wholly within one province. But when you come to an undertaking of this kind, which is purely of a manufacturing and commercial character, a company not invested with any public or governmental function, so far as I have been able to observe, and when you declare that to be a work for the general advantage of Canada, although in reality it is an ordinary commercial and manufacturing enterprise undertaken for the purpose of gain, it seems to me we are not justified in making such a declaration. I would like to know the reasons which induced the Committee on Private Bills to declare this undertaking to be a work for the general advantage of Canada. I must say that at the present time I cannot conceive any reasons, valid to my mind, which could have induced them to make that declaration, and, as I have already said, if there are grounds for our jurisdiction, they should be recited in the preamble of the measure. We should not, without reciting such, simply declare, without some explanation, that this work of an ordinary commercial and manufacturing character, undertaken for private gain, is a work for the general advantage of Canada.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not take exception to what my hon. friend says. I think he and I view such legislation from the same standpoint and in the same spirit. It could be argued that every enterprise of this kind, though purely local, is for the general advantage of Canada. It is to the general advantage of Canada that a manufacturing institution should establish itself in a province. I do not say this is within the meaning of the British North America

Act, but nevertheless the committee may be satisfied it is; they are the ones to construe the meaning of the British North America Act in regard to a company; and if, in their conception of the meaning of the British North America Act, they are satisfied that a work of this kind is for the general advantage of Canada, I do not know that we are warranted in saying that the committee is wrong.

Mr. BARKER. We are the people who are saying that it is for the general advantage of Canada.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. At the same time, I wish to observe that every year similar legislation is passed. You will find on the statute-book Dominion charters to persons to carry on business in a province without reference to any locality at all; and yet over and over again we have given Dominion charters here; there is not a session gone by since I have been in parliament that such legislation has not passed, and this is the first time—it may have occurred before—but this is the first time in my experience that this procedure has been challenged on the floor of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have challenged it before.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It may have been challenged in committee. At all events, this is the first time I have heard it challenged.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have challenged it over and over again—in the committee and in this House—with respect to works that I think would justify the declaration very much better than the present one. But I cannot recall at this moment that this declaration ever has been made before by this parliament with respect to an undertaking such as this. Of course, I realize how defective one's memory is with regard to these matters; I would not speak with positiveness, but at the present moment I cannot recall any instance where that declaration has been made with regard to an undertaking of this character. Does my hon. friend remember an instance?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not remember any instance, because I have not been following closely private Bill legislation. But I am warranted in saying that you will not find any session for many years in which there has not been similar legislation and declarations in respect to works that are in their nature essentially local, but which parliament has declared to be for the general advantage of Canada. Whilst I quite approve of the hon. gentleman's attitude, he will observe that this discussion itself may remedy this very practice, without our having in this instance stopped the measure.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY. Does it not occur to the leader of the opposition that we are not given power to legislate at all in this House with regard to these matters unless they are for the general advantage of Canada? That is the basis of our legislative authority, that there must be a declaration that the work is for the general advantage of Canada. Now if that declaration is not true, we should not pass the legislation at all, it would be local legislation. The question whether it is for the general advantage of Canada involves the question whether the jurisdiction to legislate is vested in this parliament or not. We are legislating in regard to an international water. I have never personally looked into the question of an international water, but I have in regard to the question of an interprovincial water, and the conclusion I came to with regard to the Restigouche river, for instance, between Quebec and New Brunswick, was that the two provinces have no right to legislate even to the centre of the river so as to cross it, but if Quebec gave a charter to a company covering half the river and New Brunswick gave a charter covering the other half, they would be legislating within the powers of section 98, I think it is, of the British North America Act, or a subsection. I know nothing about this case, except that these people are large holders of timber limits that were purchased at an Ontario sale, I think, a year ago last December. We are now legislating in regard to an international water, in respect of which the province has no authority at all. We had that question discussed in the province of Ontario in regard to the St. Clair river, when it was sought to run a natural gas pipe under that river, and my recollection of that discussion is that the consensus of legal opinion was that the jurisdiction giving the right to run that gas pipe under the river was in the Dominion. Now, if that is so in that case, it is much more so in this case, where this company, in order to protect the works they are going to erect upon that river, have to get, not only federal legislation in Canada, but also federal leave for legislation in the United States. The works they are going to erect there are very expensive and very large, so that these people who are going to invest their money in those works want to be certain that their title cannot be upset by a legal quibble. Therefore, upon that statement of fact, that this river is an international river, is a navigable river, in regard to which, I think, beyond the shadow of a doubt federal jurisdiction has exclusive power, this company would be very ill-advised and wanting in judgment if they did not get from the federal power leave and license to erect such large and expensive works as are in contemplation at that river.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know whether I made myself clear to my hon. friend in discussing this matter before. It seems to me, that if what he states now is correct,

it is the best argument against clause 1 of the Bill. If he is correct, our jurisdiction depends not on this declaration, but on the facts as they are. Yet, according to the Bill we are legislating in this matter, not because these are international waters but because we declare this to be a work for the general advantage of Canada, that declaration being necessary to give us the jurisdiction only where there is no such state of facts as the hon. gentleman has put forward. When that was suggested, speaking without a very clear recollection of the provinces of the British North America Act in that regard, I conceded that the fact that these were international waters might give us jurisdiction at least as to a part of the Bill,—I do not know that it would give us jurisdiction as to all its provisions; I would doubt that so far as I have given the matter consideration. What I did urge, and will urge, is that if that is the basis of our jurisdiction, it should be so recited in the statute in order that we may not have this statute quoted hereafter as a precedent for declaring works to be for the general advantage of Canada which are not for the general advantage of Canada according to the meaning of the British North America Act, but are simply local enterprises, ordinary commercial and manufacturing enterprises, undertaken and carried on in one province only and for the purpose of gain.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I have been here night after night watching the proceedings in relation to these private Bills, and I have noticed that we have not the advantage of the presence of either the Minister of Justice or the Solicitor General.

Mr. BELCOURT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean) generally complains that there are too many lawyers here.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. When these private Bills are under consideration, we ought to have at least one of the law officers of the Crown here to advise the House. Yet, night after night, we have these questions coming up and no one to speak for the government from a legal point of view. When the Minister of Justice is not here the Solicitor General ought to be here and give us the benefit of his advice.

The hour for private Bills having expired, House resumed in Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

Lighthouse and coast service—maintenance and repairs to lighthouses and lightships, $500,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the minister promise that, at Parry Sound, in the event of his going on with this work for the manufacture of gas at that point, the land will be purchased by advertisement? In other words that he will ask for a certain amount of land abutting on the bay, or does he propose to purchase from whom he pleases at whatever price he pleases?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I can only say that I will do the best I can to secure the best site under the best conditions possible. If we cannot find a site at Parry Sound, we will go to Parry Harbour, Collingwood or some other place in that region.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the minister please say who has the buoy service from Depot Harbour up and what is the price and for what term—I mean the placing of the buoys?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Captain Clark performs this service, at $2,600, for one year.

Mr. BENNETT. Were tenders asked for, and were any other tenders received?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I am informed that Captain Clark has had the contract for a number of years. And when it was given nobody else would take it. It had been continued from year to year.

Mr. BENNETT. I would call the attention of the minister to the fact that according to the Auditor General's Report of last year the contract was let at $1,595. I ask the minister again whether any other tenders were received besides that of Captain Clark?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Other buoys were added, and that made the price higher. The new arrangement was submitted to Colonel Anderson, the chief engineer of the department, and he recommended it as fair and reasonable.

Mr. BENNETT. That is, instead of tenders being called for an offer was made by Captain Clark and the department considering that it was fair accepted it. And no other tenders were received by the department.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No.

Mr. BENNETT. It seems very strange that the year before the price was $1,595, and now the minister had advanced it to $2,600. I ask the minister again if any tenders were received besides that of Captain Clark.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No.

Mr. BENNETT. I had the information that a gentleman named Galna tendered for the same work at $1,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The officer in charge, Mr. G. F. Fraser, informs me that there was no such tender.

Mr. BENNETT. Was any offer made by Mr. Galna, or by any firm of which he is a member?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No.

Mr. BENNETT. It seems an extraordinary thing that the price should now be $2,600, when it was only $1,595 last year, and that the increase was made without being called for;—because the minister says that, instead of calling for tenders an offer was submitted by Captain Clark and, owing to some official of the department approving of it, that offer was taken.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I did not say anything of the sort. What I said was that the price was advanced from $1,595 to $2,600 on the recommendation of the chief engineer of the department. Colonel Anderson, because four gas buoys were added.

Mr. BENNETT. Well then, the minister states that, owing to some buoys being added, the price was advanced from less than $1,600 to $2,600 without any tender being called for?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes. It is not customary to do it.

Mr. BENNETT. To call for tenders ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Where a man has been doing work for a number of years in a most satisfactory manner, and the engineer of the department recommends that, on account of the increased number of buoys he should receive a certain amount in access of what he has received, it has been the custom of the department for thirty years past to carry out that recommendation.

Mr. BENNETT. My information is right then, and the minister and I agree except as to the offer of Mr. Galna. And I will take Mr. Galna's word that he offered to do that work for $1,000. Did Mr. Galna even make an offer, as no tenders were called for, at $1,000 ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I am informed it was not.

Mr. BENNETT. I am informed by Mr. Galna that that was the case. He is now a member in the local legislature and from what I know of him I will take his word.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Do you want me to take his word in preference to the word of the officer in charge of the service ?

Mr. BENNETT. I do not want you to, I will take Mr. Galna's, and you can take your officers, and in the town of Parry Sound his word will be taken in view of the fact that the minister's administration of his department is such that it is not expected it will be on the lines of fair play. The 'Bayfield' goes continually into Parry Sound and it is a notorious fact that that vessel was given to a party friend there for $3,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. You had better read the 'Hansard.'

Mr. BENNETT. Every one knows that a steamer was given for $3,000 that was worth $6,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No one would believe that.

Mr. BENNETT. I admit the minister has a trying position to fill. He has the example of the Postmaster General who will not ask for tenders for mail services, and who, when a mail contract is up, as was shown in an answer which I obtained yesterday, raised a contract that had been at $120 to $156 without calling for tenders, and no one expects straightforward dealing in every or any other department.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BENNETT. What does the minister propose to do about that contract ? Is he going to advance Clark next year $100 ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not know.

Mr. BENNETT. I think the minister does not. The stress of party exigencies will control his course.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Do you know what you will do next year ?

Mr. BENNETT. If I were administering the department I would have an idea ? I would have an idea that the business would be conducted straightforward and above board. Of course the minister has to live up to his reputation as given by the 'Herald' and 'Witness,' that he will be crooked.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Have I lost my reputation ?

Mr. BENNETT. With the Montreal 'Witness' and the Montreal 'Herald,' the Minister of Agriculture's paper, but not with your party friends. I find the department purchased at Collingwood twelve boats and equipment costing $916.66. Were tenders asked for this ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. What kind of boats ?

Mr. BENNETT. As the minister conducts the department I do not suppose he knows or that his officers either, know. It says Watts & Sons, Collingwood; boats, 12, $852 ; oars, 21, $50.40; sundries, $12.04, $914.44. Were tenders asked for this item?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Those boats were bought in the regular way according to the market price for the service of lighthouses.

Mr. BENNETT. I know that is the regular way in the minister's department, but not in the business world.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is a matter of opinion.

Mr. BENNETT. Were tenders called ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No.

Mr. BENNETT. I want to ask the minister why he goes to Marine city in Michigan, and purchases a boat there for $116. My hon. friend from North Simcoe should see that he keeps his patronage in Collingwood.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Because we thought proper I suppose.

Mr. BENNETT. That is a good answer from the minister; that is about the answer I would expect. The minister of course can carry things on with a high hand, but he will some time have to go to the electors.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have just come back from the electors and they have returned me by over 2,000.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister knows that I went before the electors and I exposed the 'Bayfield' deal before the electors, and the deal in regard to the western islands whereby you gave $2,000 or $3,000 worth of timber to a party friend.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. Address the chair.

Mr. BENNETT. Here is a rustic.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. Here is a chump.

Mr. BENNETT. I recognize you as such. Mr. Chairman, I would say through you that I exposed these matters to the people and although even the Prime Minister came up to my riding I am here. I am going to ask the minister again, does he propose to call for tenders in regard to the buoy service up there or does he propose to live up to his reputation.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I am going to live up to the reputation which has been approved by the electors of Quebec in my county by 2,500.

Mr. BENNETT. He gets awful black eyes in Ontario.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not care.

Mr. BENNETT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would like to go up to Ontario for an election now. They have a couple of ministers on the tenter hooks who would not care much about going up to Ontario. Are you going to give large contracts in this way for buoy service at enormous figures and yet not allow any competition. The minister will outvie the Postmaster General if it be publicly advertised that the public money is to be expended in vain and without tenders.

Mr. BARKER. I understood the minister to say that it was the practice of the department to give the contract to the party holding it as a matter of course.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In some cases; not all the time.

Mr. BARKER. In some cases ? I would like to know where the hon. gentleman is going to draw the line, when he has got an instance like this where a man had a contract for $1,600 but demanded $2,600 ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. On account of the increased number of buoys. There was an increase of four.

Mr. BARKER. The man demanded an increase of 65 per cent and the only explanation that the hon. gentleman gives is that it is a usual thing. Now I think if that is the usual thing in government departments——

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In special cases.

Mr. BARKER—I do not care when the practice commenced, I do not care whether it began twenty years ago or fifty years ago, the sooner it stops the better.

Mr. BENNETT. In the buoy service, there is an item, F. Scott, Collingwood, $830, were tenders asked in this case ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not carry these things in my head. My officers cannot do it either, so I shall ask that at some future discussion I may be allowed to produce the contracts. I shall give the information with pleasure. Going back again I would say that no one would take that contract at any price because they had not the proper plan. It was continued from year to year and as the number of buoys increased a calculation was made of the value of the services to be rendered. I had nothing to do with it personally, I was in Quebec and I never saw Captain Clark. I relied on the chief engineer of the department and if he has misinformed me, he is responsible. I am responsible to the House and I will make inquiries and if there is anything wrong about it I will remedy it. I would be the first to accede to any reasonable suggestion that is made to remedy an abuse, and I do not know why I should meet with all of this abuse.

Mr. BENNETT. Nobody is abusing the minister.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. And my reputation put at stake, statements that a certain paper in Montreal has given me a bad reputation, &c. What do I care about it? Suppose that the hon. gentleman is called by a paper a thief, robber, sneak or anything else. What does he care about it? I do not care about these things; I come before the public and face the public and explain the situation, and if my electors are not satisfied with me they can keep me at home, but that is not what they have done for the past

thirty years. This is what they have done since I have been here: They elected me not only in my native county of Chambly, but also in Maisonneuve in 1896. In 1900 I was elected in Maisonneuve and also in Terrebonne, which was carved out of a Tory constituency, and I carried it by 1,600. While still a candidate in Maisonneuve I went back to the county of Terrebonne, which had not been represented by a Liberal for 37 years, and I carried that county. I was elected for two counties. Does that go to show that the insinuations which are made against me are usually well founded and that my reputation cannot compare with the reputation of any respectable man in this Canada of ours?

Mr. BENNETT. I have always sympathized with the hon. minister.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not want your sympathy.

Mr. BENNETT. Sometimes we have things thrust upon us. Sometimes greatness is thrust upon some persons, but the hon. minister has never had greatness thrust upon him yet. I do not assail the hon. minister. It was the Montreal 'Herald' and 'Witness' that assailed him. It was his colleague the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), because the 'Herald' is his journal.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I beg to deny that it is the journal of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. BARKER. It is his brother's journal.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Is it possible for any one to know what his brothers and his cousins and his sister are doing?

Mr. BENNETT. When the hon. Minister of Agriculture was charged in this House with stabbing my hon. friend in the back his statement of defence was that he had transferred his stock in this journal to his brother.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Therefore, he was not responsible.

Mr BENNETT. I do not think there is any love lost between the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I beg pardon, we are on the best of terms and we are the best of friends.

Mr. BENNETT. I have no doubt that up to the day before the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior gave out his announcement these hon. gentlemen would all have claimed to be brothers together. It is a case of hanging together.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. The galleries are laughing at you.

Mr. PREFONTAINE.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) says they are laughing at me. Perhaps it is at himself; perhaps it is at seeing a freak in the House. As long as I am in this House and as long as the hon. minister or any other minister is administering that department and whenever I believe there are good grounds for criticism I will discuss and criticise his administration, whether it be in regard to the buoy service, the purchasing of boats or be it what it may. The hon. minister is not doing what he should in the interest of the country in giving to this Captain Clark, who is a friend of the hon. gentlemen opposite, this contract at this price. To the statement that no one else is capable of taking charge of this work, I would say that Captain Galna, who is the owner of one or two tugs, is just as capable of doing that work as Captain Clark is. Let me call the attention of the hon. minister to the fact that Captain Galna offered to do this work for $1,000 and that there is no warrant at all for the hon. minister increasing the price from $1,600 to $2,600. Will the hon. minister say how many buoys have been added to the Parry Sound service?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Before the hon. minister answers that I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett), who has been criticising without discrimination the administration of the Marine Department with the desire of making people believe that something is being done that should not be done, and who has evidently been speaking for the benefit of people who are supposed to be the builders of certain boats, if he can produce an item in the Auditor General's Report showing that W. Watts & Sons did not give full value for what they were paid? If there is no charge of that character and if the hon. gentleman is bound to confess that the item is right, his criticism is entirely factious. Then, I ask him the same question as to Captain Scott's contract in regard to the buoys. It is well known in Collingwood that Captain Scott has been performing that service for a great many years. Whether there have been tenders or not I do not know, but I have never heard a word of complaint about the way in which he did his duties. He is the very best man for the job. Has the hon. gentleman any information from Collingwood or the vicinity that he has not performed the service properly or that he has been paid too much? If he has not that information, again I say that the hon. gentleman's criticism is factious and that it is made with the intention of creating the suspicion that something is being done that ought not to be done. If he has not that information, it must be a purely imaginary charge for the purpose of creating a wrong impression in the minds of the public.

Mr. BENNETT. How many buoys are in the Parry Sound service?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Eight gas buoys, 12 spar buoys and 4 buoys added, making 24.

Mr. BENNETT. In reply to my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), who seems to be very much perturbed, I can only say that my only complaint is that the hon. minister has seen fit to go to Marine city and purchase a boat for $116. I think that boats for the use of the lighthouse service can be manufactured in Collingwood, and if they cannot be manufactured there I know many places where they can be. I think that boats for the service of the department should be purchased in Canada without going to Marine city, and I think it is a fair cause of complaint that the hon. minister did go to the United States to make such a purchase as this. My hon. friend from North Simcoe and I, perhaps, do not see eye to eye in this matter. As to the bill of Watts & Sons, $914, there are other boat builders at Collingwood, and when $900 worth of boats are purchased tenders should be asked for in the open market. I do not know anything about the class of boats purchased, and I am not in a position to complain of them. Then, as to Captain Scott's contract, all I have to say is that tenders should be called for this service and whoever is prepared to do it satisfactorily at the lowest price should have the contract.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Were tenders called for previously ?

Mr. BENNETT. Tenders have been called for the buoy service repeatedly, although I will not say so in the Collingwood case.

Mr. CAMPBELL. They were never called for in your time.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. As to the case in which the hon. gentleman seeks his justification I agree with him. I do not want to see boats bought outside of Canada. There are boats of all kinds made in Collingwood and I want to see them purchased in Canada whenever they can be purchased here. But, I say that the hon. gentleman's criticisms in regard to the Watts and Scott accounts, are not justified, that they are factious and that they are made for the purpose of creating a wrong impression in the minds of the public.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) give me the page of the Auditor General's Report ?

Mr. BENNETT. Page P—54.

Thomas Langell, Marine City, Michigan, 1 boat, $116.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I am quite sure that if that boat had been procured in Canada it would not have been bought elsewhere because my instructions to the department are to give the preference at all times to Canadians.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. minister will see that while he has increased the buoy service 20 per cent, there having been four buoys added, he has increased the price paid the contractor by about 65 per cent. What is the explanation of that ? I am going to ask the hon. minister another question about his department at Midland. Can the hon. minister explain why two decent range lights were sent there to be placed on the hill by the department and a day or so after they were brought there and the freight paid on them they were sent back and two miserable electric lights were put in their places? What influence was brought to bear to bring about that result ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The information, as far as I can gather it at the present moment, is that it was decided afterwards to use electric light as being more powerful.

Mr. BENNETT. I can tell the minister that the principal men in this Midland Electric Light Company were friends of the Liberals, and when two splendid range lights were brought there to be placed on top of the hill to light the harbour and to keep vessels from going on the shoal in the middle of the bay, such influences were brought to bear on the department that these two splendid lamps were shipped back and in place of them two little flickering electric lights were left on the hill. The result is that boats have been piled up on that shoal. Thousands and thousands of dollars have been spent in Midland harbour for private uses when one-twentieth or one-fiftieth part of the same money would remove this dangerous shoal ; however that is in the Department of Public Works and not in the Department of Marine. Some officer in the Department of Marine reported that these two splendid lights should be placed on the hill as beacons and after they had been brought there, the influence of the party friends was so great that for this miserable $50 a year that resulted to the electric light company, the lamps were sent back and the small electric lights substituted.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. How long ago was that ?

Mr. BENNETT. Three years ago.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Has the corporation of Midland taken over the electric light plant ?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, but it did not have the electric light substituted for the lamps. I appeal to the minister to do away with these electric lights and have the lamps placed there again.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have more confidence in the officers of my department than in the mere say of the hon. gentleman. If the chief engineer decides that these two electric lamps render better service than the

two other lamps I will not put my judgment against his.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the minister rely on the officer who reported that these lamps should be put there, and had them sent there and the freight paid on them, and then have them removed ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. I should think that the minister would have very little confidence in such an officer who ordered the lamps there and then had them sent away again.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That is what the hon. gentleman says but he does not know it. If the lamps were sent there to be installed and if the officer changed his mind on an offer being made, and found that the electric lights were better, I will abide by his judgment every day, every hour and every minute in preference to the word of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister admits that the lamps were sent there ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I never denied it.

Mr. BENNETT. I have been informed by men who are in a position to know that the lamps sent there at first were suitable for the purpose. To-day the result is that the looking at that hill you are unable to tell which are the range lights and which are the ordinary lights of the town, and the consequence is that boats have been piled up on that shoal, while if the large lamps had been there the casualties would not have happened.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is no such report in the department ; it is pure invention. I would like to know whose opinion am I going to take. Am I going to take the opinion of my officer or am I to take the opinion of the hon. gentleman to run my department ? I have Colonel Anderson who has been there for thirty years, Mr. J. F. Fraser and Mr. B. Fraser all good officials, and am I going to cast aside the opinion of these officers and let the member for East Simcoe run the Department of Marine ? If I did that I would be discredited as a minister.

Mr. BENNETT. Which of these officers reported that the lamps should be sent there ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There are three officers in that service and I cannot remember which one of them so reported. They do not consult me about these technical details ; it would be preposterous that they should do so. If there is any important change or any expenditure of money of consequence they have to report to me and I have to approve or disapprove, but matters of detail are attended to by the officers themselves. I will furnish the information to the committee if it is of such importance as to entitle us to spend money in laying on the table of the House a report ; that Mr. So-and-So on such a date ordered lights to be placed at that point ; that a few days afterwards having considered that the electric lights would be better, he changed his mind.

Mr. BENNETT. So far as the report is concerned I am not interested. I know that the lamps were placed there on the report of one of the officers and he must have thought that the lamps were the proper thing to put there. If it was on the recommendation of Colonel Anderson, then Colonel Anderson was in Midland previously and he knew that the town was lighted by electricity before he ordered the lamps. It was openly discussed in the town that the lamps had been switched back, and that was done because of the few dollars which this electric light company got. I suppose the town will have to grin and bear it ; the private interests must be served first and the public interests afterwards.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Even although this has all happened in the town in which the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) lives, yet as a representative of the district I cannot allow to go without protest the statement of the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) that the harbour of Midland, a Canadian harbour, has been for the last three years in such a condition that for want of proper lighting boats have been piling up on this shoal, almost one upon the other. And forsooth, why is it that all this has come about according to the story of the hon. member ? It would appear that the electric light company, which the hon. gentleman says was composed of friends of the Minister of Marine, desired to put up electric lights to light the harbour, but it might be no harm to mention that in the district whence the hon. gentleman comes, it is well known that they are struggling and fighting, and if it was not an unparliamentary expression I would say, that they are scrapping from one end of the year to the other, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) and the gentleman who was the main controller of that electric light company. But some two years ago, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) acting on behalf of the town of Midland obtained the control of that electric light plant, and since then the electric light plant is a corporation concern. Consequently, for the last year and a half or two years the corporation of Midland are the people who are getting the advantage of this $50 a year, which has been the cause of all these wrecks on that terrible shoal in the beautiful harbour of Midland. If that is the picture the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) wants to present to the country of our Canadian harbours on the upper lakes, I protest against it, and I can assure the House that it is not a correct statement of the conditions in Midland har-

bour. It is not susceptible of belief by anyone that for the last three years such a state of affairs could have existed. The refutation of such a statement can be found in the fact, that the man who was the largest shareholder in the electric light company at the time referred to namely Mr. Playfair, is a hundred times more interested in navigation and boats and shipping than any man in the constituency of East Simcoe. It is absurd and preposterous to suppose that in order to obtain $50 a year for an electric light company, he would take any chances of running ashore on the shoals of Midland harbour, a fleet of vessels which I suppose is valued at half a million or a million dollars.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the minister now if he will take into consideration the question of substituting proper lights for those electric lights and ask for a report from his department ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I will not, because I depend upon my officers.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the minister consult his officers, then, as to the desirability of such a change ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I will not, unless they take it upon themselves to recommend it to me.

Mr. BENNETT. Unless the officers report to the hon. gentleman, he will not make any inquiry—is that as I understand it ? Well, perhaps the hon. gentleman expects to get through some estimates to-night. If he does, he had better come down from that high and mighty vein, or he will not get very far. Now, I am going to ask the minister if he does not think it fair that proper lights should be placed there, or that this matter should be inquired into, in view of the fact that there is a shoal there with deep water alongside of it, and that any one may mistake those twinkling lights on the hillside. Will he not say, in the interest of the town, that he will consult his officials as to that ? Will the minister answer ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have answered twice already.

Mr. BENNETT. Then the minister says he will not look into the matter at all. That is understood ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Very well ; we know where the minister stands on that question.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I stand with my officers on what they have recommended and what I think is honest and fair. Those lamps have been there since 1901, I have never received any complaint about them, and the work is going on all right. This is one of those fancies of the hon. gentleman that I am not going to satisfy.

Mr. BENNETT. Then, let me tell the minister that these little lights on the hillside are a matter of complaint in the town, and that the town would prefer to lose the $50 and have two suitable lights placed there instead. And yet the minister says he will not consult his officials.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Until I get a complaint.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the hon. gentleman not regard a complaint as coming from myself ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Not under the circumstances.

Mr. BENNETT. Then we may reciprocate. The hon. gentleman may have a complaint coming to me from himself.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the minister is taking a rather unusual course in this instance. If any citizen of Midland made a complaint of that kind, I think the hon. minister would consult his officers.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. With the greatest pleasure.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But when a member representing that district makes a complaint, he says he will not take the trouble of consulting his officers.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Because my officers say they have not received any complaint from any citizen.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend does not perhaps understand me. If any citizen not in a representative capacity made a complaint, I would consider it the duty of the minister to make an inquiry ; and when the minister has a great deal more than that, the statement of a gentleman who represents in this parliament 25,000 or 30,000 people, it seems to me that the hon. gentleman is going a little beyond what I have heard before in saying that he will treat that with absolute contempt and will not make an inquiry of his officers in regard to it. I am bound to say that I have never heard an announcement of that kind before by a minister, and I trust that my hon. friend will reconsider that a little, and at least make the matter which has been mentioned a subject of some inquiry.

Mr. INGRAM. Perhaps the minister will say what candle power are those two lamps of which the hon. gentleman is speaking ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have not a list of the lights. I will inquire.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the minister listen to a complaint from me as to another pair of range lights, or is he going to treat it in the same cavalier way and say he will not listen to any complaint coming from me with reference to that riding ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I am here to listen.

Mr. BENNETT. I am glad to see that the minister is coming down from his high horse. There are two range lights around the point from Midland harbour, the caretaker of which is a man named Somers. May I ask whether these are satisfactory, or if any complaints are made relative to them ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I am informed by the officer in charge that there has never been any complaint.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, I can tell the minister that I have heard complaints from captains of vessels plying there in reference to those range lights.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Let them send their complaints to the proper authorities.

Mr. BENNETT. I flatter myself that I am here as the representative of that riding. I have been here for a considerable time, and the signs of the times indicate that the people there quite approve of my course here, no thanks to hon. gentlemen opposite. A great deal of time has been lost by hon. gentlemen opposite in their vain endeavours to keep me out of this House. I have always been flattered by the presence of the premier at a meeting and with the presence of the Minister of Customs ; I have always had orators from the province of Quebec and some members of the House ; but all their efforts have been without avail. I want to tell the minister that, representing that riding as I do here, and having represented it in this House for fifteen sessions, I am not going to be treated in this cavalier way by him, and I am going to ask him now whether or not he will ask his officer for a report as to whether or not it would be advisable to raise those two range lights to a higher position. I am advised that the lights are not sufficiently high or strong, and that it would be a very decided advantage to navigation in that quarter to have them changed.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Might I ask the hon. gentleman when he got those complaints, and from whom ?

Mr. BENNETT. I am not specifying the parties, but I have often heard the captains speak of them. I am not here to say to what extent I am interested in the town of Midland. I am interested as a citizen and taxpayer, and if the minister will consult the assessment roll, he will find that I am probably the largest taxpayer of the town.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Then I understand that the hon. gentleman is the complainant?

Mr. BENNETT. I am the complainant—one of the complainants.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Who are the others ?

Mr. BENNETT. The others are mariners trading in and out of that port.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Who are they ?

Mr. BENNETT. I am not here to mention their names particularly, but I will say to the minister that it is a matter of common complaint that those two range lights are inferior lights, because they are not strong enough or high enough. I ask the minister if he does not think it is fair to the town and to the shipping interests there to ask his officials to report whether it would not be better to have two powerful lights on the hillside which would stand out boldly instead of the two small lights which are there now ? Although the town may be the recipient and has the advantage of getting this paltry $50, the town would be much better pleased to see two strong lights there than to get the remuneration from the sale of the power.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have just asked my officers if there had ever been any complaint, and they never heard of any. They tell me the hon. gentleman's complaint is not well founded.

Mr. BENNETT. Has either of the hon. gentleman's officers ever been in the town of Midland ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Both of the officers have been there, and they know all about it.

Mr. BENNETT. That is the opinion of the hon. gentleman's officers, but there is the opinion of the people who are trading there with vessels and barges, and I know they complain of it.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I would ask the hon. gentleman to give me the name of one man, who is a mariner, who has made any complaint.

Mr. BENNETT. I can tell the minister that there are large boats plying there, boats 450 feet in length, carrying a quarter of a million bushels of grain. Some 15,000,000 bushels of grain are handled there. Vessels come from Chicago and American points on the other side, and when the captains look up on the hill and see it dotted with electric lights, and only two little insignificant lamps in the harbour, so small that the hon. gentleman is forced to admit that his officers do not know their candle-power, they get confused. I challenge one of his officers, who profess to know all about it, to say that either of those lamps are equal to an ordinary street lamp, and yet the minister says he is not going to inquire into it.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I never said anything of the kind. I said just now that I had inquired from my officers if there had been any complaints, and their answer was that there had been none. Then I asked them whether the statement of the hon. gentleman was well founded, and they tell me it is not. Therefore, I again ask the

hon. gentleman to give me the name of one single mariner who would put his signature to a complaint, and he cannot do it. The hon. gentleman talks about the millions of grain that are shipped from the port of Midland, and he thinks that is a justification for his assertion that the boats were piled up on the shore in the harbour of Midland. That is a farce. The hon. gentleman is wasting the time of the committee. Under the circumstances, the hon. gentleman says I am on my high horse. I am on my ordinary horse. I try to be polite, to be reasonable, to be just and fair to every one. But I will not stand here to be ridiculed and cross-examined by the hon. member, when he cannot justify a single one of his statements.

Mr. BENNETT. I can tell the minister that I never made the complaint that boats were piled up on the shore.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BENNETT. There is the horse laugh again.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT. An ass would understand it anyway.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, I want to tell the minister again that I did not make any complaint that boats were being piled up on the shore; my complaint was that the boats were piled up on the shoal. But, unfortunately, there have been boats piled up on the shoal owing to defective lighting. When a captain comes in there from Chicago, who has never been in the place before, and when he looks up on the hillside and sees street lamps there and electric lights by the dozen, it is a very difficult thing for that man, on consulting his chart, to pick his way. I appeal to the minister as a representative of the town, and ask him if he will ask his officials whether it would not be advisable to have proper lights placed there rather than these two electric lights.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the minister would answer this question—I am putting it in view of what the hon. gentleman has stated—what would his officers regard as a proper degree of candle-power for these electric lights?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. One hundred candle-power.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the minister able to state, from the information afforded by his officers, that these lights comply with that standard?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is impossible for them to state, with regard to these particular lights, what is the exact candle-power. The hon. gentleman will understand that my officers are unable to carry in their memories the candle-power of 3,000 lamps distributed in different parts of the Dominion. They cannot say say whether they are of 50, or 60, or 30 candle-power. But I will procure the information.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is what I was going to suggest, that he ask his officers to procure that information. There is a certain standard, and they do not seem to be able to state whether these lamps comply with it.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have never refused that. But when the hon. member for East Simcoe tells me and tells the House, and thinks we are going to believe such a statement as he makes——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps we had better not go into that again.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not know what statement the hon. gentleman means to insinuate that I made. If the hon. gentleman challenges the statement that there never have been boats on that shoal, I will stand by that statement. Last year a boat caught on fire there owing to defective lighting.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Does the hon. gentleman try to make me believe that if accidents happen there, it was owing to defective lighting in the port of Midland? The mariners must have been either stupid or did not know their business, otherwise the accidents did not happen from defective lights in that port. People do not wait for accidents to happen from defective lights; they complain of the lights beforehand.

Mr. AMES. Some days ago a return, prepared at my request, was brought down showing the buoy contracts let since July 1st, 1903. It covers information concerning seventy-seven buoy contracts. In forty-five cases tenders have been called for and the lowest tender accepted. In twenty-seven cases the contract has been renewed without calling for tenders. In five cases the circumstances have been exceptional. I compared a few of these in which tenders have been called for with the prices we have been paying. For instance, in the case of Grand Manan, we used to pay C. B. Harvey $200, as will be found at page P—69 of the Auditor General's Report for the year ending June 30th, 1904. Evidently we recently called for tenders, and now we are getting the lighting done by Austin Levy for just half the money —$100. At Mahone bay, according to the Auditor General's Report, page P—73, we formerly paid C. U. Mader $95. That contract expired and another was made on the 12th of August with D. Evans for $78, a reduction of about 20 per cent. These are a few cases that go to show that when contracts are called for the results are almost invariably a reduction in the price.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Oh, no.

Mr. AMES. A business man would so infer, at all events. I would ask the minister if he would take into consideration the fact that there are twenty-seven of these

contracts, many of which, if renewed by calling for tenders, could probably be renewed at a lower figure ? Is it his intention hereafter, wherever possible, to call for tenders ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That is what we have been doing.

Mr. AMES. Twenty-seven out of seventy-seven seems to be a large proportion of contracts renewed without tenders.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I will procure the information the hon. gentleman asks for.

Mr. AMES. What I am asking is whether, speaking as a matter of general policy and not of particular instances, it is understood in the department that tenders are to be called for except in unusual cases ? I know that the minister desires to improve upon all previous administrations, and I think he has an opportunity here of saving a considerable sum of money if he desires to do so.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I accept the lecture. Of course, I do not understand completely the running of the department. But the information I get from my officers is that when a contractor has been doing his work loyally and well at a fair price, we do not take away the contract, but renew it at the same price. Of course, they ask me to sanction the renewal, and I approve it after examining the documents of the report. It sometimes happens that there are changes in the series of buoys or lamps—they may be increased or they may be diminished. In that case, if the old contractor is unwilling to do the work at a reasonable price, in the opinion of the officers of the department, tenders are called for. I must say that these matters are left to the responsibility of the officers in charge, and reports are made to me. Most of the officers have been long in the department, and I suppose they are honest and loyal, and that they do their duty. If I should discover that they do not do their duty, I should know what my duty is in the matter.

Mr. AMES. Before six o'clock recess, the minister told us something about the purchase of calcium carbide by the department, but we did not quite finish that subject. I understand the minister to say that the carbide he uses is purchased altogether from the Ottawa Carbide Company, and that from here it is distributed to the points at which it is required for these gas buoys. The price paid, he told us, is $65 a ton. The freight is additional, and if it is sent to Sorel or Quebec the freight must add considerably to the cost. Has the minister ever given thought of purchasing carbide at a place nearer to Sorel and Quebec than Ottawa ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Within the last few months the manufacture has been undertaken at Shawenegan Falls. We have not yet bought from the people there. We do not know that article. But we feel that we are safe in buying from the Ottawa Carbide Company. I think that the officers of the department are considering the possibility of buying at Shawenegan if they can get the same quality at as good a price.

Mr. AMES. The hon. gentleman need have no fear about the carbide being the same, because the parties who carry on the manufacture at Shawenegan are the same as at Ottawa. Mr. Thomas L. Willson, whose name is found in all the carbide companies of Canada, is one of the prime movers. So the minister would be dealing with the same patentee in any case. Is the minister aware that the agents in Montreal of the Shawenegan manufacturers, the Continental Light and Power Company, are quoting this carbide at Shawenegan at $62.50 by the single ton ? Shawenegan is close to Three Rivers, Sorel and Quebec, and so the freight to these points will be very little. Yet the minister is paying $65 a ton and also paying freight from Ottawa to Sorel and Quebec, which must make the carbide considerably more expensive. As the minister buys $20,000 worth of carbide in the course of a year, here is another opportunity for him to make a considerable saving.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) asserts that buying at Shawenegan would mean less freight to Sorel and Quebec. But any business man in this House will understand that this does not necessarily follow. Shawenegan is an out-of-the-way place. You can to-day get freight from Toronto to Quebec cheaper than you can get it from Montreal to Quebec.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is Montreal an out of the way place ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No, that is stronger proof on my side. Shawenegan being an out of the way place we might be expected to pay more freight from there to Sorel, because there is no direct way to it, than we pay at present from Ottawa to Sorel. However, it is a matter to be inquired into and I thank the hon. gentleman for the information. The officers have probably made their calculation and find that it can be done better as they are doing it, but we will inquire into it. There is no competition whatever from Shawenegan to Sorel, and where there is no railway competition sometimes the rates are 50 or 100 per cent more than where there is competition, so that the question of freight does not amount to a row of pins.

Mr. AMES. This carbide is used on the river between Montreal and Quebec in large quantities and the vessels of the department are constantly passing and stopping at Three Rivers. Possibly the minister

might find that he could save considerable money in that way by buying at Shawenegan. I would like to ask the duties of the small steamer 'Maisonneuve' which is employed in the department in connection with this same service.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have been called upon to make a return on this question and it is on the table of the House, unless the hon. gentlemen want to waste half an hour while I go over this information.

Mr. AMES. I would like the information.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Anything to lose time.

Mr. AMES. I cannot allow that statement to go unchallenged. If I have information in my hands that I think is of value to the House I shall place it before the House as rapidly as possible but I do not want to be accused of trying to waste time.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I cannot be expected to carry all these details in my pocket. They were all brought down yesterday. It is stated that the 'Maisonneuve' is doing buoy service, and is used generally by the hydrographic surveying officers in visiting places where there is shallow water. I stated yesterday what the boat had done, and what it cost in the way of repairs, &c.

Mr. AMES. How much did the boat cost in the first place ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. $8,500. It had been built by an Ottawa engineer at Smith's Falls and it cost, without supervision and plans, $16,000.

Mr. AMES. I notice that the minister found it necessary to spend a considerable sum of money on the 'Maisonneuve.' There is an account here from a furniture dealer in Montreal, Mr. Valiquette, who appears to have done about $800 of work on it, and he has charged labour at the rate of 40 cents an hour and the wood fittings are charged at the rate of 5 cents a foot. These seem to be high prices and perhaps the minister will explain.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The 'Maisonneuve' had been constructed as a pleasure yacht. The fittings had to be replaced and they were replaced and changed in the same quality of material as had been employed before. I must state that the 'Maisonneuve' on three or four occasions was put at the disposal of the Governor General and we did not think it reasonable to botch this little vessel, which is a very nice little craft, or to destroy or diminish its value by putting in cheap goods, or employing labourers of no ability to do the work. We did as any business man would do under the circumstances.

Mr. U. WILSON. What is the boat used for ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I explained that just a moment ago. She was frequently used by the officers instead of a vessel that would cost 100 per cent more to coal and that would carry a more numerous crew.

Mr. U. WILSON. The reason I asked was because I understood you to say it was a pleasure boat.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It had been constructed as a pleasure yacht by a gentleman who had used it for two years. If we only wanted it for ordinary use I do not think we would have had it so expensively fitted, but I think it would have been cheap policy to destroy the value of a nice little boat like that by putting in cheap wood. It does not amount to a great deal after all. I might have saved probably a few hundred dollars on the repairs by making them cheap and of poor quality, but we probably would have destroyed the value of the boat more than the difference in price between a good job and a bad job.

Mr. AMES. The minister has brought out exactly the point I wanted to get at. In other words we have found out that this is, so to speak, the private car of the department.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I deny in toto this statement. I have used the 'Maisonneuve' only once when she was brought here to Ottawa, and I used her for about two hours, because the deputy minister wanted me to see and judge for myself the value of the boat, how it ran and what uses it could be put to. That is the only time that I used it, and if I had used it more I would say so just the same. I think it is small policy to accuse a minster who is doing his duty in a matter of this kind. Unless you can find anything wrong in what I have done personally as regards my department what justification is there for making such an insinuation as this ? If he is travelling without cause or reason and not in the service of the country, well and good, but come out straight and make a definite accusation—no insinuations.

Mr. AMES. I think the hon. minister has quite misunderstood what I said and has gone out of his way to feel aggrieved when no offence was intended. I took it from the hon. gentleman's own suggestion that he had fitted this yacht up with special care as, he said, at times he had placed it at the disposal of the Governor General. The point I made was that this was the show vessel of the department, the vessel which was to be used as a sort of private car and to be placed at the disposal of any one whom the department desired to treat well. I did not think there was anything offensive in that because if there were I would be the first to take it back. I do not wish in any way that my criticisms should be considered as

being of a personal or offensive character. I have no intention that they should be and if they should bear that interpretation I should be the very first one to desire to rob them of that character. I appreciate the work that has been done in the department of Marine and Fisheries, I appreciate the fact that there is a demand for a great work and that the minister is active and earnest in carrying it out, but nevertheless, my duty as a member of His Majesty's loyal opposition is to criticise whenever I think the methods are unbusinesslike, or wherever I think they can be improved, and I hope that the hon. minister will not imagine that when that criticism is made in good faith from a business point of view it necessarily means an offensive allusion or insinuation against himself because such is not my desire.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I am glad to hear the explanation given by the hon. gentleman but I defy any hon. member of this House to have put a different meaning on the words that fell from his lips when in a nagging way he said that this yacht was like a private car to the minister.

Mr. AMES. No, I did not say to the minister. I said a private car to the department.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The minister.

Mr. AMES. No I did not. We will see by 'Hansard' to-morrow.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Well, if you take it back all right.

Mr. AMES. I do not say that. We will see by 'Hansard' to-morrow.

Mr. U. WILSON. I do not wish to go on record as advocating a shoddy kind of furniture for a boat like that but there is quite a difference between good substantial furniture that would be suitable for that boat and extravagant furniture when it is to be used in this way. This boat is used very largely by the inspector of lighthouses and in waters where a larger vessel is not able to go.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I started to ask for some information about the ship 'Lurcher.' I understand that she was built by the Polson Iron Works Company and that the department took her over before she was completed. Was there a reduction in the cost because of the unfinished condition of the vessel ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There was no reduction for the simple reason that the boat was taken away from the navy yard at Toronto at the end of the season because we wanted to have her installed in her position before the winter navigation. We forced the contractors to bring down the boat as far as the sea in order that she would not be frozen in before winter and we should not be deprived of her service.

The work was completed at Quebec by men employed by the contractors, and after that she was taken down to Halifax, I think, in December. It cost the contractors a large sum of money to do this work, but we were put to no loss whatever in the matter. It was to serve navigation and because some of the proprietors of the steamship lines were so anxious to have the boat installed in the fall of 1904 that we had her taken down to the sea at that time.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Where did the builder, under the contract, have to deliver the boat?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I will bring down the contract.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I do not want you to bring down the contract. I want to know at what point the boat was delivered.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The contract will show that. I do not remember.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The hon. minister must know whether the boat was to be delivered at Toronto, Quebec, or Halifax.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I think the boat was to be delivered at Toronto.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Then the builder did not finish his contract in time and you compelled him to deliver this boat at Quebec ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Because we wanted to save the winter season.

Mr. LEFURGEY. This boat seems to have had quite an unfortunate career.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In what way ?

Mr. LEFURGEY. Did she not get into trouble on her way down to Halifax ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. She had to go through a very severe storm that we had no control over and she went through very well.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I suppose you would not hold the contractor liable after he had delivered the boat ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I cannot remember how we finally settled with the contractor but I will bring down the papers,

Mr. LEFURGEY. I should think the hon. minister would have this information before him.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. All the papers connected with all the items which go to make up a million dollars ?

Mr. LEFURGEY. You have your official there and surely he is posted as to what took place in regard to this boat. Can you tell me what the repairs cost at Halifax ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There were no repairs at Halifax.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I thought she got into trouble, that she got her bow stove in and that there were expensive repairs.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The contractor had to look after that.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The contractor had to pay for the repair of damage sustained owing to stress of weather on her way to Halifax?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I thought that the department had these repairs done under the instructions of one of their officers.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Of course, the repairs had to be done by the contractor under the supervision of an official of the department.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I cannot quite understand the situation yet. You say the boat was to be delivered at Toronto, but you finally took delivery of her at Quebec. How was the contractor responsible for the damage done on the way down to Halifax?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I thought that I had explained it so plainly that any business man would understand it. I said that probably the boat was to be delivered at Toronto; I cannot say it must have been. But it was delivered before it was completed, because we wanted to use the boat during the next winter. We did not want to lose that season without the 'Lurcher' being installed where she was to do valuable service. We were being pressed by the navigation companies to have her put in place. If I had allowed the boat to remain in Toronto for a fortnight more it would not have been possible to have placed her on the station before the 15th of May on account of the canals only being opened on the 1st of May. Therefore, the contractor had to send out his men on board of the boat with the inspector of the government, Mr. Stevens, and he looked after the work of completion. When the work was completed, the boat was accepted by the department in good condition, according to the contract, and she was installed at her station.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Where was she accepted as completed?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. At Halifax.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Well, the contractors must have delivered her at Halifax then ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Of course, they did deliver her at Halifax in the way I have stated. That boat was taken undelivered at Toronto because we wanted to save a season. It does not follow that she had to be delivered at Halifax; quite the contrary.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Well, then how is the contractor responsible for the damage done to her after she was taken over by the government?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I never said anything of the sort.

Mr. LEFURGEY. You said that the contractor had to repair the damage done to her bows on the way to Halifax.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, but it does not follow that the boat had to be delivered at Halifax.

Mr. LEFURGEY. It follows that if it were taken over by the government at Quebec he would not be responsible.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It was not delivered at Quebec.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Well, then, the contractor did deliver her at Halifax?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I certainly must submit to this committee that it is a most anomalous position for the hon. minister to place himself in. He said the boat had to be delivered at Toronto and that after she was taken over by the government and sustained serious damage it cost a lot of money to repair her and that the contractor had to pay for these repairs. I imagine the lawyers will have to decide as to what position the government is in with regard to this vote. On what date did she go on the shoals ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I will procure the information.

Mr. LEFURGEY. You will find that at page 33 of the minister's report.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Then why do you not read your book if it is there ?

Mr. LEFURGEY. You seem to forget it. She was taken off the shoals in February, 1904. Did she get into trouble after that ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. She slipped her anchor.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Did she lose her anchor and all her chain ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. All her chain.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What was the cause ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The hon. gentleman can find it in the report.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Was a report sent to the department a few days afterward she was placed on the service concerning the mooring of this vessel ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. If you want Captain Salmon's report, you shall have it.

Mr. LEFURGEY. There is a report from Captain Salmon ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I suppose so.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Did he recommend how to moor her ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not remember.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Will you ask your deputy minister ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. He does not know from memory. There may have been a suggestion to moor her in a different way, but I am not a mariner. There may be the fact that some of the sailors did not know how to maintain her anchor, and that is a very stormy place, and we have to learn by experience.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What had the sailors to do with the anchor when she was moored ? Who advises the department on such a matter ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is no particular adviser. If an accident happens you cannot help it.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I am not blaming the minister, but I want to know who is responsible. Who recommended the mooring of this vessel ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It must have been the nautical adviser, Captain Spain, or Capt. Salmon.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Who is Mr. Hutchins?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The inspector at Halifax.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Did he have anything to do with the method of mooring on the shoals ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I understand he sent a plan which was submitted to the nautical adviser.

Mr. LEFURGEY. After the vessel broke loose, was there any objection to the method of mooring her again ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I suppose some improvements were made; we would be stupid not to learn by experience.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Did you follow the reports sent in by Captain Salmon ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not know ; I think not.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Will the minister explain the two methods of mooring ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I will not, because I cannot.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I have a report here which purports to be a copy of a report sent by the adviser in this matter, and I shall read one or two sections from it.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Better read the whole thing if it comes from Captain Salmon.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What was the cause of her breaking away a second time ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Probably because Captain Salmon had not advised the department properly.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I have here a report sent on the 26th of March, 1904.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Who is it signed by ?

Mr. LEFURGEY. It purports to be a report from Captain Salmon or some other officer of the department. It refers to the method of mooring this vessel, and I want to know if any consideration was given to it. Has the minister the duplicate of this report in the department, sent by Mr. Salmon ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The hon. gentleman had better ask the hon. member for St. Antoine, who seems to be very well posted in regard to Captain Salmon, who for about a month has been a very important individual. If the hon. gentleman leaves the case in the hands of the hon. member for St. Antoine, he will be in a better position to get the information or to explain it in such a way that I can understand it.

Mr. AMES. This is not a matter of trifling importance. The minister has simply to turn to his own report to find on page 33 that no sooner had he made this expenditure of $90,000 than the lightship had such a disastrous voyage through the ice that her bows were smashed and she had to be repaired at Halifax. Then she was taken to the Lurcher reef, and the report says: 'a few days later she broke from her moorings and put into Yarmouth.' Then a little further down : 'On the 1st of October the lightship again broke from her moorings, and she was consequently sent to the dockyard for overhauling before resuming her station for the winter. Up to the date of writing this report she has not been replaced on her station.' There we have, in the first place, the vessel torn from her moorings and taken back again ; and, in the second place, three months later, torn from her moorings again and sent to be repaired. The country is not only put to the expense of the repairs, but this dangerous shoal is for three months without protection. The point is whether she was properly moored. I have endeavoured for the last eleven days to have placed upon this table a document signed by an officer who at that time was high in honour in the department—a document which calls the attention of the department over and over again to the unseamanlike way in which that vessel was moored, and which practically says that unless a different method is adopted, disaster will result; and, bearing out exactly the prophecy of that report, we have the vessel three months out of service because of her being moored in an improper manner. If Mr. Hutchins or any one else is responsible for this improper mooring, we want to know it ; and it is on that point that the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) is endeavouring to give the House information, because we have been trying to get this return, and have not yet succeeded in doing so.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. I desire again to supplement the demand made by the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) for an investigation as to the conduct of certain officers of the department at Halifax. Yesterday the hon. gentleman called attention to the conduct of an officer of this department in the city of Halifax. I desire again that the department should take steps to look into this matter and to prevent a repetition of such occurrences as have taken place. My hon. friend from Montreal has again called the attention of the House to the conduct of another officer in the city of Halifax. I desire to add my demands to his, and to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to look into the conduct of the various officers of the department at Halifax, and to see whether they are advising the department properly. I understand that certain officers of the Marine Department at Halifax have given instructions to the department here, and I understand that their advice has been accepted. That advice is not acceptable to the hon. member for St. Antoine; perhaps it is acceptable to the country. All I desire is that the minister should take steps to ascertain once for all whether the advice received from his officers at Halifax is such as has been indicated by my hon. friend from Montreal. If it is not desirable that the department of Marine and Fisheries should receive that advice, let the department take steps to put in charge of the agency at Halifax men whose opinions will be endorsed by the hon. member for St. Antoine and the people of this country.

Mr. LEFURGEY. While hon. gentlemen opposite have a very laudible desire to see that the officers of the department are efficient, they seem at the same time to be much troubled because this side of the House is endeavouring to get information from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as to where the blame lies.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The blame must have been upon Mr. Hutchins if he advised the department wrongly. I am going to look into the matter, and if he is to blame, he will have to walk out.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Have any complaints been made?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The hon. gentleman is making a complaint that he was the first to suggest that the moorings were wrong, and he will have to stand by it.

Mr. LEFURGEY. But the minister must know that he had advice from other officers of the department as to those moorings, and it was after he had this advice that the vessel broke away for the second time. All we ask from the department is to give us some information as to where the blame does lie. The minister informs us that he does not know anything about it, nor has he ascertained anything from his deputy. Has he not had time since the 1st of October, 1904, to ascertain where the blame lies? Is it only now that he has to get instructions from the back benches to inquire as to whether his officers are suitable for the positions allotted to them or not. We want to know from the minister why he has been negligent of his duty in not finding this out. I want to give the minister an opportunity to know something of the report which comes into the department before this vessel broke away the second time, and I think, from this report, which I have in my hand, and from the fact that they did not follow this report, that the department are more to blame than Mr. Hutchins or any other official down there. This report, which is file No. 20198 C, and is dated Ottawa, 26th March, 1904, says:

> The method adopted by Mr. Hutchins of mooring this vessel with three heavy stones is, in my opinion, a very poor substitute for the mushroom anchors provided, but my principal objection to the arrangement of mooring is not in the anchors, but in the method of supporting the cable with a submerged buoy. The safety of a vessel, when riding out a gale of wind, lies in her never being able to put a heavy strain on the anchor or cable, as owing to the long scope and weight of the cable, it forms what is called a 'catenery,' that is to say, on account of the length and weight of the cable out, the vessel can never tighten it; if she could the cable would snap or the anchor drag.

The second time this vessel was moored, did the department use the method of a buoy attached to a cable? Can I find that out from the minister?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No, you cannot find out anything from me to-night.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Then the minister apparently does not want to follow the advice given him by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston)?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Oh, yes, I am going to follow it.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Then, you are a long way behind the trail now.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Allow me to say that we understand that the hon. gentleman wishes an investigation made into the conduct of Mr. Hutchins.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The House will understand that I am trying to get information as to why this steamer broke from her moorings. I am not dealing with any particular individual in the department. It is the minister who is responsible to the House, and we want the information from him. We want to know why this report was not acted upon, and why we have the unfortunate circumstance of a boat a few months on the service breaking away from her moorings on two occasions, and the

minister not being able to supply any information.

Mr. MACDONALD. Does the hon. gentleman wish the committee to understand that he has any information that would indicate that the boat was improperly moored, or that her slipping away was not due solely to an accident ?

Mr. LEFURGEY. I do not pretend to be a critic of the proper method of mooring lightships. I am here to get information from the minister as to whether there was any. The minister should know as to whether there was any fault in the first mooring of the vessel, and as to why some other method was not used in mooring her the second time. Apparently the minister does not know anything about mooring lightships, and we can get no information from his department. This report is a comprehensive one, and we would like to know whether the department took cognizance of it, or whether, because the gentleman was in bad odour with the department on account of another circumstance where they could not have their own way, they threw his report aside and persisted in using the old method, the submerged buoy and stones.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. Both my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Lefurgey) and my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Ames) have brought forcibly to the notice of the department the fact that certain officials of the Marine and Fisheries Department in the city of Halifax have not advised the department properly. Reports were made to the department by the then officer of the department, Captain Salmon, and the services of that officer have been dispensed with since then. Whether the department did right or wrong in dispensing with his services, I do not know, my own judgment is that they did the proper thing. It would perhaps suit my hon. friend from Montreal and my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island to have retained the services of Captain Salmon and to have dispensed with the services of the officers of the department in Halifax. Perhaps that would have been the better course. The request I have now to make of the department is that they shall look into the request made by my hon. friends opposite and ascertain whether it is in the interest of the department, not only to dispense with the services of Captain Salmon, but with the services of the officers of the department at Halifax as well ; and if the department reach the conclusion arrived at by our hon. friends opposite, then no doubt the department will do its duty.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Alex. Johnston) apparently has reached a conclusion.

Mr. LEFURGEY.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. I have not reached any conclusion. There is no use wasting time over this question. Again let me impress upon the minister the importance of looking carefully into this matter. The truth or falsity of the charge made in regard to the mooring of this ship can be easily arrived at. Now that the hon. member for Montreal and the hon. member for Prince Edward Island have asked this committee to put our little hands in theirs and pass on, of course we will sit down and wait the result.

Mr. AMES. We would not have it understood that we are endeavouring to find a scapegoat for the department, or that we believe that this, that or the other officer is to blame. The point we make is this, that the ship was improperly moored, that the deputy minister was told that it was improperly moored, that no heed whatsoever was paid to the memorandum served upon him and that the very result which was prophesied came true, that the vessel, moored as she was, broke loose and as a result there was loss. That is the way it seems to us. We want to find out whether the department was properly warned, and until the papers we are asking for are here, we cannot tell whether the department was warned that this method of mooring was improper, and if it was warned, whether it took heed.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. I still continue to believe that no matter how this ship was moored, even if she was moored according to the directions of Captain Salmon, she would have drifted away. Is the hon. gentleman in a position to assert that if the ship was moored in the manner represented by Captain Salmon she would not have broken away under the conditions in which she did break away ?

Mr. AMES. Of course I cannot say what might have happened under hypothetical conditions. I can only say that the method recommended was apparently not adopted, and that the results foreseen came true.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. I may agree with the hon. gentleman that the instructions issued by the officers of the department at Halifax directed the vessel to be moored in an improper manner. But that is a question I desire to be investigated, and if the investigation shows that the member for St. Antoine (Montreal) is right I will be then able to agree with him.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose the method of mooring was submitted to some one who had technical knowledge. We do not know that Mr. Hutchins was an authority. But there was a technical official, I understood the minister to say ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The first mooring was done according to the best method in

use in the United States, by submersion. As I stated, the station is a very difficult one to maintain, and that is the reason why such an expensive lightship was put there. She was moored according to the best method known, and she broke her moorings. Another method had to be adopted which showed clearly that the first mooring under the circumstances was not a proper one. It was decided afterwards to moor her as before. After being there six or seven months, she broke away again. It was simply an accident due to stress of weather, and really nobody was directly responsible. There was no fault or neglect. Since then she has been put back and is rendering the service for which she was intended. Of course, accidents cannot wholly be prevented. Buoys will be driven away, and you cannot always prevent it, any more than you can always prevent a lighthouse being set afire by lightening and burned down. I do not see what object there is in discussing these accidents.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have not followed the details of this discussion, but I understand the point of criticism to be that Captain Salmon made some suggestions with regard to the mooring that were not carried out.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I told the gentleman who brought up the question that I had not the papers here, and this provision for the 'Lurcher' is part of an item which was carried last night. I offered to bring down all the papers on the subject. I think that was a reasonable offer. So, what was the use of cross-examining me as to whether the anchors had been put out at a certain distance or a certain other distance? Trying to show that I know nothing about these things. Well, I do not know anything about them, and I am not supposed to know.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, the minister cannot have technical knowledge about these things. Possibly if we are to have the papers laid upon the table and if we are to be at liberty to discuss the matter on some other item, I should think that would answer the purpose of my hon. friends who are discussing the matter.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I had no intention of criticising or worrying the minister as he seems to think. But I had a report here and wished to get some information as to the methods followed by the department in regard to this lightship. I am glad that the minister acknowledged that no one is to blame. My hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. A. Johnston) who has been worrying about the conduct of the officers at Halifax, having now received this assurance from the minister, can go home and rest quietly.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I did not say that no one was to blame; I said that it might be shown that no one was to blame.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I certainly understood the minister to say so in answer to the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) a few minutes ago. And, if he will look at 'Hansard' to-morrow I think he will find that he said no blame attached to any one.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Personally, I do not think there is. But the attitude of the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) and the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Lefurgey) creates suspicion.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I wish to relieve the anxiety and apprehension of my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Lefurgey). I may have been living in a fool's paradise, but, as the minister knows I was under no apprehension about this matter. I thought the officers at Halifax were endeavouring to do their duty, and, during the nine years I have had to do with political affairs I have never made representations to the contrary to the minister or to any other person. But my suspicions were aroused by the statements made by my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Ames) and my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Lefurgey). These members upon their responsibility have brought to the notice of the House certain points with regard to these officers. I think it is the duty of the minister to make still further inquiry and ascertain whether there is any reason for the suspicion aroused by these hon. gentlemen.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. A. Johnston) is laying down a different doctrine from that which his leader propounded this evening. The minister lays down the proposition that any complaint from this side of the House was not to be regarded as a complaint at all.

Mr. BENNETT. Has any vessel been purchased by the government to be used as a lighthouse supply boat? If so, what is her name and from whom was she purchased? I do not know whether the government has ever had a boat that went about with supplies for the lighthouses. Has one been purchased by the department?

Mr PREFONTAINE. No.

Mr. BENNETT. I see it stated in one of the papers that such a boat had been purchased.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It was wrong.

Mr. BENNETT. Are negotiations proceeding for the purchase of a boat?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Nothing has been done.

Lighthouse and coast service—construction of lighthouses and aids to navigation, including apparatus, $500,000.

Mr. AMES. Better let that stand. There is a good deal on that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. AMES. This item brings up the discussion of the new aids to navigation from the St. Lawrence and the reports of the various bodies that have asked for improvements. I think it had better wait until we have more time.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have all the information here including the maps and the plans.

Mr. AMES. But, it will take a long time to get the information. Still of course, if the minister wishes to sit here until four o'clock in the morning, all right.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is a way out of the difficulty. I am asking here for only $500,000. Last year we spent $850,000. Therefore it will be necessary for me to ask for a supplementary estimate. I think this item could be voted and any discussion that may be necessary take place on the supplementary item.

Mr. AMES. The subjects covered by the next four or five items require considerable discussion. There is this one of construction of lighthouses. There is the signal service—that can pass if you like. But there is an item to provide for the establishment of Marconi stations. We want considerable information about that. We also want a good deal of information about that submarine signal apparatus contract. Those three items might stand.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We might put through most of the items, and leave either that $500,000 item or the $100,000 item or the $75,000 item. I understand that the leader of the opposition has requested that the item to provide for submarine signal apparatus, $70,000, should be suspended for further information. This would involve a discussion of all the other items, I would give all the information I have before me now, and we could discuss the further papers that I am to bring down.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I suggest to the minister that, of course, technically, it is all one item, No. 197—and, by the way, there seems to be a great divergence of practice in regard to the way in which items are numbered. In some departments we would find every one of these items with a distinct number, and I would think that the minister would get things cleared up more satisfactorily if he would put them in that way. As the whole item must stand, I would suggest to the minister that we might run through those that involve no discussion and leave about three that will involve discussion.

Mr. BENNETT. I would ask the minister when his estimates are taken up again if he would please bring down the papers in connection with the cutting of timber on Hope island.

Mr. AMES.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Those produced last year ?

Mr. BENNETT. I think the minister will find that some further ones were brought down, because, if he will remember, one of his officers went up there to view the amount of cutting that had been done.

Signal service, $10,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is a slight increase here.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is an increase in the service.

To provide for the administration of the pilotage, $12,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That, I suppose, is some increase in the service ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. AMES. What are the duties and emoluments of Mr. E. Guerin in connection with the Montreal Pilotage Commissioners' Court ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. He is a commissioner appointed to make special investigation under the old law. He is not a wreck commissioner, but there is still under the Pilotage Act a disposition which might require the services of Mr. Guerin, who was appointed about three or four years ago. During last year he rendered no service, he had not been called upon to render any service, so the amount of money has not been expended.

Mr. AMES. He is paid so much per sitting ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. $10 a day.

Salaries of temporary officers, engineers and draughtsmen at Ottawa, &c., &c., $20,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is an increase of $4,000 in this.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The increase is due principally to the fact that we have appointed an officer, Mr. St. George, a special engineer, to superintend and look after the works of the Harbour Commissioners, in the port of Montreal, at a salary of $3,000 a year. The expenditure was about $1,057.42 a month, so we required this increase of money on account, first, of the appointment of Mr. St. George, and, secondly, on account of the fact that since the organization of the lighthouse board we have been called upon to pay the travelling expenses of the gentlemen outside of Ottawa who have come to sit on that board, which meets once or twice a month, according to the applications. It is only fair and reasonable that these gentlemen should be paid their travelling expenses to attend the lighthouse board. Members of the shipping federation have been called upon to take part in the deliberations of the lighthouse board, which is composed mostly of officers of the

department, and we have made arrangements to pay their expenses.

Mr. AMES. It is out of this appropriation that Mr. St. George is paid ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. AMES. Is he now permanently in the employ of the department, and does he give his entire time to it ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not know that he gives his entire time. He is obliged, of course, to do the service that is required from him. He is obliged to be in attendance and to superintend the work as an engineer occupying that position.

Some resolutions reported.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What will we take up on Monday in case we get through with private members' business ?

Mr. FIELDING. Supply, taking up the estimates of the Department of Public Works in case the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not here.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 20, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES.

On the Orders of the Day being called,

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I desire to inform the House that it is the intention of the government to proceed with the Autonomy Bill on Wednesday next as the first order. I may say to the House also that it is contemplated to introduce an amendment to section 16, which amendment will be placed in the hands of the clerk, I hope, before the adjournment of the House ; and before the adjournment I think we will be able to place on the table of the House the papers which were asked for the other day by the hon. the leader of the opposition.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, it would be desirable, as I have pointed out to the right hon. gentleman, that these papers which are to be brought down, or have been brought down, should be printed, or put in some such form that they will be properly available to members of the House who desire to deal with them in the course of the debate.

THE BUDGET SPEECH.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. Is there any announcement by the First Minister or the Minister of Finance as to the budget, or is that now to be indefinitely postponed ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I intimated to my hon. friend the other day that some days might elapse before we could make an announcement ; and in view of the business which is likely to come before the House, and which is of, perhaps, more immediate interest, I think we will have to postpone for a few days the announcement concerning the budget.

PRIVATE BILLS.

MOOSEJAW AND EDMONTON RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 20) to incorporate the Moosejaw and Edmonton Railway Company.—Mr. Scott.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The reason that this Bill stood was because I desired the hon. gentleman who has the Bill in charge (Mr. Scott) to explain why it was necessary to have a capitalization, if I remember correctly, of $2,000,000, and in addition to that the power to issue bonds upon the whole length of the road to the extent of $25,000 a mile. I would think that perhaps the bond issue would of itself be amply sufficient to build and equip the road—perhaps more than sufficient—but in addition to that we have authorized a capitalization of $2,000,000.

Mr. SCOTT. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that the application of the promoters called for a capitalization of only $1,000,000 and it was in the judgment of the standing committee on Railways and Canals that the capitalization was increased to $2,000,000. I have not the faintest objection to reducing that to $1,000,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the reason for increasing it? Perhaps the hon. gentleman who was present at the committee can give this committee some information as to that.

Mr. HYMAN. It has been the usual custom of the committee in regard to roads of this character to make the capital stock in the neighbourhood of $10,000 a mile. It is necessary under a clause of the Railway Act to subscribe 15 per cent of the capital to make a start with the road. With a road of this character having a capital of $1,000,000 it would mean $150,000, but with $2,000,000, capital it would mean $300,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the length of the road ?

Mr. HYMAN. About 400 miles. These matters have all been discussed from that

standpoint and it has been the custom to allow an issue of stock in the neighbourhood of $10,000 a mile.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

ONTARIO AND MINNESOTA POWER COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 86) respecting the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company, Limited.—Mr. Campbell.

On section 9,

Mr. FOSTER. Where does this Bill come from ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. From the committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me that we are getting no idea of the Bill at all. A comparatively small committee—not saying anything against the committee at all—takes the Bill up ; we do not know how much time they give to its consideration, the Bill comes down to the House and we simply just hear the annotations at the sides of the clauses read. I do not think that is good legislation. I would like to ask my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he thinks it is ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Most of these Bills are purely formal and do not require much discussion. It may be, of course, that there are some Bills that are very important and something might slip through that requires consideration. But, as a rule these Bills are purely formal and require no very great consideration. If there is something that requires consideration in a Bill sometimes I agree with my hon. friend that it might slip through.

Mr. HYMAN. I think there are some principles of the Bill which should be discussed when the gentleman in charge of it is here. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to and committee rose and reported progress.

GILLIES BROTHERS, LIMITED.

House in committee on Bill (No. 95) respecting Gillies Brothers, Limited.—Mr. A. A. Wright.

On section 3,

Mr. BARKER. By this section we are apparently confirming letters patent that are not before the House. It has sometimes happened that letters patent have been issued somewhat irregularly, and the effect of section three would be to affirm the terms of such a patent and grant additional powers.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I was present at the committee when this Bill was considered, and I must say that it was very thoroughly discussed. The manager of the Gillies firm was present and also many of the lumbermen who are members of the House, and the whole matter was thoroughly gone into. I may say that this is one of the largest firms in Ontario. I understand that the letters patent were filed before the Standing Orders Committee, which committee passed judgment upon them. It may seem strange that all these powers are asked, but evidence was given before the committee that the company is really carrying on the different lines of business mentioned in the Bill. We found it a little strange, for example, that they should ask to do business as wharfingers and warehousemen, but we were told by the lumbermen present that they were actually operating boats and tramways for the purposes of their business. The only objection was to clause 9, which empowered the company to expropriate, but that clause was withdrawn. In passing this Bill we are encouraging a firm which is doing a very large business in Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Were the letters patent granted under Dominion authority?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I was not making any objection to the firm or to their work. I know the firm and they are a very excellent one and doing a very large business.

Mr. LEMIEUX. They very willingly dropped the expropriation clause when they found it would create a bad precedent.

Mr. FOSTER. It is very satisfactory to the House to have the Solicitor General make that statement.

On section 6,

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The usual provision is contained in this clause?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes; they have to ask the permission of the several municipalities.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. By clause 5 they can only acquire by purchase.

On section 10,

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will not repeat the objection made the other evening with regard to certain features of this clause. If it is the policy of the government to permit such legislation to pass, I suppose these people are as much entitled to it as any one else.

Mr. McCOOL. The same power was granted to the Ottawa and Hull Company.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I fully appreciate the fact that it was granted to a great many companies, but the point we made was that it should not be granted to any company, and that some policy on this question should be determined on by the administration, which policy we should carry out in future. It is not a party question exactly, because

I think it has been done under both administrations in the past, and it is not a matter that is personal to this company at all. It is simply a matter of public policy in which hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House ought to be interested. It would be far better to have all stock paid up in cash, so that you might know that every dollar of the company's stock represented cash actually paid in.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The principle laid down by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) is making headway, because there were several objections in the committee to the clause, but after the representations made by the promoters of the Bill the committee thought we should give them the benefit of the precedents.

Mr. HAGGART. The Bill leaves it to the directors alone to make any arrangement they like without consulting the shareholders, and so the directors might completely destroy the stock of the original company.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No. The Bill provides that it shall be approved by a majority of the stockholders of the company.

Mr. HAGGART. Very well.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the order :

House in Committee on Bill (No. 45) an Act respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Macdonald.

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN. Stand.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I would like to ask the Prime Minister, in view of the fact that an announcement of public policy is to be made in connection with this Bill, whether it would not be well to deal with it in the afternoon. Otherwise, it will come up probably on Wednesday or Friday after dinner.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Monday next.

THE CENTURY LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

House went into Committee on Bill (No. 49) respecting the Century Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

On section 1—time extended for obtaining license,

Mr. FOSTER. How is this? The time seems to have been extended from 1901.

Mr. FIELDING. This Bill has been assented to by the Committee on Banking and Commerce, and I suppose the House will agree to it; but I do not wish to let it pass without offering a word of objection. I think the law we have limiting the time for the organization of insurance companies and banks is a reasonable one, and we should only depart from it in special cases and when the cause for extension shall be shown to be exceptional. Personally I was not satisfied that the cause had been shown as respects this Bill. However, the committee took a generous view and allowed the Bill to pass. My view is that insurance companies and banks should be organized only when there is a group of men of sufficient financial strength to give an assurance that they will be able to start the concern, and that an extension of time should be granted only for some exceptional reason. I do not suppose that the House will alter the decision which the committee has come to; but I think that it would be well for hon. members interested in Bills of this character to realize that the object of the general law is a desirable one, and that we should all try to uphold it in the future better than we have done in the past.

Mr. FOSTER. I agree with my hon. friend the Minister of Finance; and, being in the dark as respects the exceptional reasons for extending the time in this case, I think the mover of the Bill ought to enlighten the House as to what they are.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. HYMAN. What is the object?

Mr. MACPHERSON. I do not wish to attempt to force the Bill upon the House if it is against public policy. It was introduced in my name, and I was informed that the company had spent a large sum of money in organizing, that some $200,000 had been subscribed and 10 per cent thereof paid up.

Mr. FIELDING. I wish my hon. friend to understand that I am not opposing the Bill. I am rather asking the House to accept the judgment of the committee, but I am suggesting that we ought to have a clearer understanding of what public policy is, and keep nearer to that in the future. I am not opposing my hon. friend's Bill, although I voted against it in the committee; but I do not wish it to become a precedent.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection to the Bill; but I agree entirely with the policy which the hon. Finance Minister has laid down. On the other hand, if it can be shown that there are exceptional reasons in this case, they would no doubt have weight with the committee; and the statement that has been made to-day by the Finance Minister will probably render such a Bill as this impossible hereafter, because it will be public notice to promoters that they must get a little more hustle on, and get their Acts into operation more quickly. If $200,000 has been subscribed and a cer-

tain portion of that paid in, in good faith, I would be disposed for my part to withhold opposition. At the same time, I think we ought not to allow even a chance for franchises of this kind to lie around for so many years waiting for somebody to take them up.

Mr. MACPHERSON. In answer to the hon. gentleman I may say that the men who have organized this company have not attempted to carry a charter around or to act as chartermongers. The matter was brought up in good faith. I am informed that the principal mover in the organizing of this compary was a gentleman named Gilmour, who has died, and that for that reason the business of the company was held up for awhile. The company is not composed of men of straw by any means. They are all pretty responsible people, and the fact of their having some $250,000 subscribed is an indication of that. My reason for moving that the committee rise and report progress was that if there was anything wrong with the Bill, I might talk the matter over with the Minister of Finance. Still, I desire to have the Bill go through, and therefore I will withdraw the motion.

Mr. HYMAN. I think we ought to deal with each case of this kind on its merits. It may be that the company was almost ready to go on, but that for some exceptional reasons delay was caused. It would have been different if the company had got the legislation, and had done nothing to forward the objects for which it was formed. This case seems to be an exceptional one on account of the death of the main promoter of the company. The fact that $250,000 is subscribed is an evidence of good faith, and we might let the Bill go through.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

DOMINION ANNUITY COMPANY.

House went into committee on Bill (No. 82) to incorporate the Dominion Annuity Company.—Mr. Bole.

On section 1,

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend the Finance Minister made a statement some time ago regarding the probability of the government taking some action in the way of annuities. Has any definite policy been decided upon ?

Mr. FIELDING. The matter came up in this way. It was suggested in the committee that the name 'Dominion Annuity Company' might possibly lead to the impression that these annuities were issued by the Dominion government ; and consequently if the Dominion government should at any time issue annuities, there would be confusion. The Bill however was left as it is with the understanding that the promoter would suggest another name on the third reading. My hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Bole), after consultation with the promoters, has decided to ask that the name be changed to the 'Annuity Company of Canada.' I have said that the Dominion government might at some time see fit to issue annuities, and it is quite likely that this session some legislation on that question will be brought up. What we contemplate is not a general system of annuities, but one limited to old age annuities—not precisely old age pensions, but a limited system of annuity to meet the conditions of people advanced in life.

Mr. FOSTER. Involving any assistance ?

Mr. FIELDING. Perhaps in the rate of interest, or in some such way as that the Dominion might be a contributor. It is not intended to be, in the common meaning of the word, old age pensions, but a system of old age annuities. My right hon. colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce has given the matter considerable attention and a Bill is being prepared which we expect to introduce this session. I should have explained that when the objection was taken in the committee to the title, 'Dominion Annuity Company,' the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill, after consultation with one of the promoters who was at hand, suggested that the name should be changed to 'Manitoba Annuity Company.' Of course, if Manitoba should some day issue annuities, the same objection might be advanced. Therefore, on further consideration, the promoters decided to ask that the name should be 'Annuity Company of Canada' and an amendment to that effect will be moved.

Mr. LOGAN. I do not see that there is very much improvement in this change of name. Why not make it 'The Western Annuity Company.'

Mr. FIELDING. We have already one western Bill before the committee, that of the Western Life Insurance Company—to say nothing of another western question we may have.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not see that there is any objection.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the name now proposed is a reasonable one.

Mr. HYMAN. I move that section 1 be reconsidered and that the name be changed to 'The Annuity Company of Canada.'

Motion agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. BOLE moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. If the House has no objection, I would rather that this Bill should be left over in the meantime. I would like the promoter to think over the question of

the name. The change may have been made without careful consultation. At first, it did not seem to be very objectionable. But, as we consider it, it becomes evident that other annuity companies, to be incorporated hereafter will be debarred from getting the best name. It may be said that this company is the first in the field, and should have the choice of names. While there is something in that, yet, I think it would be giving this company an unfair advantage to allow it to be known as 'The Annuity Company of Canada'—the name of this whole vast realm—so that companies coming later must use some less pretentious and less inclusive title. I think it might be fairly considered whether this would not be giving them an unfair advantage.

Mr. BOLE. I appreciate the point made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), but I think that as this is the first annuity company, they are entitled to the advantage that comes from being first in the field. I might remark also that the name that has been put in the Bill was the second choice made at a full meeting of the promoters. Also a leading promoter consulted with the officers of the department on Saturday and there appeared to them to be no objection; in fact, they regarded it as a very happy and proper name to give the company. I think, that, under these circumstances, the Bill should be allowed to go through.

Mr. FOSTER. Second thoughts are sometimes best. I think there should be time for consideration.

Bill reported.

Mr. SPEAKER. When shall the Bill be read the third time?

Mr. FOSTER. At the next sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER. At the next sitting of the House.

CATHOLIC MUTUAL BENEFIT ASSOCIATION OF CANADA.

House went into Committee on Bill (No. 93) respecting the Grand Council of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association of Canada.—Mr. J. J. Hughes.

On section 2—sick benefit fund——

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose this follows the rule?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, it has been carefully examined by the officials.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. As I understand this section it provides that there is to be this fund, but if there is a loss, society is not bound to pay. I think the promoter should explain.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. The object, as I understand, is to enable the association to establish and maintain a special fund to be known as the sick benefit fund. Assessments will be levied for this fund, and the fund thus created will be available as far as it goes. It will be for the officers to provide a sufficiency. This Bill is substantially the same as was passed in 1903 for the Woodmen of the World, a similar assessment society.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. It does not seem to be very reasonable that this association should establish a fund like that. If there is a benefit, they are going to take it; if there is no benefit, they will not get the advantage. They have two funds, as I understand; they have the sick fund and a general fund. If the sick fund is profitable, they are going to take it; if it is not profitable, they are not responsible for any deficit.

Mr. HYMAN. It depends on the assessment.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. The object of the association is to establish a fund for a special purpose, and to levy on the members, those who are willing to join. In assessment associations of this kind, I understand, they have sick benefit funds, but all the members of the association are not obliged to contribute towards that fund. Those who wish may contribute towards that fund under certain conditions; and then in case of sickness, when they are eligible, they will be paid according to the provisions that are made. It is a common thing for assessment associations of this kind to have the privilege, the legal ability, to establish a fund for that purpose. That is all that is asked for in this case—only those members who contribute to that fund will benefit by it in case of sickness.

Mr. HYMAN. There is no liability on the others?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. None at all.

Mr. BERGERON. I would suggest to my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. L. P. Demers) that the principle is the same as the Bill concerning the Alliance Nationale.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. It is like the Foresters, who have a similar fund; the principle is the same in all.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

IMPERIAL GUARANTEE AND ACCIDENT INSURANCE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 98) to incorporate the Imperial Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company of Canada.

On section 10,

The company may acquire and hold any real property required for its use and accommodation, and may dispose thereof, but the annual value of such property held in any province of Canada shall not exceed $3,000.

Amended by the committee by adding the words 'when necessary,' after the word 'thereof.'

Hon. W. S. FIELDING. Does that mean when the disposal is necessary or when the property is necessary ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I think 'when necessary' applies to the disposal.

Mr. FOSTER. This is subject to the Insurance Act ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes; the last clause implies that. In some cases a clause is put in stating that it shall be subject; but even without that, there is no question that, unless it be exempt from the provisions of the General Insurance Act, the general Act applies. Clause 11 says that the Companies' Clauses Act shall apply to this company in so far as the said Act is not inconsistent with any of the provisions of the Insurance Act or of this Act. That seems to make it clear that the General Insurance Act applies.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It would be plainer if you added after the words 'Insurance Act' something making the general Act applicable to this company.

Mr. FIELDING. There was a clause of that kind in the Bill we passed a few minutes ago; and perhaps, to remove all possible doubt, it may be as well to insert a clause in the same words.

Mr. GALLIHER. Then section 11, standing as it is, would be in conflict. Section 11 says :

Notwithstanding anything contained therein the Companies Clauses Act, except sections 18 and 39 thereof, shall apply to the company in so far as the said Act is not inconsistent with any of the provisions of the Insurance Act or of this Act.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is there not a clause in the General Insurance Act the same as in the Railway Act ?

This Act shall apply to all persons, companies and railways within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. There is no doubt that, even without that clause, the Act would apply; but we might put in a clause expressly stating that the Insurance Act shall apply to this company.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Why should you put in all these special clauses. If there is a General Act it should apply to all companies and this should be set out in the General Act ?

Mr. FIELDING. It does.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If it is set out in the General Act, why should it be necessary to say so in every Act that comes along, because if it is done in one case and not in another, some one will set up the argument that all are not being treated alike ?

Mr. FIELDING moved :

That a new clause be added to the Bill as section 12 as follows : The Insurance Act shall apply to the company.

Section as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

ONTARIO FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 105) to incorporate the Ontario Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Boyce.

On the question, shall the Bill be reported ?

Mr. HYMAN. The only question that may arise in regard to this Bill is the question of the title. The title is the Ontario Fire Insurance Company. There has been in existence for some years a company called the Ontario Mutual of Berlin. I understand that company has now changed its name to the Mutual Life of Canada. It is just a question as to whether we should allow another company to take the name of 'Ontario' after a company of that name has been in existence for many years and when many of its policies will still be in existence under the name of the Ontario Mutual.

Mr. BARKER. Is that fire or life ?

Mr. HYMAN. Will it make any difference? You would not allow a fire insurance company to take the same name as a life insurance company.

Mr. FIELDING. I should think that if the Ontario Mutual had any opposition we would have heard of it before this time. If they are opposed to the name the matter would be worth consideration. If my hon. friend (Mr. Hyman) desires the Bill to be held in the committee for that purpose we might do so.

Mr. HYMAN. I think under the circumstances it might be well to hold it.

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to me that one being a fire insurance company and the other a life company there is not much danger of confusion.

Mr. FIELDING. And the Ontario Mutual does business under a different name. It is now known as the Mutual Life of Canada, so that my hon. friend's remarks would only have reference to past policies.

Mr. BOYCE. There could not possibly be any confusion of insurance as that of the Ontario Mutual has been changed. There are a number of insurance companies of different kinds having the name 'Ontario,' for instance, the Ontario Accident Company and the Ontario Mutual as the Acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) says.

Mr. HYMAN. That has been changed now.

Mr. BOYCE. Yes, that has been changed. I would point out to the committee there will be less danger now of any confusion or that this company will be unfairly confounded with any existing company that the Ontario Mutual has changed its name and is no longer known by the name of 'Ontario.'

Mr. HYMAN. Of course there are a lot of policies of the Mutual Life of Canada which have been issued under the name of the Ontario Mutual and these policies are still in force.

Mr. BOYCE. But they are life insurance policies.

Mr. HYMAN. Yes, that is quite true. But it has always been considered inexpedient to grant the name of another company to a new corporation even if it is of a different character as long as it is an insurance company. I think the matter had better be referred to the Mutual Life of Canada to ascertain if there is any objection.

Mr. FIELDING. I would suggest that we take the Bill out of the committee stage and let it stand for its third reading so that if there be such opposition we can take the matter up again and amend the Bill. Report the Bill and let it stand for its third reading only.

Bill reported.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 111) to incorporate the Saskatchewan Bridge Company.—Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 114) respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 119) to incorporate D. R. Fraser and Company, Limited.—Mr. Oliver.

QUESTIONS.

CASCUMPEC SANDHILLS CHANNEL.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. What amount of money has been expended by the government to date in trying to stop the new channel, Cascumpec Sandhills, near Alberton, Prince Edward Island ?
2. What was the nature of the work attempted ?
3. What portion of it has been effected ?
4. Has the brush work placed there remained, or is it all gone to sea ?
5. Who was in charge of the work ?
6. Who advised it ?
7. Is it the intention of the department to continue it ?
8. If so, what is the estimate, and who is to be the superintendent ? If not, what is to be done with the stone and timber on the ground ?

Hon. CHARLES HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works) :

1. $2,977.51.
2. Works which have a total length of 415 feet, consist of a dam of brush and stone in the bottom, with cribwork top, fully ballasted and fender piled at 10 feet centre.
3. and 4. Previous to storm of 14th November last, works were in good condition ; department not aware yet of extent of damage, if any, caused by storm.
5. Work under Engineer Hegan.
6. Recommended by Captain Gordon and Resident Engineer Jas. B. Hegan.
7. and 8. It is not at present the intention of the department to continue the work, any material left will be utilized in protection work around lighthouse beach.

ST. JOSEPH, LAKE HURON.

Mr. ARMSTRONG—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Is the pier at St. Joseph, on Lake Huron, completed ?
2. If not, when will the said pier be completed, and what is the cause of the delay ?
3. How much money has been expended on said pier to date ?
4. What interest is to be served in building said pier at St. Joseph ?

Hon. CHARLES HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works) :

1. Only small portion remains to be done.
2. First of July, next. Inclemency of weather.
3. $14,991.20.
4. General interest of surrrounding country.

COLD STORAGE ON STEAMERS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Does the contract entered into between the government and the steamships subsidized to give cold storage or cold air chambers, compel all said steamers to keep certain temperatures while crossing the Atlantic ?
2. Are thermograph records taken on all subsidized steamships ? If not, on how many are such records taken ?
3. How many dollars worth of perishable products were exported from Canada in the fiscal year 1904 ?
4. What amount of perishable products were exported by cold storage, and what amount by cool air compartments or ventilated storage ; and what amount by ordinary storage ?
5. What was the quantity of each perishable product exported ?
6. What is the extra charge per barrel or per box for apples sent in cold storage or cool air compartments ?
7. What were the comparative results of shipments of fruit by cold storage, with cold air chambers or ventliated storage ?
8. What information has the government with reference to perishable products remaining on the docks in Europe for days before being shipped to their destination ?
9. What are the freight rates on perishable products from the ports of Montreal, St. John

and Halifax during each month in calendar year 1904 ?

10. What are the freight rates on perishable products from the ports of Boston, Portland and New York for each month in calendar year 1904?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. The contract entered into between the Department of Agriculture and the steamship companies provide a regular cold storage service from Montreal to ports in Great Britain terminated at the close of navigation from Montreal in 1901, and the contracts for cooled air service terminated at the close of the navigation season of 1903.

2. Since the spring of 1903 thermographs have been placed in all steamers sailing from Montreal for ports in Great Britain, having perishable products on board.

3. Cheese, $24,184,566 ; butter, $4,724,155 ; eggs, $1,053,396 ; bacon, $12,603,521 ; apples (green or ripe), $4,590,793 ; total, $47,156,431.

4. No exact records are kept of the quantities of perishable products carried in cold storage chambers, in cooled air compartments or in ordinary storage, from the port of Montreal, but the following figures are approximately correct for the total shipments from Montreal to Bristol, Liverpool, London, Glasgow and Manchester for the season of navigation in 1904 :

—	In Cold Storage.	In Cooled Air.	In Ventilated (Ordinary) Storage.
Cheese.....boxes	.....	102,238	1,908,867
Butter.....pkgs.	487,182	.....	2,516
Eggs..... cases	1,000	.....	78,625
Bacon..... "	.....	18,072	68,720
Apples..... brls.	5,450	1,521	321,749
" ....boxes	827	1,003	21,478

5. The total exports from the port of Montreal to all ports, last season, of the five products mentioned above, were as follows : Cheese, 2,114,639 boxes ; butter, 490,300 packages ; eggs, 80,565 cases ; bacon (figures not available) ; apples, 342,890 barrels ; apples, 31,903 boxes.

6. Fifteen shillings per ton of 40 cubic feet.

7. Cold storage is necessary to carry the early, soft varieties of fruit across the ocean safely, but the late, firm varieties 'cooled air' or well ventilated holds is all that is required.

8. Officers of my department have ascertained that at the ports of Liverpool and Glasgow there is considerable delay on the part of the consignees in the removal of Canadian butter after it has been landed on the docks. The bulk of the butter discharged from each steamer is removed within a reasonable time but the balance is allowed to remain for days before delivery is taken. No such delay occurs at Manchester, London or Bristol owing to regulations enforced by the dock companies at these ports. Efforts are being made by my department to induce the dock company at Liverpool to enact regulations similar to those in force at the above named ports, but thus far no definite result has been arrived at.

9. The information asked for in questions 9 and 10 is not in the possession of my department.

AGREEMENT WITH GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC.

Mr. BARKER asked :

1. Have any agreements been entered into between His Majesty and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, or the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, or any other corporation, company or person, pursuant or with relation to any of the provisions of the National Transcontinental Railway Act, or of the Act amending the same, or of the scheduled agreements therein referred to ?

2. With whom and when were such agreements, if any, made ?

3. If any agreements so entered into have not already been laid upon the table of the House, what is the nature of each such agreement not so laid upon the table ?

4. Has the Governor in Council given any, and if so, what approval pursuant to section 4 of the National Transcontinental Railway Act ?

5. Has the Governor in Council, or the Minister of Finance and Receiver General, given any, and, if so, what approval pursuant to section 9 of the Act of 1904 amending the National Transcontinental Railway Act ?

6. Have the forms of any leases, mortgages, bonds, securities or other documents referred to in the said Act or amending Act, or in the scheduled agreements, been settled or approved by or on behalf of the government ?

7. And what, if any, such forms have been so settled or approved ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

1, 2, 3. No such agreements have been entered into.

4, 5, 6, 7. There have been conferences between representatives of the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Company respecting the forms of mortgage and the terms on which the guarantee bonds are to be issued, but no conclusion has been reached and no Orders in Council have been passed.

MAILS—ST. JOHN AND ST. MARTINS, N.B.

Mr. DANIEL asked :

1. Have tenders been asked for the carriage of mails between St. John and St. Martins, N.B., for the ensuing year ?

2. Has any contract been let for this service ? If so, to whom, and at what price ?

3. If tenders have not been asked for this service, when will such tenders be called for ?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). The contract for this

service was awarded to Mr. Henry Nugent, the lowest tenderer, in March 1901, for a four years' contract expiring on the 31st March, 1905, contract price $779 per annum. A renewal has been granted Mr. Nugent at the same rate for another term of four years.

ST. PAUL LAND AND HYDRAULIC COMPANY.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What is the amount of rental payable to the government by the St. Paul Land and Hydraulic Company for its water privileges at Côte St. Paul, on the Lachine canal ?
2. What is the duration of the lease ?
3. What are the other principal conditions of the lease ?

Hon. CHARLES HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works). In the absence of the Minister of Railways I beg to answer :

1. There is no lease from the government to the St. Paul Land and Hydraulic Company.

2. and 3. Answered by number one.

VACANCY IN CENTRE TORONTO.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker. I beg to call your attention formally to the fact that by the lamented death of Mr. E. F. Clarke, who represented Centre Toronto, in this House, the representation of that electoral division is now vacant.

WHARFS, PIERS, ETC., CONSTRUCTED BY GOVERNMENT.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER moved for :

A return showing the number of wharfs, docks and piers constructed by the government in Canada each year since 1896 ; the situation of each ; the total amount expended thereon, (a) in construction, including cost of land ; (b) in maintenance ; whether owned by the government or by corporations or individuals ; the current expenditure in each year for (a) employees ; (b) repairs ; the revenue derived therefrom each year ; the number of vessels, (a) steam ; (b) sailing, which called each year, and the tonnage of each.

Hon. CHARLES HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works). I have no objection to the motion, but the hon. gentleman will understand that it will require a great deal of time to complete this return.

Mr. FOSTER. I quite understand it will take some time, but I would ask the hon. gentleman to expedite it, and to have it if possible before the budget speech comes down.

Mr. HYMAN. I doubt very much if I can.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For copies of all correspondence had with the Minister of Railways and Canals, or any officer in his department, in reference to the dismissal of James Ritchie, inspector of masonry on the Trent Valley Canal, Gamebridge, and the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Foster.

For a return of all the thermograph records used in the transportation of perishable products from Canada, in cold storage or ventilated storage, or cool air compartment. Also a copy of all contracts entered into between the government and any steamship company, whereby the company receives a subsidy for installing cold storage or cool air ventilation or ventilated storage.—Mr. Armstrong—by Mr. R. L. Borden.

COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND THE MAINLAND.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (P.E.I.) moved for :

Copies of all correspondence, telegrams, reports, estimates, and all other documents or information which passed between any minister or official of the government and engineers or others, with reference to the investigating or taking of soundings, or any other work for the purpose of ascertaining the best plan and place for the building of a pier or breakwater, in the vicinity of Carleton Point, or Cape Traverse, P.E.I., to establish and facilitate communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, winter and summer.

He said : I congratulate myself on having the opportunity of speaking on a very important subject, so important to the people of Prince Edward Island and the Dominion at large, with the Prime Minister and so many other members of the cabinet present, as well as the leader of the opposition ; but I regret that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not present. I regret that year after year this matter of communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland should have to be so much harped upon in this House ; but I feel it my duty to call the attention of the House to the most deplorable state of affairs that has been experienced by the people of that province during this last winter. For some fifty-five days, from the 24th of January up to the present time, there has been no steam communication between the island and the mainland, and only an indifferent service at the capes, and it may be weeks yet before communication by boat is resumed. Now, I must seriously charge that the government have not used every effective effort to meet the exigency of winter communication. During the last two or three years that I have been in this House I have urged on the government the necessity of having a third and more powerful winter boat to meet the conditions of the service between these points. In the last session of the late parliament the minister did give us a hint that such a boat would be constructed and placed upon this route, but up to the present time no move in this direction appears

to have been made. Now, we are coming in no huckstering spirit nor in any cringing manner before this hon. House. We are simply asking that the terms under which Prince Edward Island entered confederation be carried out. There was at that time a distinct bond entered into by which we were to have continuous steam communication winter and summer, thus putting us in communication with the Intercolonial and the other railways of the Dominion; and it is for the fulfilment of these terms that we come here to demand our rights. I might say that prior to the time the province entered confederation, from 1867 to 1873, the Dominion government was very assiduous in its efforts to get us into this confederation, and I may say that it has been in some respects a doubtful benefit. I do not for a moment wish to utter a disloyal sentiment against this great confederation; but I must say that the feeling of the people of Prince Edward Island is that we have not received fair treatment in this regard. While I do not wish to present the case of Prince Edward Island in any such spirit, I certainly think that if we cannot prevail upon this government to treat us in a just and fair manner, we shall have to look to the full letter of the bond in the terms of union. It was understood and felt at the time that so isolated was the position of Prince Edward Island that every means should be used to provide steam communication between the province and the rest of the Dominion winter and summer. Now, we have surely come to a time when patience ceases to be a virtue. The question should not be considered from any mere monetary point of view. We must surely realize that it is necessary to the upbuilding and growth of this Dominion that there should be unity from one end of the country to the other, and that unity will only come about by this government using every possible means to fulfil the terms under which Prince Edward Island entered confederation. We have suffered very grievously this year. You can imagine, Mr. Speaker, a province shut off for two months from trade communication with the neighbouring province. The trade of the island has altered largely during the past ten or fifteen years. We have a large quantity of perishable products that we should be able to market at all seasons of the year. At the present time the terminals at Pictou are filled with some two hundred to four hundred cars of merchandise for the island, and, besides, the Intercolonial and the Canadian Pacific have been refusing for some time to book orders for merchandise for the Island until the blockade is raised. We have had, as hon. members know, a hay famine in Prince Edward Island, and had to contract for large quantities of hay from the upper provinces, a great deal of which has been lying at Pictou awaiting transportation to the island. In many instances our farmers have had to sacrifice their milch cows, and the dairy industry will suffer seriously thereby. The blockade has never before been so bad since confederation. Yet in the last ten or fifteen years the trade of the island has been increasing so rapidly that the two boats which we have at the present time, even under favourable circumstances, are not sufficient to carry away from the island our products and to bring back the importations.

During December and January there were 16,500 dead hogs shipped. Just imagine the position of the farmer. During these two months there was an immense number of large shipments from the island, and in consequence of the stoppage of communications, those people who had hogs on hand were unable to ship them and were put to the expense of feeding them when fodder is high and scarce. The loss to the farmers in this one item was immense. When we come to consider the quantity of cattle, fish, cheese, butter and other products which the people of the island had been preparing to ship and place upon the market, but which they were compelled to hold over, we can form some idea of their loss. Our farmers not only lost the winter prices, which are the best, but the people who would naturally look to Prince Edward Island for the supply of these products will seek other markets where they can always depend upon getting a supply. Then take the loss occasioned to people travelling. I have known cases this year where people travelled from Halifax to Charlottetown and were put to an extra cost of $35 or $40 caused by waiting until communication was opened. This position is certainly intolerable and ruinous to the advancement of the Island. The population of Prince Edward Island fell off, as shown by the last census, some eight or ten thousand in the course of ten years, and no doubt this falling off is due to the uncertainty of communication between the island and the mainland and the disadvantages of establishing businesses resulting thereby. I think that the population would largely increase if we had regular steam communication between the island and the mainland. That would lead to the establishment of industries of various kinds and our population would increase to some 300,000 or 400,000. I wish to state another illustration as to the disadvantage in marketing our products. Take for instance, the article of potatoes. According to the navigation and trade reports, the average price in Ontario is 65·2 cents; Nova Scotia, 52·5 cents; Manitoba, 47·1; New Brunswick 46·1; Quebec, 45; and Prince Edward Island, 26·5. In other words Prince Edward Island got less than one-half of the Ontario price and Nova Scotia price and about one-half the price in Manitoba and New Brunswick and Quebec. When we take into consideration the fact that there are upwards

of 2,000,000 bushels of potatoes for export from the island during the season, we can realize the loss to the people through not being able to market their potatoes at the time when the best prices are prevailing. The loss under this one head would be over $300,000 or $400,000. I might go on and point out the great disadvantage we are under through having three short hauls. First the haul over the Prince Edward Island Railway, then the haul across the ferry and the haul on the Intercolonial Railway, for which we have to pay three separate rates. That brings out freight rates up to some 30 or 40 per cent higher than they would be if we had a continuous haul the same distance on the Intercolonial Railway. There was a resolution upon this situation forwarded the government, and I trust the government will look into this matter and see if we cannot get the equivalent of a continuous rail haul and a through rate, but shall not deal further with that phase of the situation now. What we require is an immediate solution of the present difficulty. How is that to be brought about ? As I have pointed out for the last two or three years we must place boats at each end of the island. That is to say, we must have a boat on the western route and also one on the eastern route. I have been urging, and so have others, the necessity of having this for years, but though we have had several futile attempts made to have this route properly tested and established, there has evidently been no practical desire on the part of the government to carry that out. I would ask that the hon. minister would place at the earliest opportunity one of those boats on the western and one on the eastern route, because the conditions that lock up the steamers, as they have been the past two months, on the eastern route will open the western route. We have been trying the Pictou-Georgetown route the last thirty years, and we may go on trying the next thirty years and the result will be the same. Some winters we will get a very fair service and other winters the whole trade of the island will be paralyzed. In Pictou harbour there is an island about seven or eight miles out from the town, lying east and west some four or five miles. The consequence is, when we have the prevailing winter winds from northeast and northwest, the ice blocks down in this bay and forms a barrier through which the boats cannot pass. But the east and northwest winds which block up Pictou harbour, will clear the harbour of Summerside or the straits between Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse and allow a boat to move about there. The distance between Summerside and Cape Tormentine is only fifteen miles, and while we had a winter boat on there for one winter, the winter of 1902, it did very excellent service. I would just like to put this on record so that the minister may compare it with the work the steamers have done other years. The 'Stanley' made her first trip on the 3rd January, 1902. In twenty-five working days for January she made sixteen round trips and two half trips. In twenty-four working days for February she made ten round trips and five half trips. Twenty-six working days for March she made twenty-one trips and four half trips.

In a total of seventy-five working days, she made forty-seven round trips and eleven half-trips. That is, she made 105 half-trips, or the kind of trip usually made by the other steamer during winter on the Pictou-Georgetown line, or an average of nearly one and a-half trips per day during the whole seventy-five working days. Surely the record of this boat will warrant the department in placing one of the winter boats on that service. And, if there are times when, owing to the weather conditions she cannot make the trip, in all likelihood, there will be a chance for the boats to run on the other route. Now, what is the next thing that is required? The next thing required is a third winter steamer. We need a third steamer because the trade of the island has increased so greatly that the two steamers have not sufficient capacity to carry that trade, especially with the interrupted trips we have had and are likely to have and consequent accumulation of freight. I think there is unanimity in all parts of the island as to the necessity of the third winter steamer, and a more powerful steamer than either of those we now have, and the placing of one of the boats on the western route. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) I believe, the other night said that we had the 'Stanley' and the 'Minto' and that they were powerful boats. And some hon. members seemed to think he had gone as far as he could in the direction of giving us a good service. But the 'Minto' is a vessel of only 2,400 horse-power, and was built in 1899. The 'Stanley' is of 2,000 horse-power and was built in 1887. These boats cannot meet the conditions of the route. I want to point out that there are other boats in existence that show us what can be done in that way of winter navigation. There are the steamers 'Ignace' and 'Marie' that ply on the straits of Mackinaw at the junction of Lake Michigan and Lake Huron. These boats are very much more powerful than the 'Stanley' or the 'Minto.' It stands to reason that if you construct your boat with greater power of resistance, and put in her engines of high motive power, you can go through a larger pack of ice than with a less durable or less powerful boat. This is shown by the experience of these two boats and also by that of the 'Ermaak' built after the pattern of these boats. I understand that these boats are able to contend with ice of a thickness of twenty feet. I have here

a description of these boats that are used in the straits of Mackinaw, and it is as follows :—

The boat is 440 feet in length, the extreme width being 66 feet with hull 50 feet. She is 10,000 horse-power, 8,000 aft and 2,000 forward. There are three screws, two at the stern and one in front of the bow. The latter bores through the ice literally churning it to pieces, while propelled with irresistible force by the propeller behind. The steel shaft on the front screw is of solid steel, two feet thick in diameter, and will bore through ice from one to forty feet in length or depth. This steamer cost $600,000, and was built by the Detroit Michigan Building Company. The Strait of Mackinac is 16 miles wide and the steamer has not missed a single trip in ten years. Her deck is equipped with four tracks and she carries a train of cars across from track to track, on either side of the strait.

The 'Stanley' draws upward of 19½ feet and the 'Minto' 20½ feet. There is ample water both at Summerside and at Pictou for a vessel of that draft. So, I must contend, and urge upon the serious attention of the House, that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the government of which he is a member, have not used every effective means at their disposal to overcome the difficulties of the situation.

Now, I have pointed out to the government the necessity of immediate action to relieve us of difficulties under which we are suffering and have shown that we must have boats placed on the eastern and western route simultaneously, and we must have a third and more powerful winter boat. But possibly occasions might arise when it would be impossible for any boat to fulfil the terms requiring continuous steam communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. In view of that fact I would urge upon the government the advisability of building a tunnel connecting Prince Edward Island and the mainland. And I think I can put before the House a very good case in favour of the construction of that tunnel. The work will cost, possibly $10,000,000 or $12,000,000. It would be a good investment for the country, for it would absolutely overcome the difficulties of the situation and would cost for interest no more than it would cost to maintain the present service, and give us the additional steamship and terminal facilities needed for an improved and efficient service. I have just stated that the people of the island were practically agreed on this question of communication with the mainland. A mass meeting was called in Charlottetown a few days ago, with representative delegates from all parts of the island, and that meeting passed the following resolution :—

Whereas, this province of Prince Edward Island entered the Canadian federation under these explicit terms as to communication 'efficient steam service for the conveyance of mails and passengers to be established and maintained between the island and the Dominion, winter and summer, thus placing the island in continuous communication with the Intercolonial Railway and the railway system of the Dominion.'

And whereas these terms have not been fulfilled, to the great hardship of the people and detriment of the province.

And whereas a tunnel under the straits from Carleton Head Cove to Money Point, as already surveyed and reported on, by Sir Douglas Fox, is a possible impletion of said terms of confederation.

Therefore resolved that this meeting of the people of Prince Edward Island in general convention assembled do hereby call upon the federal government to fulfil the said terms of the union forthwith by causing such tunnel to be constructed at the earliest possible moment.

And further resolved that pending the construction of such tunnel we demand the daily communication by navigation by the construction and operation of a third powerful steamer of the most approved ice-breaking type, and that one of the steamers be used on the western route in winter.

Resolved that the provincial government be, and is hereby requested to urge incessantly on the federal government the absolute necessity of impleting the terms of confederation and further

Resolved that our claims for compensation for the non-fulfilment of such terms be yearly served upon the federal authorities.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Has the government of Prince Edward Island put in that demand?

Mr. LEFURGEY. I believe it has been forwarded and I have no doubt the Dominion government have it in their possession. If not, I regard this as service upon them in that respect. It has been said by hon. members on the other side of the House, and, possibly, by members on this side, that the successive Dominion administrations have treated Prince Edward Island in a generous manner and have carried out fully the terms of Union. We had a reference in this House the other night to the allowance of $30,000 made to Prince Edward Island some years ago to compensate in some manner for the non-fulfilment of the terms of Union. If the Speaker will permit me to refer to a past debate, I would like to read the words of the hon. the Minister of Finance, because I cannot let them pass unchallenged. He said :—

Any argument based upon the general view that we should improve transportation facilities in any part of Canada would be deserving of our consideration and attention ; and if, owing to the isolated condition of the island, we find it necessary to do something more in order to improve her communications by all means let us try and do it, and any reasonable argument to that end may well be brought before the House. But since my hon. friend put it entirely on the ground of a contract, I wish to say that no such contract exists which has not been fulfilled to the letter. Every contract made with the people of Prince Edward

Island has been fulfilled. If there be any doubt upon the point, you have only to look to the statute of several years ago, when in consequence of the difference of opinion said to exist, an allowance was made, the amount of which, it was distinctly declared in that statute, was to be in full and final settlement of the terms of union.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish to put in an emphatic and absolute denial that that was the intention in placing to the credit of Prince Edward Island on that occasion $30,000 a year in perpetuity. The idea of bartering the terms of confederation, one of the most sacred terms under which we entered confederation—that communication should be guaranteed to the island winter and summer—the idea of bartering that for a mess of pottage, of bartering it for $30,000 a year; why it is all out of reason to comprehend. I venture to assert that the loss resulting privately to interests in Prince Edward Island this last winter will amount to hundreds of thousands of dollars besides the almost incalculable loss that will result from loss of business in future. Now, on that point I want to read the Order in Council passed at that time:

From and after the 1st day of July, 1901, there should be paid to the province of Prince Edward Island, in addition to all sums now authorized by law, an annual allowance of $30,000, which allowance should become payable and be paid to the said province half-yearly on the 1st days of July and January in each and every year, beginning with the said 1st day of July, 1901. Such allowance to be paid and accepted in full settlement of all claims of the said province against the Dominion of Canada on account of alleged nonfulfilment of the terms of union between the Dominion and the said province as respects the maintenance of efficient steam communication between the island and mainland.

Well, that is certainly 'all claims' for non-fulfilment of the terms. But we were not settling the non-fulfilment of the terms in perpetuity, we were settling the non-fulfilment of the terms up to 1901. At that time I said to the minister:

I would ask the minister if this $30,000 is given to compensate the island for non-fulfilment of the terms of union, and up to what date?

Sir Louis Davies, who was then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, answered:

Up to the present date, all claims of whatever nature up to the present time, based on the nonfulfilment of the terms of union.

Now, Sir Louis Davies was the representative of our own province, and in reply to this question to the Minister of Finance he acknowledged that it was a settlement for claims of all kinds up to that time. The Prime Minister upon that occasion said, in answer to a question of Mr. Haggart:

That is not the ground we take. The only ground we take is, that the government of Canada entered into a solemn compact with Prince Edward Island in 1873, and for many years did not fulfil that compact. That is the only question, and I will appeal to any man in this House, when he reads the contract, to say whether the government of Canada was not entirely in fault.

Now, the government of Canada was in fault up to that time, and although I admit that the government of Canada has endeavoured in some measure to better the terms, we certainly have not yet succeeded in getting the terms of confederation fulfilled at the present time; and until we do succeed in getting the continuous communication which is possible for this government to give to the people of Prince Edward Island, we shall continue to inflict ourselves upon this House upon all suitable occasions. The Prime Minister quoted the wording of the contract:

The Dominion government shall assume and defray all the charges for the following services, namely:

Efficient steam service for the conveyance of mails and passengers, to be established and maintained between the island and the mainland of the Dominion, winter and summer, thus placing the island in continuous communication with the Intercolonial Railway and the railway system of the Dominion.

And then he said:

That is not the interpretation which my hon. friend from South Lanark gave a moment ago to this contract. It is a direct, binding and solemn undertaking that the government of Canada will maintain continuous communication between Prince Edward Island and the Intercolonial Railway. There is no provision there that the Dominion of Canada would try to do it; there is no suggestion that there might be too much ice in certain seasons.

That is a solemn compact which the leader of this House acknowledged that the Dominion government was bound to fulfil. In the debate on that occasion I also put myself on record by saying:

I have no objection to the vote of $30,000 a year being given to Prince Edward Island, but I do object, Mr. Speaker, to the agreement that this is adequate to remunerate the island for the losses to which it has been subjected, especially during the first fifteen years after we came into confederation. The hon. members of this House must take into consideration that we are an agricultural country, and that our products must be marketed within six weeks after the crop is harvested. After that the freights are always high, nearly double the summer or spring rates; and not only that, but our products are put upon the market at a time when, being rushed forward, our markets are glutted, and the farmers and merchants do not realize within twenty-five or thirty per cent of the prices they would obtain if communication were kept up for a month or two later. Now, taking these things into consideration, in estimating the loss during the twenty-five years, up to the time the 'Minto' was put on, it will be seen that $1,000,000 will not in any degree compensate Prince Edward Island for all the disadvantage she laboured under for all these years; in fact, it seems to me a very small sum indeed compared with

the losses that the island has suffered. I wish to place myself on record as dissenting from the view of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the agreement of the local government of Prince Edward Island in accepting $30,000 per annum as full recompense for all the losses which the island has suffered through the failure of the Dominion to carry out the terms of the confederation.

Now, I think, Mr. Speaker, I have placed before this House clear proof that the Minister of Finance was stating the case a little too broadly in interpreting that settlement, when he said this was a full and final settlement of all the claims which we had under the terms of union. Well, I question whether this House could cancel in such a manner that solemn obligation that was entered into without going to the imperial parliament. Why, Sir, in the case of the island's representation in this House, while every possible evidence outside of the exact phraseology of the clause every plausible construction, showed that Prince Edward Island was given six members in perpetuity to represent her in the federal House, this House would not go outside the terms of the bond, and on that occasion I believe that the representation which we were justly entitled to was filched from us. I trust we will not be called upon to fight for another sacred obligation agreed to when Prince Edward Island entered this confederation. Coming now to a consideration when the Postmaster General was speaking a few nights ago on the estimates, he said :

Can the hon. gentleman say offhand what the cost of the tunnel would be ? I believe there have been estimates.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot refer to a previous debate.

Mr. LEFURGEY. With your permission, I would read a line or two. He said :

He said that the island had with business enterprise contributed towards the cost of the Hillsboro' bridge. Perhaps the island would be prepared to join with the Dominion in a like spirit and in contributing in the same proportion towards the construction of a tunnel. If so, we would be approaching the subject in a practical way.

He also stated that the tunnel would be a question of cost. Now, I must point out to this House that the hon. Postmaster General in making a suggestion of that kind made a suggestion which was certainly a far-reaching one, and one that was not made in any spirit of fairness towards the people of Prince Edward Island. From 1865 to 1873 one of the strongest grounds against the union was the fact that Prince Edward Island occupied a unique position on account of her isolated situation. She would be called on to contribute her share towards public works, Intercolonial Railway, canals and Canadian Pacific Railway without deriving the same amount of benefit therefrom as the other provinces. This was the contention of the representatives from Prince Edward Island at the time of the final conference, held prior to the admittance of the island into the union. This contention was recognized as correct by Sir J. A. Macdonald and his government, and a clause was inserted in the terms of union with regard to Prince Edward Island which met and entirely covered the case. In consideration of the works contemplated at that time an allowance was made :

That in consideration of the large expenditure authorized by the parliament of Canada for the construction of railroads and canals, and in view of the possibility of a re-adjustment of the financial agreements between Canada and the several provinces now embraced in the Dominion, as well as the isolated and exceptional condition of Prince Edward Island, that colony shall, on entering the union, be entitled to incur a debt equal to $50 per head of the population as shown by the census returns of 1871, that is to say $4,701,050.

On the Intercolonial Railway twenty millions were to be expended, of which $15,500,000 had been expended at the time of confederation, leaving $4,500,000 to be expended.

The debt of Canada on June 30, 1873, was	$129,743,432
C.P.R. authorized (unexpended).	30,000,000
I.C.R. authorized (unexpended).	4,552,148
Canals, authorized (unexpended)	8,933,333
	$173,228,914

Under the basis of population the debt per head was $49.40. Prince Edward Island's assumed debt was $4,701,050, equal to $50 per head of the population of 1871, viz.: 94,021. This was the assumed debt. The actual debt of the island on June 30, '73, was $754,559, not including railway expenditure. The railroad expenditure was $3,153,672 for which we paid.

Actual debt of Prince Edward Island, June 30, 1873, not including railroad expenditure..	$ 754,559
Railway expenditure.....	3,153,672
Amount withdrawn by provincial government in 1888..	200,000
Balance remaining	582,818
	$ 4,701,050

So that out of that debt of $50 per head to put her in the same position as the other provinces she was charged every dollar expended in the construction of her own railway. Now, as stated, there were only three large public works provided for at that time and taken into consideration, viz.: the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Intercolonial Railway and the improving of the canals. Since the union enormous amounts have been expended on these works and every year large appropriations are being expended on them.

The Statistical Year-book for 1903 on Public Works gives the expenditure on railways and canals and other public works

since 1873 as $253,356,496. Of this amount up to two or three years ago we got the Cape Traverse branch and we have since got the Murray Harbour branch and the Hillsboro' bridge in Prince Edward Island. There is a large amount of this that we were fairly entitled to, as up to a few years ago being one-fortieth part of the population of the Dominion of Canada we were entitled to one-fortieth of the expenditure of this public money. We believe that other parts of the Dominion should be built up, and I am only giving you these figures to show that the idea of some of our friends from Ontario and from other provinces that Prince Edward Island is all the time grumbling when she is getting more than her share is not borne out by the facts of the case. You will remember that when British Columbia came into confederation, one of the pledges given was that the Canadian Pacific Railway would be built. Hon. members of this House will remember that when this great work was being put forward by the Conservative party they were told that the expenditure which was authorized would not pay for the axle grease. Yet it was one of the terms under which British Columbia came into the confederation, Sir John Macdonald, assisted to some extent by the members on the other side, went forward and carried out that contract. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) wants us to appeal on justice and not upon the principle of exacting the letter of the bond. We will be perfectly willing to appeal on any ground which will get the ear of the Minister of Finance and the members of the government, and so we will appeal to them on the ground of justice. We want the terms of confederation carried out in regard to Prince Edward Island, as the terms of confederation were carried out in regard to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. As regards the works done in other provinces outside Prince Edward Island we could carry the comparison forward logically and charge up the losses that we had on the Intercolonial Railway in the matter of interest and deficits, we could do the same thing in regard to canals and we could do the same thing in regard to moneys and aids to the Canadian Pacific Railway. If we did this we would find that the losses would be somewhere in the neighbourhood of $300,000,000. For that we have to bear our proportion of upwards of $6,000,000. I am not giving these figures in any complaining way at all; I simply want to put the position of Prince Edward Island fairly before the House so that the House may mete out justice to us.

I want to present another situation in regard to Prince Edward Island. I want to point out what we receive yearly and what we are contributing yearly to the coffers of the Dominion. We are receiving under the terms under which we came into confederation the following amounts:

Interest on debt of island assumed by Dominion at confederation viz. : on.		$ 17,880
Subsidy to province..	$181,982	
Added on account of non-fulfilment of terms in 1902	30,000	
		211,982
Interest on amount paid by Dominion government for proprietary estates viz. on $747,971 at 3 per cent..		23,439
Cost of Prince Edward Island Railway to June, 1904..	$6,128,116	
Amount in estimates to complete M.H.B. & H. bridge..	357,000	
	$6,485,116	
Proportion, H. bridge.. ..	400,000	
Interest on balance at 3 per cent	$6,085,116	182,553
Paid to Indians		1,850
Postal expenditure..	$21,612	
" subsidy to P.E.I.R..	18,710	
		40,322
Judge's salary..	$19,400	
Lieut. Governor's salary..	7,000	
		26,400
Maintenance of 'Stanley' and 'Minto' half of $95,000		47,500
Lighthouse and coast service..		25,603
Fisheries..		7,320
Half cost of telegraph to mainland.. ..		3,500
Excise..		2,241
Weights and Measures..		1,784
Food inspection..		157
Gas inspection..		409
Electric light inspection		34
Quarantine..		1,565
Collecting revenue customs..		18,532
Ice boat service..		8,912
Public buildings..		18,924
Harbours and rivers....		60,803
		$691,870

This gives a total expenditure of $691,870 that may be fairly said to be the sum expended by the government in Prince Edward Island last year. Nova Scotia and New Brunswick should properly bear a certain portion of the service of the 'Stanley' and 'Minto,' because they get a proportionate benefit from that service, and so I have credited one half their service to Prince Edward Island. In like manner I credit the island with the $400,000 paid by the province on account of the Hillsboro' bridge. The total revenue of the Dominion last year was $70,669,817, and taking our population as one fiftieth the total of the population of the Dominion we would be entitled to an expenditure in Prince Edward Island of $1,413,396. Take from that amount the actual expenditure by the Dominion in Prince Edward Island of $691,870, and there is a balance in our favour of $721,526. In other words, we contribute to the revenues of this Dominion $721,526 more than they pay out to us ; and yet we have hon. gentlemen getting up in this House and telling us that Prince Edward Island was an improvident bargain, that we are getting more than our share, and notwithstanding that the representatives from that province are constantly complaining. It may be possible that I have omitted from

the expenditure in Prince Edward Island a few trifling items, but however that may be, we do not get more than $750,000 all told from the Dominion treasury, so that we are contributing as much again as we receive. As a matter of fact, Prince Edward Island, because of her peculiar conditions, contributes more to the revenue of the Dominion in proportion than do the other provinces, in the fact that not being a manufacturing community we have to import all the manufactures we consume, and so we naturally pay a larger proportion of the revenue than do the other provinces.

I wish now to bring to the attention of the government and the House some little history of the construction of a tunnel between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. This is not a new question. It was first brought to the attention of this parliament by Senator Howlan in 1885 and afterwards a deputation from the provincial government was sent to interview the imperial authorities with reference to the matter. Although the imperial authorities said at the time that they could not intervene, yet under date of March 30th, 1886, Lord Granville, writing to Lord Lansdowne, then Governor General, made this statement in his communication :

> The establishment of constant and speedy communication by rail would be a great advantage both to the province and to the Dominion, and I should suppose that the development of the traffic on the island railroads and of the capabilities of the province generally, would produce a large direct and indirect return on the expenditure.
>
> It would reflect great credit on the Dominion government, if, after connecting British Columbia with the eastern provinces by the Canadian Pacific Railway it should now be able to complete its system of railway communication by an extension to Prince Edward Island.

Not only have we this recommendation of the tunnel scheme from the imperial authorities, but we have also the opinion of the Prime Minister of Canada himself, who, writing to Mr. Higgs, of Charlottetown, made this statement :

> Dear Sir,—I have your favour of February 2nd. I hardly would have thought an expression of opinion as to the construction of a tunnel to connect the island with the mainland, necessary from me. Every man who has given any attention to the condition of things and to the necessities involved by the entering of the island into confederation, must admit that such a tunnel must be constructed if the thing is reasonably practicable. The first requisite is to have an accurate survey and reliable estimates. I am only sorry that these were not obtained long ago.
>
> WILFRID LAURIER.

That was written by the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier, now Prime Minister of Canada. We have no reason to believe that the right hon. gentleman is in any different frame of mind to-day with regard to the carrying out of the terms of the union or as to the building of a tunnel than he was at that time. I am in hopes that this afternoon the Prime Minister will get up in his place and express himself in no uncertain language in favour of the tunnel scheme. I may say that the Dominion government of that day were, to some extent, committed to the building of this tunnel, and I believe that if it had been continuously pressed on their attention we would now have had the tunnel in process of completion. However, it is never too late to mend, and we will now make a fresh start. In 1886 surveys for the tunnel were made and different plans were brought forward, one with reference to a subway, which was afterwards abandoned, because the tunnel was found to be most feasible. Surveys for a tunnel across the straits were made as late as 1890, and borings were taken. The then government obtained the report of Sir Douglas Fox as to the estimate of the cost and the feasibility of building a tunnel, and this report will be found in the Sessional Papers of the House of Commons for 1894. For the benefit of those hon. members who are not familiar with the subject, I shall read a few passages from the report of Sir Douglas Fox :

> Mr. Palmer reports that having reference to the opinion of Mr. Bain as to the strata under the bed of the sea on the line of the tunnel, the proposed location under the narrowest portions of the straits between Money Point in New Brunswick and Carleton Point in Prince Edward Island is well selected from both a constructive and a traffic point of view.

Take into consideration, Mr. Speaker, that this report was made in 1891, and that we have had from engineers of the greatest repute in Canada, the United States and England expressions of opinion that this tunnel was absolutely feasible, that the conditions for tunnelling under the Straits of Northumberland were more favourable than anywhere else where tunnels had been constructed in the world, and that this report of Sir Douglas Fox was made after a thorough investigation of the reasonableness and feasibility of the tunnel. So that the stipulations in the right hon. minister's letter of some years ago have been amply met. The report goes on to say :—

> The greatest depth of water is shown as being 96 feet at high water, with a rise of tides of six feet at springs and three feet at neaps, and the speed of the current is not exceeding three knots, with two hours of slack water at each tide.
>
> The distance from shore to shore is given as about 13,200 lineal yards, or say from shaft to shaft, 13,500 lineal yards, exclusive of the land approaches on either side, of which about 2,000 lineal yards would be in the tunnel.

I may say that the length of the tunnel in nautical miles would be about 7·47 miles. But this has been eclipsed by three or four other tunnels, some a long time in oper-

ation, and others of more recent construction. The St. Gothard tunnel is 9½ miles; Mt. Cenis, 7 1-8 miles; the Severn, 5 miles, built below a rapidly-flowing tidal estuary, and one of the greatest and most difficult engineering feats in the world; the Mersey, 4½ miles; and the Simplon, between France and Switzerland, which was completed on the 24th of February last, 12½ miles long. This tunnel was built in two twin passages each 16½ feet wide, and separated by a distance of 55·7 feet between their axes. The cost of the twin tunnels was $15,700,000, and the engineering difficulties met with were, I believe, unparalleled in the history of tunnel construction. The reports of Sir William Dawson, Sir Douglas Fox, Mr. Bain and Mr. Palmer go to show that the strata through which the tunnel from Prince Edward Island to the mainland would pass would be one of the easiest for tunnel construction that could possibly be found. In another part of the report Sir Douglas Fox says :—

It is my duty to state that though convinced of the accuracy of what I now present, a more minute and detailed geological investigation should be made before active engineering operations are begun.

I have also before me a copy of a letter addressed on January 9th, 1891, to the Hon. G. W. Howlan, by Sir William Dawson, of McGill University, Montreal, which runs as follows :

I beg to say that I have read and examined the report and section prepared by Mr. Bain, with reference to the proposed tunnel from Carleton Head to Cape Jourmain, which you were kind enough to show me, and that from my knowledge of the geological structure of the locality, I have no hesitation in stating that I believe the report and section fairly represent the character of the beds to be penetrated by the proposed tunnel, and that these will not present any serious difficulty, the ground being in fact as favourable as could be desired for such a work.

He recommended that before the work should be proceeded with, certain surveys and borings should be made. In this part of the report he says :-

Borings similar to those taken at Sarnia tunnel, viz., from a vessel or platform through 6-inch wrought iron pipes, so as to ensure cores of sufficient size and undamaged being brought to the surface, should be laid at intervals of, say not more than 500 yards, right across the straits and down to the carboniferous bed rock, but this line of borings should be at some distance, say 300 yards from the centre line of the tunnel. This work should be carried out in the presence of an experienced engineer who should carefully note the sample taken.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the purpose for which I bring this matter before the House at this time is that we may have the recommendation of Sir Douglas Fox carried out: that a complete survey with borings be made under a competent engineer and an estimated cost obtained. And for that proposal I ask that a sum sufficient for this work be placed in this year's estimates. I think these reports demonstrate the absolute feasibilty of a tunnel. This report was made ten years ago. Since that time immense improvements have been made, greatly cheapening the cost of tunnelling, so that while Sir Douglas Fox's estimate of the cost of a 16½-foot funnel was $9,800,000 and of an 18-foot tunnel rim, $11,000,000, I have no hesitation in expressing the belief that to-day an 18-foot tunnel, capable of taking the largest cars, could be constructed for $10,000,000. It may be said that this would be an unwarranted sum of money, and that Prince Edward Island is to small a province to have such an expenditure as that. But I want to point out that the Dominion of Canada is under an obligation to give us continuous steam communication winter and summer, and that the annual cost of keeping up the method at present provided for this purpose, and such as it will be absolutely necessary to further provide, is more than would pay the interest on any possible cost of the tunnel. I have made a statement of the comparative cost of keeping up the present service and the cost of the service which this government would have to put in operation if they intend to carry out the terms of Union.

Subsidies to summer steamers..		$ 12,500
Loss on Prince Edward Island Railway		101,305
Maintenance of SS. 'Stanley' and 'Minto' as per minister's statement.. ..		95,000
Cost of steamer 'Stanley' ..	$145,000	
Cost of steamer 'Minto'.. ..	190,000	
Insurance on cost at 10 per cent	335,000	33,500
Depreciation and interest in value at 10 per cent..		33,500
New boat..	$500,000	
Insurance at 10 per cent..		50,000
Maintenance..		50,000
Depreciation and interest at 10 per cent		50,000
Ice boat service, 1903..		8,912
Telegraph service..		7,000
If you add pier at Carleton Point..	$1,250,000	
Additions at Tormentine..	1,000	
Interest thereon at 3 per cent	1,350,000	40,500
		482,217

All these figures may not be strictly accurate, but they are substantially correct and may be used as a basis to show that cost of tunnel even of ten or fifteen millions might well be a good investment. Then there would be an increase in the business of Prince Edward Island and an increase in the value of land of $13,000,000 to $15,000,000, and an increased business on the Intercolonial which could be safely estimated at $100,000, as almost everything would go by the tunnel if we had reasonable rates. The tunnel could be built for ten million dollars, possibly twelve million dollars. Ten million dollars at three per cent would mean an annual interest outlay of $300,000, whereas the cost of keeping up the service by the winter

boats—and a service we could not always depend upon, even with such expensive boats as we ask the government to build—would be $482,217. I would suggest that the government is confronted with this situation—either the keeping up of a service with such boats as I pointed out or the construction of a tunnel. I would ask the right hon. the First Minister and his colleagues to take this into their serious consideration. We certainly may in all fairness ask that an immediate investigation be instituted into the feasibility and desirabilty of constructing a tunnel between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.) The question now before you, Mr. Speaker, was discussed in this House a few days ago, and it has been taken up again to-day by the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Lefurgey). The question of communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland is the most important question that can engage the attention of the representatives from the island province, and is, I think, worthy, perhaps, of a little more consideration than has yet been given it by the government, the parliament, and the people of Canada. As I said a few evenings ago, when this matter received some consideration in Committee of the Whole, the question is not new. In pre-confederation days, when the subject of union with the other provinces of the Dominion was being discussed in Prince Edward Island, there was no argument addressed to the people of that province to induce them to enter the confederation which appealed to them so strongly as this—that if they entered confederation their isolation would be at an end, the difficulties and disadvantages of their insular position would be a thing of the past, and it would be practicable, to all intents and purposes, to unite Prince Edward Island physically as well as constitutionally to the other provinces of the Dominion. So strongly did our people feel upon that point that the delegates to the conference which arranged the terms of union were specially instructed upon it. And, in accordance with these instructions from the people of Prince Edward Island and in accordance with the wants and requirements of the province, this clause was inserted in the terms of union :—

That the Dominion government shall assume and defray all charges, or for the following services :—

And one of these services was :—

Efficient steam service for the conveyance of mails and passengers to be established and maintained between the island and the mainland of the Dominion, winter and summer, thus placing the island in continuous communication with the Intercolonial Railway and the railway system of the Dominion.

Now, we think that 'efficient communication should mean communication adequate for the purposes for which it was employed, and that 'continuous communication' would surely mean communication at least once a day, unless prevented by some extraordinary or unforeseen act of Providence which might interrupt the communication for a few days and which might be called, I supposed, vis major. We would not object to an interruption of that kind. But, when the interruption lasts for weeks and months at a time, as has frequently been the case since these terms were agreed upon and ratified, we certainly feel that this is not carrying out the terms of union. Now, we may be told—and I think the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) takes that position—that this is not the best ground upon which to put our case. That may be. I think that hon. gentleman holds the view that we should rest our case upon these facts :—That there is considerable improvement and development going on all over the world, and particularly in Canada, in every branch of activity including systems of communication, and, as Prince Edward Island is an integral part of this Dominion, it should share in that development at least to a reasonable extent, and so the means of communication should be as perfect as our knowledge and the application of science has made practicable. That, of course, we believe to be a good ground upon which to base our case. But we also think that it might be unwise to overlook entirely the constitutional aspect of the question. And for this view of the case, I think I have fairly good authority—that of the Prime Minister himself. I find that in speaking upon this question in 1901, when the question of communication was under consideration by this parliament, in reply to some objections raised by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) and by Mr. Clancy, the member for Bothwell, the Prime Minister made use of this language :—

With due reference to my hon. friend, I do not see where the difference lies between giving $1,000,000 and giving the interest on $1,000,000. But, I come to the point made by my hon. friend from South Lanark. He says the contract is not at all as represented by my hon. friend beside me (Sir Louis Davies)—that the contract made with Prince Edward Island in 1873 was other than to keep up efficient steam communication, that it was not a direct bargain, but that it was qualified with the condition that we were to do the best we could, and if we found the forces of nature too strong for us, we were not to be responsible. That is not the wording of the contract. This is it, in so many words :

'The Dominion government shall assume and defray all the charges for the following services, namely: efficient steam service for the conveyance of mails and passengers, to be established and maintained between the island and the mainland of the Dominion, winter and summer, thus placing the island in continuous communication with the Intercolonial Railway and railways of the Dominion.'

That is not the interpretation which my hon. friend from South Lanark gave a moment ago to this contract. It is a direct, binding and solemn understanding that the government of Canada will maintain continuous communication between Prince Edward Island and the Intercolonial Railway. There is no provision there that the Dominion of Canada would try to do it; there is no suggestion that there might be too much ice in certain seasons. It is true that it might be a case of force majeure. No one would complain if the service were interrupted for a day or two by an act of Providence, because that is a case of force majeure.

Now, not only is this the view expressed by the leader of the government a few years ago, but it is the view that the people of Prince Edward Island take of this matter. What is the condition of things this year? The interruption of our communication has lasted now practically for two months—some fifty days—continuously. For that length of time we have had no communication with the mainland other than by the small ice-boats which provided means of communication some fifty or seventy years ago. There is practically no improvement whatever as compared with that time. I am sure that no hon. gentleman in this House and no fair-minded man in this country, looking at the facts as they are to-day and the stipulation that was made when we entered confederation, will say that the terms of union have been carried out. You may tell me that this is an exceptional winter. And that is quite true—it is exceptional so far as the snow-fall in the maritime provinces is concerned. But, in my judgment and in the judgment of others, and as a matter of fact this winter is not greatly exceptional so far as frost and ice conditions are concerned. Now, if the ice breaking steamers that we have are not able to make their way across the Straits of Northumberland because there is a heavy fall of snow on the land, have we any reason to suppose that similar interruptions will not take place in the years that are to come, if some better means of communication are not provided? I hold that we have no reason to suppose that the conditions which we have this year, that the interruption of communication that we have this year, will not be repeated in some future years.

The steamers ought to be able to cross at least in fine and clear days, and they have not been able to do so this year. What means of communication have we this year? Simply the old method that was employed long before confederation, that is crossing with small boats. Let me describe that method so that hon. members of this House who have never seen it may have some knowledge of it, for no man who has not seen it and who has not crossed there can fully realize the difficulties and dangers connected with that navigation. These boats are about 15 to 18 feet in length. They have to be built light and small so that the passengers and crew can haul them up on the surface of the ice, and they have to be built large enough so that when they reach stretches of open water, which are very frequently met with in the ordinary course of crossing, they can carry a fair number of passengers and crew. Now the passengers and crew are strapped to these boats by leather thongs by which they can drag them along in the first place, and which in the second place would prevent them from being drowned if they accidentally fell into the water through some unseen opening in the ice, which is not unfrequent. If the passengers or crew should happen to make a mis-step or a miscalculation in getting into the boat preparatory to crossing one of these stretches of open water, or to make a mis-step in getting out when they come to an ice barrier, by means of these leather thongs they are prevented from falling into the water; and they use them also to haul the boats up on to the ice. They have to work their way across the straits through the broken ice, and sometimes through slush and snow from six to twelve inches deep, dragging these boats along with them. Any one can understand the danger and the exhaustive labour involved in the work of crossing. There is no possibility whatever of carrying any freight across in that way, and frequently parcels and heavy mail matter have to be left over. But that is not the only danger connected with this method of crossing. There is an ever present danger to life and limb. Only a few years ago a party of four or five boats left Cape Traverse and when they got half way across the straits a snowstorm came on completely shutting out their view of the land. All day they toiled in their endeavour to reach land, and when night came on they had to do the best they could to provide themselves with some shelter. They hauled the boats up on to the ice, and turning them over, huddled beneath them to shelter themselves from the pitiless storm during the night. The wind changed during the night and the weather turned very cold, and they had to break up one of the boats to make a small fire to prevent the weaker passengers from freezing to death. They had drifted a long distance out of their course, and the next day they had to work all day and only reached land after nightfall, thoroughly exhausted and worn out, so exhausted indeed that some of the passengers threw themselves down in the snow and were not able to walk to the farm houses a little distance off. Some of the stronger

members of the party reached the farm houses and gave the alarm, and searching parties were instituted as quickly as possible and went out to find those who had been left behind. They were all frozen more or less, and in the case of some of them toes and fingers had to be amputated. All suffered in health. Among the party was a member of parliament who represented King's county at that time, Dr. McIntyre, who suffered so much from exposure to the cold that he was ill for many weeks: Indeed they were all ill, and those who had not homes to go to had to be taken to the hospitals. One gentleman was attacked with pneumonia or rheumatic fever from the effects of which he has not yet recovered. A few years previous to that an almost similar experience occurred where the passengers were out all night and suffered dreadfully, so much indeed that a short time afterwards one of them died from the exposure—at least that was the common opinion at the time.

Now there is nothing to prevent a like occurrence from happening at any time, because the conditions of crossing there have been little improved. The only difference is that when the boats go out now they carry with them some water and provisions, and a compass, but these precautions were not taken on the occasions I have referred to. These are the conditions that prevail on this crossing, and a calamity of that kind may take place almost any day in the winter season. Now, Sir, no man can say that communication of that kind is in accordance with the agreement that Prince Edward Island made with the Dominion when she entered the confederation. It may be said that we ought to make some suggestions, and I think we should.

Now the first suggestion I would make in order to meet the requirements of the case would be to provide a more powerful ice-breaker than either of those we have at the present time. I do not know exactly what is the ice-breaking capacity of the 'Minto' and the 'Stanley,' but I do know that for a week or ten days, or perhaps a fortnight, they have been prevented from entering the harbour of Pictou by the ice barrier that has formed across the entrance to that harbour. I am informed by men who have crossed there recently that the ice is from three to four feet thick, that thickness has been sufficient to prevent those steamers from making the passage. From a telegram received to-day by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and which I have seen, the captain of the 'Stanley' reports that he broke about a mile of that barrier yesterday, and that he is working his way on to-day. That would seem to indicate that the ice-breaking capacity of these steamers is three or four feet, when the ice is packed. Now, Sir, those are the conditions ; we may expect to have ice of that thickness in ordinary winters, and there is a possibility, in fact a probability,

Mr. J. J. HUGHES.

that we could provide a steamer that could overcome an ice pack of the thickness of say six or seven feet. In all probability we would require a steamer of that capacity in ordinary winters to keep up uninterrupted communication with the mainland. I believe such a steamer could be built. If we are to believe the reports that we see in the 'Scientific American,' some of the European countries have steamers of that capacity, or even greater. From the information I have been able to obtain on this subject, I think that the conditions in the Straits of Mackinac, for instance, are not similar to the conditions we have in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Straits of Northumberland. According to my information, the ice in the Straits of Mackinac does not move very much, and when once a steamer has cut through a passage, and makes a trip every day, that passage remains open for the winter. But the ice in the Straits of Northumberland is constantly moving with the winds and current, it moves perhaps several miles a day. My information leads me to believe that the conditions of the ice in the Baltic sea and in the Gulf of Finland approach more nearly to the conditions we have in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Straits of Northumberland. I will read just a short paragraph contained in the 'Scientific American' describing what the 'Ermaak' is able to accomplish in the Baltic sea.

As the 'Ermaak' was built for polar enterprise, as well as for ice-breaking in the Baltic, she was designed to receive the very severe blows that locally strike her when among the enormous ice of the polar ocean, and ice pressures that may lift her clean out of the water, leaving her ice-borne.

Her bow engine, though successful in one-year old ice, has been removed, as the shape at the bow to admit the propeller was not suited to the requirements of the polar ice. Her speed through 24 inches of solid ice, with 6 to 12 inches of snow on top of it, is 9 knots an hour, and she can charge and demolish packs of ice 20 to 35 feet in thickness. In polar ice the speed has to be kept at about 2½ to 3½ knots an hour, as one is apt to lose control of the vessel in this enormous ice, and the local shocks become very severe when she is charging about at her own 'sweet will' among the palaeocrystic ice. She has proved to be of enormous use on her station on the Baltic coast of Russia, where she can negotiate any ice, and can safely bring out of danger all steamers that she goes to assist. In one short season she rescued and assisted shipping of over two millions sterling value and, in another winter she saved the Russian battleship 'General Admiral Aproxine' of £750,000 value.

With the 'Ermaak' in the Baltic there is no difficulty in Russia putting to sea her fleet, which usually winters at Cronstadt, as the 'Ermaak' could easily guide them to open water should necessity arise ; and there is nothing to prevent this vessel herself being made an armed cruiser.

If that be true, a vessel of that capacity, or of much less capacity would be

sufficient to overcome the difficulties of winter navigation in the straits of Northumberland. The other evening, when speaking upon this question, I suggested that the ice breaker might be used for another purpose, that she might be used for the assistance of commerce in the Hudson bay. I said then, and I repeat now, because there are some hon. gentlemen present who were not present then, that in all probability the Hudson bay route will in a few years be used for commercial purposes. The Great Northern Railway Company, I understand, is likely to build down to Fort Churchill. There is a very great probability that a large part of the traffic of the great Northwest will find its way to the markets of Europe over that route, and an ice breaker of that capacity could probably lengthen the season of navigation for one month—two weeks in spring and two weeks in autumn—and it would therefore be of very great value to the commerce of the country. If these countries of northern Europe, such as Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Russia, provide powerful ice breakers of the character I have described, it might and probably would pay the Dominion of Canada to provide such a vessel, which could be used for the navigation of the Northumberland straits during the winter season and leave there in sufficient time to be available for her work in Hudson bay. In midsummer, when she was not employed for commercial purposes, she could be employed for other purposes, such as surveying and that kind of work.

There is another way of overcoming this difficulty, and it is by means of a tunnel. A good many people smile when the question of tunnelling underneath the Northumberland straits is mentioned. Why should that be the case? The question of tunnelling under the Northumberland straits is not new at all. For many years this subject was discussed by the late Senator Howlan, and a very considerable amount of information was obtained about it. I think it was in the year 1891 that the matter was brought forcibly to the attention of the people of this country. It was not at that time considered a chimerical or Utopian idea by any means. If the language conveying the ideas held by leading public men of Canada, which I shall read, be a correct representation of their views, and if they meant what they said—and I am sure there is no gentleman in this House or in this country who will say that the men whom I am going to quote from would make a statement that they did not believe in—we must conclude that they regarded this project as one possible of accomplishment. Here is a letter written at that time by the then leader of the government, the late Rt. Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, in which he says :

> My dear Howlan,—In response to your pressing request with respect to the tunnel across the straits I desire to repeat that, under the present circumstances, the cabinet are not in a position to deal with the question. If, as I believe, the country will continue to give us its confidence, the ministry will, under my guidance, take the matter up without delay. I understand that Sir Douglas Fox is of the opinion the scheme is a feasible one. The chief thing still unknown is the cost of construction. I fully appreciate the nature and extent of the obligation incurred by the Dominion to maintain continuous communication between the island and the mainland. We have tried to carry this out by the 'Stanley,' but of course she cannot fight against the elements. So, if the cost comes within a reasonable amount, such as parliament feels itself justified in incurring, I shall be prepared to submit the question for their favourable consideration.
>
> (Sgd.) JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Here is a telegram that was sent by Sir Charles Tupper, who was then in the country, in response to a request, I think, that was sent to him by the Hon. Donald Ferguson, now Senator Ferguson :

> I regret deeply that it is impossible for me to go to the island as the 'Stanley' cannot cross, and I will not attempt the capes.

He knew something of the difficulties of crossing there, some of which I have described this evening.

> I have satisfied myself that the tunnel can be made for $6,000,000, and you may rely upon all the aid I can give to that important and necessary work.

Here is a letter from Hon. Mr. Laurier—as he was at that time—the present leader of the government, in reply to a letter which had been sent to him by the 'Guardian' newspaper of Charlottetown :

> My dear Sir,—I have your favour of the 2nd February instant. I hardly would have thought an expression of opinion as to the construction of a tunnel to connect the island of Prince Edward with the mainland should be required from me. Every man who has given any attention to the condition of things and the necessities involved by the entering of the island into confederation must admit that such a tunnel must be constructed if the thing is reasonably practicable. The first requisite is to have an accurate survey and reliable estimates. I am only sorry that these were not obtained long ago.

Now, then, have we not reason to bring forward the question of the tunnel for the consideration of parliament, for the consideration of the government and for the consideration of the Canadian people ? But there are other reasons. Since that date great improvements in tunnelling have been made, as well as in other things. Within a few months, I believe, the great Simplon tunnel will be open for traffic between Italy and Switzerland, a distance of about twelve and a half miles. I understand that at this moment the British government is undertaking the construction of a tunnel between the mainland and the Isle of Wight, the distance being about four miles, or about half the distance that would have to be

tunnelled under the Northumberland straits. The Isle of Wight is less than one-tenth the area of Prince Edward Island, its population is much less, and there is the further important fact that Great Britain is under no constitutional obligation to build a tunnel there. We have the further fact that there is no difficulty whatever in maintaining continuous communication winter and summer, daily and hourly, between the Isle of Wight and the mainland. And, Sir, considering all the obligations that are pressing on the people of Great Britain to-day, I presume that the motherland is not any better able to undertake the construction of a tunnel under the Solent than the Dominion of Canada would be to undertake the construction of the tunnel which we advocate under the straits of Northumberland. In view of what Great Britain is doing in respect to the Isle of Wight, it is not unreasonable that we should ask that this Dominion should connect its island province with the mainland by means of a tunnel. I shall not go into the question of the cost of this project further than to say that already very considerable investigation has been made in order to ascertain its cost and its feasibility.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the length of the Isle of Wight tunnel as compared with the length of the Prince Edward Island tunnel ?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. The tunnel to the Isle of Wight would be about four miles and the tunnel to Prince Edward Island about eight miles in length. In 1893 the government of Canada made provision to have this matter investigated, and Mr. Alfred W. Palmer, C.E., an associate of Sir Douglas Fox, bored ten holes to ascertain the geological strata and to obtain other data necessary to make an estimate of the cost. I shall read a few short extracts from that report. He says :

I beg to state that ten borings varying in depth from 60 to 184 feet by 8½ inches were sunk by means of a steam diamond drill, and the cores of the same were preserved in wooden boxes which are now in the hands of the government at the Geological Museum. The total length is 14,908 yards or nearly eight and a half statute miles.

The shores upon either coast are exceedingly well adapted for tunnel approaches and have a mean altitude of about 30 feet. They both fall back towards the interior to high water level, and the soil is of a red clayey nature.

If we consider the formation as proved by the boring to consist of equal parts of red sandstone and stiff red clay shale, the cover of 40 feet referred to would give a roof of impervious material of at least 20 feet.

The geological formation through which the proposed tunnel is located is what is known as the upper or permo-carboniferous, consisting of red sandstone and stiff red clay shales in approximately equal proportions, the latter being impervious to water.

The conditions under the straits are similar to those found in New Brunswick, and I have since 1890 been enabled to declare that this same formation which extends under the Northumberland straits is eminently suitable for the construction of a submarine tunnel. The formation across the straits appears to be thoroughly impervious to water, and cores of sandstone have shown a perfectly dry fracture.

In accordance with the information obtained from these borings, Sir Douglas Fox made an estimate for an 18-foot tunnel, and that estimate was between $10,000,000 and $11,000,000. The interest on that sum would, of course be a very considerable amount some $300,000 or $400,000 a year, but the people of the Dominion of Canada would not in reality be chargeable with all that, because from it we would have to deduct the cost of the present service, which is certainly inadequate, and which will certainly have to be improved. That service is now costing us, in round figures, $100,000 a year. There is the further consideration that if a tunnel were built to the island and there was close and continuous communication with the mainland all the year round, the greater part of our exports would go out in that way, and the traffic on the Prince Edward Island Railway and the Intercolonial Railway would be greatly increased. What the net profits on that traffic would be it is difficult to say, but they might be stated in a general way. That this traffic would greatly increase goes without saying, because under present conditions all our exports have to go out by water, and in consequence they are carried on the Prince Edward Island Railway but very short distances. The railway traverses the island from Tignish in the west to Souris and Georgetown in the east. The railway is in no place more than twenty miles from the nearest shipping point, and consequently the average haul on the railway for our export produce cannot be more than eight or ten miles. The farmer living near the shipping point will, of course, cart his produce there without putting it on the railway, while the farmer living nearer the railway will ship by railway, but the average haul at present is not, in my opinion, more than eight or ten miles. On the other hand, if our export produce were sent via the tunnel—and I think three-fourths of it would go in that way—the average haul on the Prince Edward Island Railway would be very greatly increased, and when it got to the mainland it would pass over to the Intercolonial Railway when destined to points on that railway. That portion of our produce which was destined for New York and Boston could go as far as St. John over the Intercolonial, and consequently the traffic on the Intercolonial Railway would be largely increased. I believe it would be a conservative estimate to say that the earnings of the Prince Edward Island and the Intercolonial Railway would be increased by $50,000 a year from this traffic if the tunnel were built. That would be $150,000 which might rea-

sonably be deducted from the interest that would have to be paid on the cost of the tunnel, which would leave about $200,000 which the people of Canada would have to pay over and above what they are now paying; and what would that amount to? About three cents per head of the population, not a very large sum. And if that $200,000 would be a large sum to the people of Canada to bear, the people of Prince Edward Island, because we have not continuous and efficient communication with the mainland, have to bear a much larger loss every year. I will endeavour to make that clear in a very few words. The province of Prince Edward Island is admirably adapted for the growth of potatoes. Perhaps there is no other part of North America that can produce potatoes in such abundance and sell them so cheaply. It is estimated, and I think the estimate is a conservative one, that we have for export every year, 1,500,000 bushels of potatoes. I know myself farmers who grow from 2,000 to 3,000 bushels of potatoes for export, and they would grow more if we had a profitable market for them. Now, our potatoes are not ripe and ready for shipment before the 15th of October. At that season of the year the farmers are very busy housing their potatoes and trying to do their fall ploughing, and there are only about six weeks to the 1st of December in which they can do their marketing. About the 1st of December navigation closes, so that during those six weeks their potatoes have to be rushed to the provincial markets and the markets of the New England States, and that large quantity of potatoes going forward in so short a time naturally depresses the price. I know something about this, because I am engaged in business. On some days, after the winds have been in a westerly direction for a week or so, and the vessels cannot proceed farther than the Strait of Canso, I have known as many as 50,000 bushels of potatoes from Prince Edward Island to enter the Halifax market. As that market is limited, the price naturally goes down. The farmers of Prince Edward Island get on the average about 20 cents a bushel less for their potatoes than the farmers of any other part of Canada. But say that the loss is even half that, namely, 10 cents a bushel: there is $150,000 of loss on our potato crop alone. In addition, there is this disadvantage, that during the month of December quite frequently the price in the United States advances, and we cannot take advantage of that advance to any great extent, because it is almost impossible to get vessels to enter the Gulf of St. Lawrence at that season of the year. Freights go up largely. Whereas we can charter vessels during the months of October and November to carry potatoes to the United States for from 12 cents to 15 cents a bushel, in the month of December, if we can get them at all, we have to pay from 18 cents to 20 cents a bushel, because at that season the vessels cannot get insurance in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the difficulties of navigation are very great. The result is that at that season we are shut out of the market. Again, in March and April, which are the best months for the sale of potatoes, we are shut out entirely; whereas, with the tunnel, we could send our potatoes in these months to the markets of the world. It is a conservative estimate that our loss on that article alone each year averages $150,000, and that on the other products of the farm our losses would amount to $50,000 more. Then there is a loss and a great disadvantage on our imports. Every merchant will understand well what I mean. The merchants of Prince Edward Island have to provide a large stock of goods during October and November to carry them over the winter months. They have to pay interest and insurance on them, and they cannot enjoy an advantage from the reduction of prices that may obtain during the winter months. A man doing business at Truro, Pictou, Halifax, St. John or any other place in the maritime provinces can order a car of flour in Ontario at any time during the winter, and in ten days he can have it in his warehouse.

Mr. HYMAN. Not this year.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. This is an exceptional winter. But we cannot do that in Prince Edward Island. There is a direct loss and a very considerable loss. I am safe in saying that the loss to the people of Prince Edward Island from not having continuous and efficient communication with the mainland winter and summer, such as a tunnel would provide, if it were found feasible and practicable, is at least $200,000 a year; and if it would be hard for the people of Canada as a whole to provide that money, how can you expect 100,000 people living on Prince Edward Island to bear that loss year after year? I know that assistance to the people of Prince Edward Island in that way would not be of any direct benefit to the people of Canada as a whole; but this surely will be admitted, that if you benefit one province of the Dominion, no matter where it is, its prosperity and development are shared to some extent by every other province.

While I am on this point, Mr. Speaker, if you will pardon me a slight digression, I have a small grievance to ventilate. I find that in some parts of the country at least, when reference is made to Prince Edward Island, language is used which to say the least is not agreeable to the people of that province or their representatives. The island and its people are referred to perhaps in a somewhat sneering maner.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Not, I hope by any member of this House. I can stand a little pleasant banter; I am not complaining of that; but a few weeks ago the Hamilton 'Spectator' referred to Prince Edward Island as 'that blotch on the map.' Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there was any great amount of wit or sense in that remark. The province of Prince Edward Island is just as large now as it was when we entered the Dominion of Canada, and, territorially speaking, it is twice as large as the state of Rhode Island. I do not know that any reputable paper in the United States has ever thought it necessary to refer in a disparaging manner to the state of Rhode Island, but we in Canada are inclined to be too local in our ideas. We are inclined to believe that anything outside the province in which we happen to live has no real merit; and we find people who will speak in offensive terms of their brethren in the other provinces. That sort of thing, Mr. Speaker, has been carried too far. In discussing this question, there is another newspaper which has a larger circulation than the Hamilton 'Spectator' and very considerable influence in this country—and deservedly so because it is a very well conducted paper—the Montreal 'Gazette,' and that paper referred a few days ago to this tunnel question in a manner not at all justified by the facts of the case. It said:

> The Prince Edward Island people have again got it into their heads that it is the duty of the Dominion government to build a tunnel to connect Prince Edward Island with the mainland. As a vote getter the project is all right, but as a commercial proposition it is as sensible as would be a proposal to build a railway to the moon. It will be built just as soon, too.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that from the statements I have made to-night and the manner in which this question has been taken up by the leading men of both political parties, as well as from the information which I in my humble way have been able to give the House the 'Gazette' was not justified in saying that the project was just as feasible as a proposal to build a railway to the moon. It is a proposition at all events worth considering. There is not perhaps at present sufficient information before parliament, and I do not suppose that the government or parliament is prepared now to take up this question, but something must be done to grapple with the proposition to provide better communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. That fact I think, I have made abundantly clear. There is a considerable amount of information available in the parliamentary library in connection with the investigations which have already taken place on this tunnel matter—information I have not been able to bring before this House; and I have this proposition to make. I do not suppose that parliament would be justified in making any large appropriation immediately, but I would submit this proposition. I would submit that a parliamentary committee be appointed to take this whole matter into consideration to obtain evidence about it, to collect the information and report to parliament. I know that the government has a thousand and one subjects before it at present and that parliament has many important matters on its hands. Therefore I do not suppose that either of these bodies is in a position to give that attention to this subject which its importance demands and in a debate on this matter we of course cannot bring forward all the information that could be obtained by a committee of inquiry such as I have suggested. That committee could obtain very valuable information which would be of great assistance to parliament. But the first thing to be done is to provide another steamer and a more powerful ice-boat than has yet been supplied, and this steamer could be used profitably for commercial purposes in the Hudson bay. I wish to say only one word in regard to myself. In my humble way I have supported every great measure that has been brought forward in my time for the development of this country. I supported the men who were in favour of building the Canadian Pacific Railway; I voted for the building of the Yukon Railway and of that other great Transcontinental Railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific, and I did so in the belief that these great projects were for the development of this country and would add to the prosperity of the Canadian people generally. But in Prince Edward Island we cannot possibly derive much advantage from these undertakings while we remain cut off from the rest of the Dominion as we are now. But if we were closely united by some efficient means of communication with the mainland, we would then derive our natural share of the benefit. As an individual I can appeal to the members of this House and the people of this country for at least a fair and reasonable hearing for the case of Prince Edward Island. I believe if this question is fairly and reasonably considered, and considered in some such way as I have suggested, that an improvement will be made which will satisfy the people of Prince Edward Island and at the same time will not be a burden on the people of the other provinces.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. As I have already discussed this matter on the motion to go into supply, I shall not prolong the debate this evening to any considerable extent. But I have much pleasure in rising to support the motion introduced by my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Lefurgey). It seems to me that this motion should receive the hearty support of the government of the day. You are aware, Mr. Speaker, that previous to 1873, when Prince Edward Island entered confederation, there was a great agitation

in that province, in consequence of which representations were made to the Dominion government by the legislature of Prince Edward Island. As the outcome of these representations, certain resolutions of the Dominion parliament and the legislature of Prince Edward Island were submitted to the imperial parliament and an Order in Council of the imperial government was passed on the 26th of June, 1873, which provided that Prince Edward Island should enter confederation on the terms agreed upon and set forth in the addresses of these two representative bodies. The words were as follow :

And whereas Her Majesty has thought fit to approve of the said terms and conditions, it is hereby ordered and declared by Her Majesty, by and with the advice of Her Privy Council, in pursuance and exercise of the powers vested in Her Majesty, by the said Act of parliament, that from and after the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-three, the said colony of Prince Edward Island shall be admitted into and become part of the Dominion of Canada, upon the terms and the conditions set forth in the hereinbefore recited addresses.

Then, this Act of 1867, the British North America Act, contains a clause, section 146, which reads as follows :—

It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's most honourable Privy Council, on addresses from the Houses of parliament of Canada, and from the Houses of the respective legislatures of the colonies or provinces of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, to admit the colonies or provinces, or any of them into the union, and on address from the Houses of the parliament of Canada to admit Rupert's Land and the Northwestern Territory, or either of them into the union, on such terms and conditions in each case as are in the addresses expressed and as the Queen thinks fit to approve subject to the provisions of this Act and the provisions of any Order in Council in that behalf shall have effect as if they had been enacted by the parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

Now, I contend, that under these ordinances of His Majesty's Privy Council, the position of Prince Edward Island was the same as if she had come into the union under the original Act of 1867. What are the terms under which she came in? It is provided that she should have :—

Efficient steam service for the conveyance of mails and passengers to be established and maintained between the island and the mainland of the Dominion, winter and summer, thus placing the island in continuous commuincation with the Intercolonial Railway and the railway system of the Dominion.

Now what is the meaning of 'efficient steam service.' The Dominion government interpret it to mean a service afforded by steamers. They put two steamers on the route between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. We must use the words of this section, 'efficient steam service' as they would be ordinarily used in connection with shipping matters. Supposing these words were used in connection with a charter party, they would mean steam service adequate and fit for the purpose for which the vessel was chartered. Now, I would ask the government, are the steamers which they have put upon this service adequate and sufficient to perform the service which they are called upon to perform? I think the evidence brought before this House by my hon. friends from Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) and King's (Mr. J. J. Hughes) showed clearly that these steamers are not adequate and sufficient to perform that service. I say that it is the clear duty of the Dominion government to provide for that service, steamers which will adequately and fitly perform that service, or else to supply some other steam communication with Prince Edward Island which will give continuous communication with the railway system of the Dominion. I am sorry that the hon. senior member for Queen's (Mr. A. Martin) is not here today. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, he was called home on a very serious matter for him. He will greatly regret that he was not here when this matter was brought up. But it is not possible to await his return. It will be remembered that he has brought before your attention and that of this honourable House day after day the condition of affairs which has existed up to the time he was compelled to leave for his home. His sentiments and views have already been expressed in this House, so that it is unnecessary for me to enlarge upon what he would say if he were here. It was not my intention to make any extended remarks. The facts of the case have been ably represented by those hon. gentlemen who preceded me. I ask the House to take this subject into its serious consideration. A few days ago the Prime Minister made a statement concerning a grievance brought before the House by my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Sam Hughes) and, with your indulgence, I will quote the words he used in reply to my hon. friend :—

As soon as a grievance was found to exist in the realm the British people, not at all rapidly, somewhat slowly, but always effectively made the necessary changes. If, however, the conditions existing at the present time in the British empire are deficient and no longer answer the purposes of the empire, I have for my own part no doubt that means will be found to remedy these deficiencies.

Now, if we use the word 'Canada' in place of 'empire' I think the effect must be to show that the sentiment of that right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is that when he knows there is a grievance on the part of Prince Edward Island, it is his duty and the duty of the government to find a speedy remedy for that grievance.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I had not the good fortune to hear the whole of this debate. But the question now before the House is not at all a new one, and I imagine that, unless something adequate is done, generations yet to come after us will also hear the members from Prince Edward Island voicing their grievances in respect of the communication between that island and the mainland. Ever since I entered public life, the subject has been under discussion. The communication with the island has never been satisfactory, although of course great improvements have been made. Some seasons are much more severe than others and the circumstances much more exceptional; and, with the present means of combating the difficulties, I imagine that seasons will every now and then recur when it will be impossible to keep up stated and constant communication. From my own knowledge of it, so far as that goes, I should be very much in doubt whether it is possible to build any ice-breaker which will succeed in combating successfully the ice which forms in the Straits of Northumberland at certain times of the year. It is more difficult than almost any other route on which ice-breaking machinery is used. And that circumstance alone, I think, will make it impossible to construct any steamer which will be perfectly successful in keeping up communication. So far as I am concerned, I would like to see all information on the subject of a tunnel brought together. There is no doubt in my mind that that is the only perfectly satisfactory solution of the problem. The question of its possibility from a mechanical point of view, does not trouble the mind of many persons who have thought about it, I imagine.

Anything can be done these days provided you put enough money into the enterprise to carry it to a successful completion —anything, I mean, in the way of tunnelling. The mechanism of the age has come to a high pitch. I have no doubt that a tunnel between the provinces of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island is within the compass of mechanical ingenuity. How much money it would take I do not know, but I think it is worth while spending a good deal of money in completing a method of communication which would be constant, uniform and satisfactory. A suggestion has been made this afternoon that a parliamentary committee might take it up. If it would not be travelling outside of our record here, I would suggest that in another House than this there is more leisure than there is in this House, and I could not think of anything which would be of greater public service for that other House to perform than to make a thorough examination, through a parliamentary inquiry, as to the improved methods of tunnelling, as to the cost of tunnelling, as to the difficulties which are to be met with in this particular place, and come as near as they possibly can to a reasonable estimate of what this would cost. A great deal of valuable information has been gained, borings have been made, and the results of these are in the departments and are ready as helps in this direction. The government might take that up as a not very costly, and I think a very good means of gathering information upon this important subject. If a tunnel could be built between the mainland and the island at a cost of not more than $10,000,000 or thereabouts, it is a project I think which might well be taken up. Prince Edward Island is with us now and will always be with us, no matter though some ill-advised individual may speak of it as a blotch on the map, or the staid 'Gazette' of Montreal may think that the project is not quite feasible and not much better than an attempt to connect the moon with New Brunswick. Yet the members from the smaller provinces, from Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, must not be too sensitive in these respects, and I imagine the 'Spectator' was guided by an authority which is not unknown to us in this House, for if my memory does not fail me, a very distinguished man who is now leader of the government in this House, uttered an expression something like that with reference to the whole Dominion, to wit, that at one time he went to bed when Canada was but a blotch on the map of the universe, and he woke up the next morning and found that it had expanded suddenly into a nation. Now, if such a term is used with reference to the vast Dominion of Canada and by a noted authority, why we must have Christian charity at least for newspapers of the day who are sometimes hard up for paragraphs and who print expressions something like that.

But I say that Prince Edward Island is with us and will be with us. It is a fertile island, almost every foot of its soil is cultivable. There is no doubt that to-day it is under great disadvantages in business; its agriculture has to be carried on with interruptions, it has to labour with difficulties, and all kinds of trade and communication commercially are hampered and severely hampered by the loss that occurs, the delays that occur, the difficulties that occur in transportation. I have no doubt that the population of that little island might be largely increased if there were steady and uniform means of communication. As the Dominion grows and its population and wealth increase, it may well be that $8,000,000 or $10,000,000 could not be better expended than in uniting Prince Edward Island by steady and uniform communication with the mainland, and giving it a chance to develop to the utmost the capabilities with which it has been richly endowed by Providence.

But until that time comes, that information is gained, and that project is under-

taken, there is something I think which might be done now. It has always struck me that it was rather an unbusinesslike method to have the communication distributed between so many authorities. You have the post office authority doing a part of it, you have another department doing another part of it, the business is now divided amongst three departments. It seems to me it would be better managed if one department took the whole matter into its hands, so that it could give undivided attention to the means of transit and communication between the island and the mainland. That is a suggestion that might be taken into account. Then there is the suggestion that a parliamentary committee might be appointed to look into this matter thoroughly and quickly, so that parliament could be seized of just about what the cost would be and the feasibility of the undertaking. In some way or other I always feel that we have not done all we might do in order to make communication with Prince Edward Island what it ought to be. I think that after all we must not go by the consideration of its being or not being a commercial undertaking. Many things are done in this country for other than commercial reasons, and to tie down the means of communication between the provinces to the mere matter of commercial returns, is not taking in the importance of the subject as a whole. Commerce would be benefited, but other and greater interests would be promoted, and if the means of communication could be thoroughly attained by means of a tunnel the cost of which would not be too unreasonable, I certainly think the Dominion of Canada might very well undertake it.

Hon. C. S. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works). I join with my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in expressing the pleasure I feel when the annual Prince Edward Island day comes up in this House, and possibly for that reason alone I should be somewhat loth to provide a tunnel if it were to deprive us of the pleasure of hearing at least one day in the session the pleasant speeches which the members from that island deliver in the House of Commons. As regards the suggestions which have fallen from the member from North Toronto, I do not think it would be necessary or politic to leave a matter of this kind to a parliamentary committee. I do not think the government have any desire to shirk their duty in this matter, and I think that department which is more particularly charged with this work, the Department of Marine and Fisheries, as well as to some extent the Department of Railways and Canals, and in a lesser degree the Department of Public Works will always be glad to give every possible attention to remedying the grievance which our friends from Prince Edward Island have pointed out to us. It is quite true that the work is divided amongst more than one department of the government. But it must be remembered that the Department of Marine and Fisheries is the one more immediately responsible for the communication between the mainland and Prince Edward Island. I do not think the Railway Department has anything to do with the crossings, though they may have something to do with the terminals.

The only way that the Department of Public Works is interested is in finding if it be possible to create a more accessible landing place which will render possible a more efficient service during the winter time. Now, it cannot be denied at the same time, Mr. Speaker, that there have been considerable improvements made in the service, not only by the previous government, but also by this government, and I do not think that, taking everything into consideration, it will ever be possible to have a thoroughly efficient service by way of boats. The particular motion which is being moved today has reference only to a landing place on the island. As far as that is concerned, the Department of Public Works have on one or two occasions had full reports from their engineers as to the building of a landing on the island. These reports were brought down to this House, I think, in 1902, and I think also in 1903. There are great difficulties—difficulties of an engineering character—to be overcome. The tide, as we all understand, runs very fast through that narrow strip of water, some eight miles in width, which divides Prince Edward Island from the mainland. Two or three of the engineers of the Department of Public Works have thoroughly gone into the question of the possibility of building and maintaining a wharf on the island side from which the boats could operate. From the reports of the engineers, which I have before me, the only place where it would be possible to put a landing which would afford the necessary accommodation would possibly be Carleton point. The estimate of the cost of the work is something in the neighbourhood of $1,300,000. But the great difficulty is that I do not think the masters of the steamers themselves feel that it is possible to maintain an efficient and regular service even if that expenditure were made. I understand from the masters of boats, not in all seasons of the year, but in almost every season of the year, that the bord ice is of such a character that it would be impossible, not only for the boats which the Department of Marine and Fisheries have established there, but practically for any boats, to maintain an efficient service. I am also informed by the officers of the department that in different seasons the ice comes in at different places. At the present season the winds, I understand, have been principally from an easterly direction and that a lot of ice has gathered on the

Cape Breton shore, and has formed to such an extent there and far out into the bay that it has retarded the passage over a certain part of the bay. Even if the Department of Public Works were to make the large expenditure which this motion practically calls for, it might be found that the ice, instead of gathering where it has gathered this year, would gather at the particular part at which it would be necessary to cross to reach the landing which it would be found necessary to reach. That, I understand, is the great difficulty. Of course, during the present year the difficulties of navigation or communication are not confined to Prince Edward Island. I think the difficulties of communication in Nova Scotia are such as have never been found there during any year within the memory of any hon. member of this House, and therefore I think that our Prince Edward Island friends should bear with some degree of composure the unfortunate state of affairs which has continued there for some four or five weeks.

In so far as the question of the tunnel is concerned, I quite agree with my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), that in these days all things are possible, and that practically it is simply a matter of dollars and cents. Whether the expenditure is $10,000,000, or $12,000,000, or $15,000,000, I do not think it has been definitely ascertained as yet. There have been some attempts made to ascertain the cost of the proposed work, but I do not think they have been yet of such a character as to afford such information as would justify this House in definitely undertaking a work of that kind. I think it would be well, under all the circumstances, before the government deal with this question, which is purely and simply an engineering matter, that some of the engineers of the department should be asked to make some estimate in regard to the cost of the tunnel, and then the House will have all the facts before it. Having an estimate of the cost, and having possibly the results of some further researches by the engineers as to the possibility of maintaining the service by water, the House may be better able to decide the course which it would be well to pursue. On behalf of the government, I will say that I will take great pleasure in bringing the subject to the attention of my colleagues, and that I will endeavour, as far as the Department of Public Works is concerned, to take the necessary steps by which such material may be gathered together as will put the House in possession of the information necessary to the proper consideration of a question involving such a large expenditure as it may be called upon to make should it decide to undertake the construction of a tunnel.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. HYMAN.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—PLANS OF TERMINALS.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma) moved :

For a return containing a copy of the plan or plans deposited by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company with the Department of Railways and Canals, showing the proposed terminal point or points on the Pacific coast. Also for a copy of the plan or plans deposited by the said company for terminal points at Port Arthur, Fort William and Winnipeg.

He said : Mr. Speaker, the motion on the order paper which stands in my name is one which has been mentioned in different ways on two or three different occasions in this House. The motion is for a return containing a copy of the plan or plans deposited by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company with the Department of Railways and Canals showing the proposed terminal point or points on the Pacific coast, and also for a copy of the plan or plans deposited by the company for their terminal points at Port Arthur, Fort William and Winnipeg. The question of the production of these plans has been raised by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson). I understand that that hon. gentleman contends that these plans are not produceable under the order of the House for the reason that they are privileged from being subject to the order of the House, because they have not, under the Railway Act of Canada, been approved by the hon. minister. That is the position which the hon. gentleman took when the matter came up on the motion which was made in this House on the 13th February, and again when certain questions were asked that hon. gentleman on the 16th February. On these occasions that was the ground upon which the production of these plans was withheld. By reference to the answers that the hon. gentleman made on the 16th February we find that certain plans of the terminal points at Port Arthur, Fort William and on the Pacific coast were deposited—the term 'deposited' is used by the hon. gentleman—in the department ; as to Fort William, on the 2nd August, 1904 ; as to Port Arthur, on the 16th August, 1904 ; and as to the Pacific coast, on the 16th August, 1904 ; that none of these plans had up to that date been approved ; that none of them had been rejected, and that the grounds assigned as a reason for them not being yet approved were that it was premature to approve them. Without desiring in any way to enter upon any legal argument, and without desiring to impress upon the hon. minister what I have before stated upon the floor of this House on my responsibility as a member, that there has been brought to my notice information in respect to the obtaining of sketches or copies of these plans, I would merely endeavour to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to some matters which I think will

convince him that the ground upon which he is endeavouring to withhold the production of these plans is not a tenable ground.

In the first place, the plans have not been approved pursuant to section 122 of the Railway Act. That section does not make it obligatory that the plans shall be approved by the Minister of Railways before they are produced, nor, if it were applicable to this case, does it prohibit the production of any plans, or the inspection of any plans, or the exhibition of any plans, or the furnishing of the copies of any plans while they are in a transitory state between their deposit and their approval by the minister. The reason they are deposited is, as I take it, that these persons whose lands are affected—the public as well as the government—may have an opportunity of knowing exactly what the intentions of the railway company are with reference to the exercise of the right of eminent domain. That is an important factor, and it is a factor which I desire now to impress upon the minister. Then, of what moment and to what purpose is it, to withhold information and the production of plains which it is impossible to maintain as secret by reason of the fact that the engineers, or the railway companies themselves keeping draft copies of them, can hand them out to whomsoever they wish? To what purpose is it that the government is in possession of plans showing the intentions of the railway company—and I am speaking only of an ordinary railway company to which the provisions of the Railway Act apply—to what purpose can it avail the government to withhold the production of these plans? What object would be served by this sealing up of plans the moment they are deposited in the Department of Railways? As I understand it these plans are not deposited in the Department of Railways to be sealed up; according to the statute they are deposited to be subject to the daily inspection of the minister in order that he may see the gradients, the nature of the route, the nature of the curves proposed, and all other circumstances connected with the location of the line. As I have before stated, upon the reliable information that has been given to me, if it be the case that copies of the plans have been exhibited, or inspection of the plans has been allowed by any person in the Department of Railways, then surely that is a reason why the production of the plans before the House should not now be refused. I would particularly impress upon the minister the fact, that if as he suggested when the question was last before the House, copies of the plans had been obtained outside the department and possibly from the engineers, then that statement answered the argument of the minister as to the secrecy of the plans, and it is a strong factor in support of the contention that there is now no reason at all for withholding the information that the plans give. Granted that it might be competent for the minister to argue that under section 122 of the Railway Act, these plans not having been deposited it might be a question of policy with the department as to their production; then I contend that it is very clear that in regard to the eastern section of the National Transcontinental Railway the provisions of the Railway Act do not, and cannot have any application. If it were only upon the principle that the Crown is not bound by its own statutes, then the Railway Act would not apply, but it is made expressly the subject of enactment that the provisions of the Act in the specific instance to which I have referred, do not apply. I would refer the minister to the provisions of the Act upon that point. It is to be noted that under section 3 of the Railway Act it is to apply,

> To all persons, companies and railways other than government railways.

Under the Act (1903) respecting the Transcontinental Railway, section 5 says:

> The eastern division from Moncton to Winnipeg shall be constructed at the expense of the government upon such location and according to such plans and specifications as it shall determine, having due regard to directness, easy gradients and favourable curves.

Section 8 says:

> The construction of the eastern division shall be commenced as soon as the government has made the surveys and plans and determines the proper location thereof.

Then by section 38 of the agreement ratified by that Act:

> The Railway Act of Canada and any amendment enacted heretofore or which shall hereafter be enacted shall apply to the operation of the eastern division by the company and to the rights, liabilities and obligations of the company as lessee thereof, and to the location, construction and operation of the western division thereof, except as otherwise provided by this agreement by the Act confirming the same, or by any any special Act of the company.

The minister will see clearly that by the last words of that section the operation of the Railway Act as to location is expressly excluded so far as the eastern division is concerned, by making it directly and solely applicable to the construction of the western division. There is another view which I would impress upon the minister and which I think is quite pertinent to the subject under consideration. That is: that this is not an ordinary transaction. It is not, as I think the minister will concede I have established, it is not the case of an ordinary railway or the case of a private company whose rights might have to be respected, but it is a case where a public work is being constructed under and subject to certain plans and specifications, and those plans and specifications are filed and deposited in the Department of Railways, and as I have suggested have been inspected by others. Surely the rights of the public and the interests of

the public are such that no harm can be done to anybody by the return of these plans, and surely it would be quite competent for the House to direct that these plans be returned and laid upon the table of the House.

The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals gave the reason why they should be withheld that it would encourage speculation if the plans were to be allowed to be exhibited or if they were placed on the table of the House by reason of this order. Sir, I fail to see in that contention any real and cogent reason for withholding this information. When it is remembered that these plans have been prepared first by the company itself, and that they are under no statutory bond of secrecy; that they are under no statutory seal such as the hon. gentleman mentioned when the matter was last under discussion to prevent them giving out any information; then, if the information is to be withheld at all, there must be an absolute safeguard or none at all. It has been shown to the hon. gentleman that there is not an absolute safeguard, that the seal of secrecy with which he stamped those plans, as he stated, and by which he forbade any person to have access to them to copy them or to see them, has not been effective, if the information I gave to the House is now to be credited; and I have nothing whatever to retract with regard to it. Then the hon. gentleman must see that the government is in this position and I feel satisfied that the hon. minister will not do anything unreasonable in the matter of withholding information contained in those plans. The information that has already gone out cannot now be withheld. This being a government constructed railway or section of a railway there are reasons why the House should be taken into the confidence of the minister with regard to the proposals of this railway in such important matters as the terminal points of construction at or near the points mentioned in the motion. The hon. gentleman, on the last occasion when this matter was referred to, that is, on the 3rd of March last, stated to the House that the moment he learned that the plans were deposited, he was asked if any one would be allowed to see them, and he said: 'certainly not, that they should be placed under seal, and that no one should be allowed access to them either in the department or out of it.' Then the hon. gentleman reiterates his statement that he is positive that nobody made copies of them and is satisfied that no one has been permitted to see them. Well, I can only state to the hon. gentleman what I stated before to the House, that persons have been permitted in the Department of Railways and Canals —and I am not now speaking allegorically, nor, I trust, immodestly—openly to inspect, and see, and take notes of, and sketch those plans. Then, the hon. gentleman, when he spoke on the 3rd of March with reference to this matter was, as I am quite satisfied, speaking only from what he believed to be the case; but I can tell the hon. gentleman that the information contained in those plans or sketches which were supposed to have remained under seal from the 2nd of August down to this day, a period of seven or eight months, as to the intentions of the company with regard to the terminals at Port Arthur, has leaked out and has possibly been made the subject of that speculation which the hon. gentleman said was the danger of producing the plans to the House. Having said so much with regard to the information that has leaked out, having shown to the hon. gentleman, as I think I have shown, that there is no object to be served by further maintaining the supposed seal of secrecy upon these plans, I would respectfully urge the hon. gentleman to reconsider a decision possibly hastily made and possibly made with but little information as to the facts—to so far reconsider it, having regard to the peculiar position of matters and to the fact that these are not plans to which the Railway Act can have any application, that he will consent to the return now being made, and thus close an incident in this House which, so far as my connection with it is concerned, has been most regretable. I exceedingly regret that having been so short a time in the House, I should have fallen under the condemnatory tongue of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals in this connection, while speaking with regard to what I believe to be my rights, and should have been on two occasions styled an immodest young gentleman and also one not wanting in information. I can only say to the hon. gentleman that I think I possess with regard to those plans information which he, at any rate, so far as 'Hansard' has disclosed, did not himself possess. I can only put it in that way. I can tell the hon. gentleman that details of all the intentions of the company as shown by those plans are known, have been made the subject of speculation, have been made the subject of taking up lands: and how otherwise could they have been obtained than through the department, if what the hon. gentleman says was done, that is, in the absence of definite information? In saying that I do not desire the hon. gentleman to take any comfort, or to think I am detracting from my other statement, namely, that that information was obtained through the Department of Railways and Canals with reference to those plans, and since they were filed, whether before or after this seal of secrecy was placed upon them.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry indeed that any remark of mine should have led my hon. friend to take offence at anything I said. Certainly there was nothing

of a personal character intended by reason of any such remarks. I see no cause for receding from the position which I took on a previous occasion in this House with respect to this motion. The motion refers in the first place to a return containing a copy of the plan or plans deposited by the Grand Trunk Pacific with the Department of Railways and Canals showing the proposed terminal point or points on the Pacific coast. Under the particular Act governing the Transcontinental line of railway, those plans must go to the Department of Railways and are subject to the approval, not merely of the Minister of Railways, but of his Excellency, the Governor in Council. Until that approval is given, in my judgment the information should not be disclosed. The other part of the motion relates to the terminals at Port Arthur and Fort William. These are allied to the Grand Trunk Pacific, but do not come under the same law. They come under the General Railway Act of 1903, and the Minister of Railways is charged with the responsibility of either approving these plans or withholding his approval. According to my view, these plans should not be disclosed to the public until such action is taken. The matter involved—not merely the Grand Trunk Pacific terminal on the Pacific coast, but the terminals at Lake Superior—are of such vital importance that they should not be hastily decided upon, and until the government has taken action, it seems to me it would not be in the public interest to bring down the information asked for. True, my hon. friend has said something about information leaking out of the Department of Railways and Canals. Well, I am bound to place reliance on the officials of my department, and I have no right to assume that when they are instructed to do a certain thing, they will not follow that instruction. My hon. friend has made assertions to the contrary, and I have challenged him to give the source of his information or name the official implicated or show the medium of that communication. He says the information came out by the back door.

Mr. BOYCE. Has the hon. minister, since my assertion on the 3rd March last, investigated the charge made and with what result?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not called up all the officials, in the department, but I have asked my deputy minister and he told me most positively that copies of those plans could not by any possibility have gone out. I have to rely on that statement, and I submit to the judgment of this House that it was in the public interest that the information should be withheld until action was taken by the Minister of Railways in connection with the terminals at Fort William and Port Arthur, and by His Excellency the Governor in Council with respect to the terminals on the Pacific coast. I may have erred in my judgment, but that was my opinion.

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. gentleman claim, as minister, to have any right with regard to the Lake Superior branch more than he has with regard to any other railway authorized by the Dominion parliament? It is not part of the transcontinental.

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. BARKER. Then what right has he that he has not with regard to any other railway?

Mr. EMMERSON. The minister is charged with certain responsibility under section 122 of the Railway Act. The map must be submitted to him and before approving of such map and location he may, subject to the Special Act, make such changes and alterations therein as he may deem expedient.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the Special Act the Grand Trunk Pacific Act?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, this refers to railways generally and means the Special Act of Incorporation.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman said something about the approval of the Governor in Council, where does he get that approval with regard to that branch?

Mr. EMMERSON. The route of the Grand Trunk Pacific main trunk line is subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

Mr. BARKER. But this is the Lake Superior branch.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am trying to discriminate and am drawing attention to the difference. Under section 122 of the Railway Act I am called upon to take action with respect to the line which runs from Winnipeg to Lake Superior. That lies with the Minister of Railways.

Mr. BARKER. Not with the Governor in Council?

Mr. EMMERSON. Not with the Governor in Council, and I have already pointed out that this motion refers not merely to the terminals at Port Arthur and Fort William, but to the terminal on the Pacific coast.

Mr. BOYCE. They are separated?

Mr. EMMERSON. Precisely, but the one is closely allied to the other. Although the terminals at Port Arthur and Fort William, are subject to the General Railway Act, yet because of their association with the transcontinental line of railway, I have felt it was not in the public interest to disassociate them, and that it would be against sound public policy to lay that information before the House at this stage. This is not a personal matter. It is simply a question of principle. It happens to be applied in this particular instance.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister allow me to ask a question for information ? As I understand him, the motion is refused on the ground of principle and public interest. What I am trying to find out is what is at stake ? If it is wrong to bring this down on the ground of principle or public interest, will the minister state what principle is violated or what public interest would be harmed by bringing it down ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In one instance because the Minister of Railways has not exercised his judgment on the matter, and in the other instance, because his Excellency the Governor General in Council has not taken action. And I submit that there can be no question with respect to the case in which action is to be taken by the Governor in Council. In that instance, certainly, the information should not be brought down, and because of the association of the two railways there are particular reasons why the information should not be brought down with respect to Port Arthur and Fort William ?

Mr. FOSTER. What would happen if it were brought down ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is very difficult to point out what would happen in a hypothetical case. But it is against principle that it should be brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. How ?

Mr. EMMERSON. For the simple reason that until action is taken it is not approved by the department, and it may never be acted upon from that standpoint.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the minister answer this question ? Suppose the information were given and the document brought down, would that hamper action on the part of the government in any way, or prejudice anybody in case it turned out that the plans were never approved ? What possible evil could result ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It would be misleading.

Mr. LENNOX. How, would it be misleading ? If they were brought down, every one would know as much as the minister knows about them. The people would know perfectly well that nothing had been finally determined upon. Would it be improper that the public should, in the meantime be seized of the facts so far as they have been presented, and should have the opportunity, probably of preventing hasty action on the part of the government ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In regard to information of that character the general public do not discriminate, but are apt to assume that certain action will be taken ; and they might be misled. I do not think it is in the public interest they should be misled, and I think that until it is determined beyond question that the location shall be at a certain point, it is not in the public interest that the information should be brought down. I would therefore ask that the motion be not adopted.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). I see that the minister has satisfied himself that the motion should not carry ; but for the life of me I cannot see how he has satisfied any one in this House or satisfied the people. He has said that he thinks it contrary to principle, contrary to public policy that the people should be given this information until he approves of the plans. He is very anxious to defend the people against themselves, to protect them against some knowledge that they might obtain. But he does not seem anxious to protect them against the railway which might tell them a hundred and one different stories of plans they have filed with the department and where they were going to locate their line, and people would have no way of finding out whether the stories they spread abroad as to where they proposed to locate their lines and their propositions made to the minister, for his approval, were true or untrue. After the approval was given, if it was given, the people would for the first time, know the truth about it; and, if refused, then no one would know whether the railway had intended to locate where it said it would or not. The minister has not, in my opinion, answered the argument, so well and tersely put by my hon. friend from Algoma West (Mr. Boyce). I listened carefully to what both these gentlemen said, and I am very much disappointed that the minister feels that he has satisfied this House with the reason he has given for rejecting this motion. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) it seems to me was entitled to succeed, if on no other ground, then on the one—which the minister has not attempted to answer—that this is part of the transcontinental scheme. The Grand Trunk is to file plans, to tell the people what they are going to do, if the minister allows them to. But the people pay the greater part of the expenses of the enterprise, yet are to have no information about what the Grand Trunk is proposing to do. And the Minister of Railways, who ought to represent the people, says he will not let the people know what these plans are, although he does not attempt to deny that the railway company can let the people know whatever they like about it. But railway companies are not bound to tell the people the truth or to allow them to learn the truth. The railway company is looking out for itself ; but the Minister of Railways is supposed to protect the people. He is very anxious that the railways shall be protected, and, forsooth, he thinks the people are going to hurt themselves if they are given too great a helping of information at one time. They are not getting from this government much infor-

mation about railways or other public matters for information about which they are seeking. But, there has been no answer made to the specific statements of the gentleman who moved the resolution—I am not speaking of the matter that the minister did deny in the sense of saying that he inquired of the deputy minister and was told that the matter had not leaked out. I speak of the statement that the plans were deposited for the purpose of inspection by the minister for the purpose of his approving them backed by the quotations from section 122. Although that section defines specifically what the Minister of Railways is to do with these plans, it is not set forth in any sense that these are not to be public property. I do not think that the minister has the right to read into this section a mortgage, as it were, on the peoples' rights in regard to these plans. What is the Department of Railways and Canals? Is it a depository of public documents, or is it a depository for railway documents, with the Minister of Railways as a sort of policeman to protect those railway documents ? In all the paragraphs of section 122, which describe with considerable detail the Minister's duties, there is no word to indicate that the minister is to keep these documents as the property of the railway company. And, if he is not to keep them as the property of the company, he has no right to say that they are to be secret and undisclosed to the people. If it were stated, or if it could be reasonably inferred from the Act that these documents remain the property of the railway company until the minister approved of them and if disapproved they were to be returned intact to the railway company, there would be some excuse for the minister, representing the people, saying that these documents should be disclosed to nobody until they had been approved. But there is not a word in the statute which the minister has invoked to indicate that these documents are anything else but public property when they got into the hands of the minister under the sections of that Act. I think the minister is going beyond his rights if he says that he does not think it is in the public interest that this information should be gven to the people's representatives. I shall not further trouble the House upon a matter which seems to be plainly in favour of the right of granting the motion of the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Boyce), and if it comes to a vote, I shall be compelled to vote for his motion.

Mr. SAM. BARKER (Hamilton). The answer of the minister is two-fold, as we have it now. He says with regard to the Pacific end that the government as a whole, the Governor General in Council, must be consulted because it is a part of the Transcontinental Railway. The western end, the Port Arthur branch, he admits has nothing to do with the Transcontinental Railway, that it is like any other railway, a branch line of 220 miles, and the minister simply deals with that as with the plans deposited with regard to any ordinary railway promoted by a railway company. He chose for his own convenience to hang up the plans deposited by that company for eight months and left the owners of the lands at the terminus subject to all the changes that might occur if he should choose to change the route. Now with regard to the western end the minister takes this position, that parliament has nothing to say about it, that it is a matter solely for the minister in the first instance, and secondly for the government sitting in Council. But it is a question where the terminus on the Pacific of a great Transcontinental Railway should be, and surely if that question is held up for eight months, parliament has a right to know what the proposition is, parliament has a right to a voice in the question. The hon. gentleman in his wisdom, and his colleagues in their wisdom, may seek to put the terminus on the Pacific at a point that, in the judgment of parliament, would be a positive injury to this country; and is that to be held up for eight months, and are we not to know even what is proposed. When we ask for the plans and when we ask the minister to tell us what the Grand Trunk Pacific proposition as to the terminus on the Pacific, he says, 'No, I have got the plans and I have locked them up for eight months, and you shall not see them.' Now it seems to me a most extraordinary proposition on the part of the government, that as regards the western terminus of the Transcontinental Railway, which affects the whole of the Dominion, the terminus of a railway which will cost this country perhaps $120,000,000, this information is to be kept absolutely secret for eight months, and we are not even to be allowed to know what is proposed so that we may offer a word of advice to the hon. gentleman. Is that government by the people? Why, Sir, the Czar of Russia would hardly lay down such a proposition as that. We are the people who are largely paying for that railway, it is of vital importance to us that the terminus shall be at a proper point on the Pacific, but this hon. minister says, I have locked it up and I will not tell you what is proposed ; I in my good judgment will decide the question before you know anything about it. That is the position the government are putting us in. As to the eastern end, or Lake Superior branch, the position is equally unreasonable, equally untenable. Would the hon. gentleman with regard to any railway company incorporated by this parliament, say to that company when it had deposited its plans, that he would seal up those plans, he would let neither the company nor the people know his decision, he would hold it back, he would give an order to his deputy to

lock the plans up so that no man should know? He knows that the man who drew the plans can hand out copies of them to speculators to use at their sweet will. I do not charge the deputy minister with having given out plans, I do not understand the hon. gentleman who brought up this motion to make such a charge as that. But I think there are few who know what the hon. gentleman has said but will suspect that in some way these plans are in the hands of the public and are being used for private purposes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what sort of business administration is that in which in regard to an important branch railway 220 miles in length, terminating on Lake Superior, plans are left in the minister's hands and he holds back his decision for eight months? He does not give us a word of reason why he has not decided that question. What possible reason can there be for it? The very fact that the hon. gentleman holds back that information is a badge of suspicion. I do not charge the hon. gentleman with anything wrong, but the very fact that it is held back in that way is enough to make people suspicious, to make them believe that there is something wrong about it. Now we might come to the conclusion that the hon. gentleman locked the plans up and forgot all about them. That is one solution, probably. I wonder whether that be so. Surely the hon. gentleman could, within the last eight months, have looked over the plans of an important railway, 220 miles long, and have given his deliberate and considered judgment upon the point as to the exact location of the terminus. There seems to be, Mr. Speaker, some reason that the hon. gentleman has not chosen to disclose to us. What is it? Are we to be left to surmise? If so, is it unreasonable for us to think that there is something hidden in the fence somewhere about this matter, rather than that we should suspect the minister of gross negligence and carelessness? It is one or the other, unless the hon. gentleman chooses to explain. And I say again, as to the Pacific end, it is an outrage upon the people that the plans should be held up for eight months, and when we ask to know what is proposed as to the Pacific terminus, we are to be told that the minister will not give us the information.

Mr. W. A. GALLIHER (Kootenay). In 1903, this parliament passed an Act known as the Railway Act. By section 122, certain powers were placed in the hands of the Minister of Railways, and in his hands alone. Under the first part of that section a railway company is to prepare a map showing the general location of the proposed line, and so forth. Under subsection 2, that map shall be submitted to the minister, prepared upon a certain scale to be approved of by the minister. The minister is the responsible party in this; he is responsible to the people and the reference is to the minister as specified and laid down by this Act. It is a reference to the minister as representing the people and not to parliament itself. That map has to be accompanied by an application in duplicate requesting the minister's approval of the general location as shown on the map. Subsection 3 provides that:—

> Before approving such map and location the minister may, subject to the Special Act, make such changes and alterations therein as he may deem expedient.

From the whole tenor of the legislation as contained in this Act a personal duty is imposed upon the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. We have passed that Act as an Act of parliament. We have not stipulated that before making any changes the minister must submit these plans or be advised by parliament in regard to them, but we have placed that direct and specific act, as it is laid down here, entirely in the hands of the minister. It may or may not be that it is good policy for the minister to give these plans to the public after he receives them and before any alterations are made, if alterations are to be made. That is a matter upon which there may be a difference of opinion, and a very honest difference of opinion. The minister is justified in interpreting the law strictly and in giving the reasons why, in his opinion, he should not submit these maps to the public, or make them public, before he has finally determined as to whether he shall or shall not approve of the location. I can conceive of a very extraordinary condition arising in reference particularly to the western terminus. We know in the west, and I fancy every one in the east knows, that we have certain points at which this railway may be expected to establish its terminal on the Pacific coast. It may be at one place or it may be at another. The plan as prepared may propose a specific point which may not be the proper point in the estimation of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and which may, therefore, be changed. What would be the position supposing these plans, before being approved, were given out to the public? What would take place? We know there are capitalists and townsite promoters who are most anxious to find out where the Pacific coast terminal shall be. Supposing the plans were made public, they would take the chance of plotting certain areas of land and put them on the market, and the public would invest their money in them. Suppose that the minister should then say: I cannot approve of this location, as I do not consider it a proper location for the terminus of this road. What becomes of the money of the public? I say that it is in the interest of the public that these plans should not be disclosed, at least, in my opinion, arguing it from my own point of view. I may be wrong and other hon. gen-

tlemen who differ from me may be right, but I say that I believe it is not in the public interest, more especially in regard to the western terminus, until these plans have been approved by the Minister of Railways and Canals, in whose hands the approval lies, and I believe it is in the public interest that the minister should take the course which he is taking at the present time.

In regard to the line from Winnipeg to Port Arthur or Fort William, I presume that will be a branch of the main line of the Grand Trunk Pacific; and if I am right in what I have said, subsection 4 covers the case there, to my mind, just as fully as it does that of the main line, because subsection 4 says that:

> The foregoing provisions of this section shall only apply to the main line and to the branch lines over six miles in length.

Therefore, I do not think there can be any difference in applying it as to the terminus on the Pacific coast and applying it as to the branch lines over six miles in length.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). This is an interesting question, and when the discussion was commenced I had not made up my mind in reference to it. I have been following the discussion with a great deal of interest. Now, I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, the way it looks to me. In the first place, is there anything by law made secret in reference to these plans? Here is a certain company which is obliged by the law to make out a plan and hand it to the minister. There is nothing within the covers of the law that prevents that company making out any other plan. It may make out a hundred plans; it is not prevented from doing it by the law. It can give one plan to one man, another plan to another, and distribute them as it pleases. There is no prohibition; there is no penalty. This law does not contemplate legal secrecy by the company. What is the object of the law? It is simply to prevent a company from building any line that it may lay out unless that line has the approval of the proper authorities. That is all. If the law bound the company to secrecy, so that it should only make one plan and hand that plan to the minister, and proceed no further and do nothing else until that plan were approved, I could see that there was something in the argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Galliher), who has just taken his seat.

Mr. GALLIHER. In doing that the company takes the risk of this plan it hands to the minister, and of the other plans it may hand out in any other way, being rejected by the minister.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly, that is right.

Mr. GALLIHER. If the company should do as the hon. gentleman suggests, and if the minister should not approve of the plan, it would be embarrassing to those who invested their money on the strength of the plan which they had received.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot quite see the strength of the hon. gentleman's argument. However, that is his argument. He says that from his point of view. I think I have made one thing clear to the House, and it is that there is no secrecy contemplated or ordered by the Act, and consequently the motive of this Act is not to prevent the public from getting hold of the profiles and plans. The motive of the Act is entirely a different one. It is to prevent a railway company from building along a line and to terminii which do not have the approval of the government or the approval of the proper authorities. That is the sole reason why the plans and profiles are deposited with the minister and for the minister's approval.

Mr. EMMERSON. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the company could file a plan to-day and then to-morrow file other plans. The statute says that they are only to file a plan and map of their proposed route. Now, having done that, because they must act within the statute, do they not exhaust their statutory powers?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. minister has misunderstood me entirely. I said that the law contemplates that they shall file the plan. The law contemplates that they shall file only one plan, but the law does not forbid them giving copies of that plan to all creation if they wish. That is all I said.

Mr. EMMERSON. I misunderstood my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. I quite agree with the minister when they file the plans once they exhaust their right to file again, but we differ as to the reason why they file them. He seems to think that they file the plans in order that the public should not know; I believe they file them that they may get the approval of the minister. That is not for the protection of the public in any way nor for the protection of the company.

Mr. EMMERSON. And until that approval is had there is no authentic plan.

Mr. FOSTER. So far as the plans and profiles are concerned, these can be given to the world; they can be printed in the newspapers, and as a matter of fact they are all over Canada to-day. My hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) has given certain information about it; I know of my own knowledge that these plans for months have been before important bodies in this country and have been discussed in every detail. The public can get them from the Grand Trunk authorities if the Grand Trunk authorities see fit to give them.

Mr. GALLIHER. They will not see fit.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no prohibition against them giving them, and the fact is they are public property to a greater or lesser extent.

Mr. EMMERSON. That does not relieve the department.

Mr. FOSTER. If the law puts the duty on the minister to approve of these plans as it does, why has he locked them up and kept them for eight months without taking action? A strong argument in favour of the Grand Trunk Pacific was that time would not wait, that there was urgent haste, and after the money is voted and the elections are over, the minister quietly puts the plans under seal, forgets all about them, or cannot find time to approve or disapprove of them. He says he does that on the ground of principle and of public interest. What does he mean by public interest? Does he mean the interest of the speculator? If Tom Jones buys land on what he thinks will be the approved location, and if Tom Jones misses it, that is not the public interest. Jones makes the speculation knowing that the plans have not the minister's signature, and people are taking that risk to-day. If the minister brings down the plans and says they are not approved they are just as much a speculation as they were before, but what public interest is hurt? If speculators take the chances of the minister approving that is a matter for the speculator, but it is not any detriment to the public interest.

Mr. EMMERSON. What public interest would be benefited by bringing down copies of plans which are of no value until they are approved? There is no connection made between the company and the department until the sign manual of the minister or of the Governor in Council is had; until that, it is in the air.

Mr. FOSTER. When parliament asks the minister for papers that are in his possession, as the servant of parliament he has to give a good reason why he shall not bring them down. The minister simply says: I cannot bring them down because it is against principle and against public interest. He has not shown what public interest would be hurt or what principle would be violated; he simply repeats that it is against principle and the public interest. If parliament, as his master, asks him to lay a certain document on the table of the House, the onus is on the minister to show how it is against the public interest, and it is no justification for him simply to reiterate the statement without proving it. There is a difference between the general public and the public as represented by the House of Commons. If a man walks in from the outside and asks the minister for permission to look at these plans, the minister would be perfectly justified in saying: I have not approved of them and they would simply lead you astray; but parliament bears the expense and is master of the situation and the minister must give a strong reason as to how it is against public interest before he refuses to submit these documents to parliament. The minister has asked why parliament should know. Well, suppose the shareholders of the company meet the directors knowing the directors have certain information, the shareholders have the right to ask for that information and the directors are bound to give it. In a way the ministers are the directors and the representative of the people in parliament are the shareholders. They are heavily interested shareholders, not merely in a matter of public policy, but as supplying the money, and they are absolute partners, building a large portion of a railroad, a mile of which they would not build unless the whole when completed was so located that it would serve the best interests of the Dominion. It is the partners to-night that ask for the information and they say to their servant: You have had that information for eight months, you have never done anything with it, perhaps we could give you some valuable suggestions, but any way as partners and shareholders we have a right to know what it is.

Mr. EMMERSON. Parliament did not make us partners in sharing the responsibility as to the approval of the plans; the law makes that personal to the minister.

Mr. FOSTER. Parliament is not asking you to forego your duty to approve of the plans which the law casts upon you. We simply say that you have been guilty of unpardonable delay in locking these plans up for eight months without doing the duty the law places on you. No man who understands constitutional practise or the rights of parliament would deny the absolute right of parliament to make the minister bring down the papers which he has in his possession. No international question involving grave consequences is hidden herein; it is simply a question of practical business. And now, to answer the question as to what good is to be served by it, the minister will not contend that he has more wisdom than parliament. He says, I am keeping my hand on the plans until I approve of them—what for? To fix as far as I can fix for ever, the location, terminals, main lines, branches, everything. Is nobody interested in these things but the minister? Is not the parliament quite as wise as the minister? Bring down the plans, and it may be that parliament will have something to say as to the location of the terminals on her western coast. It certainly has the right to assume that it would be as wise about the location as a single man, and that, representing all parts of the Dominion, it might be wiser than the single man, its servant.

Mr. GALLIHER. Why does parliament give the right to the single man?

Mr. FOSTER. Parliament gives to the single man the duty of approving, always, as in every other case of ministerial responsibility, under the idea that parliament is over and above the minister. If the minister will not do his duty, and for eight months refuses to do it, that of itself is quite reason enough why parliament should say, let the plans be brought down that we may have a look at them and may be give good advice to the minister. But on the ground of constitutional practice and right, how can the minister or his government refuse to give to parliament the documents that are there? I do not think there is any question about it at all, and the minister has certainly not given any grounds of public interest which would be strong enough to substantially prevent their being brought down; at least I have not heard them so far.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, we have been a little over-balanced as regards the number of lawyers on the other side of the House. Probably, having reference to the argument which the hon. member from Kootenay (Mr. Galliher) addressed to the House in reference to the statute, it may not be improper to refer for a moment or two to the subject under discussion. Now, the point seems to be just this: There is nothing in the statute that says there is to be any secrecy about these proceedings; there is no law which makes it so, and it is therefore a question whether it is better that the public business should be transacted in secret, or that, so far as it is convenient and easy, it should be transacted in the open. What the motion is asking is that parliament, being now assembled, and being interested in this matter, the representatives of the people shall have a right to look over what is now before the Minister of Railways, and if these representatives can give any suggestions or advice which may be usefully followed, the minister shall have the opportunity of hearing them. I am glad the hon. member for Kootenay has referred to the statute. There is nothing very new in that statute. Section 122 does not enact a new law. We had that section substantially in 1888; we had it before that, for how long I do not know, but it is well enough to look at this section and see just where we are:

> The company shall prepare a map showing the general location of the proposed line of railway, the termini, and the principal towns and places through which the railway is to pass, giving the names thereof, the railways, navigable streams and tide water, if any, to be crossed by the railway, and such as may be within a radius of thirty miles of the proposed railway.

When we pay attention to the wording of this section, does it require any elaborate argument to convice the minister that it is important in the interest of the public, is it not abundantly clear that it is incumbent on the minister to make the railway application known as soon as possible? Why, Sir, could anything be more monstrous than the proposition that this railway may be proposing to cross another railway or a navigable river in a way most detrimental to the public interest, and that until the matter is finally decided by the minister, he is to keep it a secret to himself, and the public is to have no knowledge of it? If what the minister says in regard to the members of this House is true, it must be true, also with regard to another railway which this railway proposes to cross, and yet, if the minister is correct, he has to lock up the plan in his department, and seal it so that nobody can see it. The other railways that are interested can know nothing about it, and only when he has finally decided it is to become public. I submit that instead of it being a matter of good policy to keep this matter a secret, it is absolutely incumbent, in the great majority of instances, such as those I have referred to, to make it known. In the case of the railway crossing a navigable river, it would be most important that the public, who are interested in the locality, and who knows it as the minister cannot, should be able to come and say: Where it is proposed to cross this river is the most unsuitable place that could be selected; we can point out another and much better place. There may be great public interests to be served by the line going in a different direction from what you propose. Then, it is provided that there shall be an application for the approval of the map. That is to be public and not private, I presume, and the parties interested may be heard on that application. An application does not mean, I submit, something done in a hole or corner in the dark, behind the public, but something that is open and above board. When that application is made, all parties who are interested come and make their representations before the minister, and whether he is bound to follow these representations or not, he is bound to hear them. That is the second step. The third step is to approve of the map or its alteration, if he thinks it should be altered, as provided for in the statute. When that is approved, the fourth step is then taken and the completed plan—not map—and profiles book of reference are filed with the department and become binding. It is unfortunate that this administration has taken to itself the idea that they must act in secret, that they must form their opinions in secret, and then push through their decisions by strength of numbers.

Mr. EMMERSON. Does the hon. gentleman contend that the approval cannot be ex parte but must be upon notice?

Mr. LENNOX. I do not say that the approval cannot be ex parte, but I say that

the statute contemplates that it shall not be in secret. In the case of crossing a navigable river or another railway or through a thickly populated district, it is not to be secret, and it would not be in the public interest that it should be. In the cases I have mentioned, it would be necessary to hear the parties interested before coming to a final determination.

Mr. GALLIHER. Does the statute contemplate that before a minister decides to approve or disapprove a plan, he must give a hearing to parties interested throughout the country ?

Mr. LENNOX. There must be some discretion left to the minister. If you are going through an open prairie, where there is little or no settlement, it would not be reasonable to expect the minister to consult every farmer across whose land the line might run. But in the case of crossing a navigable stream or another railway or through a thickly settled district, town or city, the public interest demands that the public should have some means of making itself heard before a decision is to come. How long is the minister to keep these plans secret? Does he mean to say that when he has these plans before him for months, he has the right to refuse to give parliament any knowledge of them? It seems to me that the public interest would be much better served by having these papers brought down now and letting the public know what is going on than by keeping them secret and allowing the railway company to give information about them to speculators so as to enable these speculators to get in on the ground floor.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria). At the time this Act was being passed to which my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) has referred, the chief argument advanced in its favour was that these plans should be made public so that the people along the various lines might know where the terminals were to be and take action to have their location changed, if they were not located where they ought to be in the public interest. The hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Galliher) himself cited an instance in which a railway company gave some little town along its line the go-by and built their station away outside of it in order to play into the hands of the speculators or gratify some grudge against the people of that town.

Mr. GALLIHER. In that case it was a town established by the government and which the government should protect.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That makes no difference; it only proves my point. The chief argument advanced in favour of the clause referred to, is that it was in the public interest that the public should know where these stations and crossings should be, so that they might agitate to have them changed, if desirable, before the plans were confirmed.

Mr. EMMERSON. The map and plan generally filed for the approval of the minister is simply the general route. The question of locating the stations and of special location comes under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The Railway Commission was not in existence when this law was passed.

Mr. EMMERSON. Oh, yes it was.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). I wish to point out, Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. BOYCE. I could point out one hon. member on the other side now calling out 'question,' who seems to occupy his place, I am sorry to say, largely as what is commonly known as a 'rooter.' He has heard no portion of this debate ; he has been in the House but a few moments ; yet he interrupts the discussion of this subject by gentlemen who have given it careful attention by crying 'question.' I was proceeding to say that the Minister of Railways takes his ground—and it seems a somewhat extraordinary one—that, whereas the depositing of a map or plan in his department by a railway company, which may traverse Dominion lands, navigable streams or tidal waters, whereas that plan may be deposited in his department, and is only subject to his approval, no hon. member of this House has any right to raise his voice and call for the production of that plan in order that the course of that line may be determined and may be the subject of discussion on the floor of this House until, forsooth, that plan has been approved and made binding and filed in the department as the actual location of that railway. And, if that be his position—and I cannot take any other meaning from the proposition he lays down —then it is an absolutely untenable and—I say with great respect for the minister and only with regard to the subject under discussion—absurd proposition, having regard to the law as it stands. It must be clear to every hon. member of this House that, from the very inception of the plan of a projected railway until it is filed in the registry office, it must be a public act. Otherwise it could not be the subject of a statutory enactment or be made the subject of approval and criticism that is provided for in this Act. Is the minister alone, without advice from parliament or his colleagues, to judge of the course of that line ? Is he to be alone the judge of the navigable rivers and streams, the Dominion public lands and the provincial public lands which it shall traverse in its course ? Surely the minister cannot read in section 122 any such meaning as that,

when the very words used in the Act themselves negative any such meaning.

But, Sir, the matter has been much debated, and I do not desire to take up the time of the House by further pressing my views. The question is, the minister having sealed these plans, when does he propose to unseal them? On the 2nd of August and on the 12th of December he tells us applications were made—not that the filing of the plans took place on these dates, but that applications were then made—to approve the plans. And, answering a question, he says they have not been approved of because it is premature to approve of them. Yet, by the terms of this enactment, this national transcontinental line we see by section 8 of the agreement, the construction cannot be commenced, and the time does not commence to run until the hon. gentleman sees fit to approve of these plans so carefully sealed up in the department, as he thinks. What does that mean? Is it possible that it is premature for the hon. gentleman to consider the plans because he does not want the time to run for construction? If there is a reasonable suspicion, from the circumstances, that that is the case, is it competent or not competent for parliament to inquire into the matter and to call for the plans which the minister admits are the subject of application for approval and which, after eight months have rolled by, are still under seal and have not even been considered by him? Is it competent or not competent for parliament to call upon him to say why he has not unsealed these plans, and what is the difficulty in the way of approving them?

I am not content to remain in the somewhat invidious position in which the minister leaves me with regard to the statement I made that information concerning the course of this railway had filtered out through his department. I desire to make myself plain to the minister, and hope that he will not misunderstand me. I do not say for a moment that the information of which I have spoken was obtained from any other source than from the Department of Railways and Canals. That information leaked out through his department. I leave it for the House to say whether the hon. gentleman has dealt with that assertion as made this evening, and as made on previous occasions, with the seriousness that he attributed to it, and that the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) attributed to it the other afternoon, when the insinuation was first made across the floor of the House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) called upon me, as he did when the matter was last under consideration, to specify, to give the names of persons and to give the facts which are within my own knowledge. I state now to the hon. gentleman, as I think I stated then, that, although I am a young member of this House, I have learned enough of the ways of the House, and of the necessities of the occasion, and of the way in which information of that kind is made use of, to know that the assertion upon my responsibility as a member is, at any rate, enough for the present, until hon. gentlemen opposite see fit to attach to my assertion the importance which it deserves, and which they admit it deserves. They have called upon me to retract that assertion. I say I do not retract it. I say that it is a correct assertion, and that the state of affairs is as I have given it. Whereas the information contained in these plans is withheld from this House, and whereas the hon. gentleman who now occupies the position of Minister of Railways and Canals states, in accordance with the principle and policy laid down by him, and contrary, I believe, at least to the spirit of the Act, that these plans shall not be produced and information contained in them shall not be made public, the information contained in those plans, either through negligence or by direct and wilful act on the part of some one in the department—to which I have never alleged the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) was privy—has leaked out, that it has gone forth to the world and has been made use of, and made use of by persons and corporations for the very purpose which the hon. gentleman said, when the matter was first mentioned, was the reason the plans were withheld. Now, there is a time for making these explanations; there is a time and a season for satisfying the hon. gentleman that I am right and that he is mistaken. He knows how to proceed; he knows the course to follow. He can instruct me in that course. But I must say, with the utmost deference to the hon. gentleman, that I do not agree with him that it would be a proper parliamentary course for me to adopt—and I say this with much diffidence—to lay before him or to state across this floor, all the particulars that have come to my knowledge and which afford the most abundant evidence, incontrovertible evidence, that there has existed a leak in the Department of Railways and Canals with regard to these sealed-up plans.

There is the statement of the hon. gentleman, and it is a significant one, that he was first told that these plans had been deposited, and he was consulted in reference to them and was asked by his deputy whether information could be given out with respect to them. Why, Sir, is it possible that these were the only plans of a railway that had ever been deposited in the department, and that the deputy minister had never seen before a plan deposited in that department and did not know the regulations? If it was a principle of the department that nobody was to be allowed to see these plans, would it be necessary for the gentleman who has occupied the position of deputy minister for so many years, to go to his chief and ask whe-

ther any one could see those plans ; and if it were necessary to ask that question, what made it necessary, except that some one was looking for information contained in the plans and had gone to the deputy minister to ask for the information, and out of that fact had arisen the necessity for the inquiry. At what stage would it be premature for the hon. gentleman to approve of these plans or to investigate them ? Can it be said to be contemplated by section 122 of the Railway Act that the minister, the moment he gets the plans that are to be prepared under that section, can seal them up so that neither he, nor his colleagues, nor parliament, nor the railway company themselves can see them or inspect them ? If that be so for a period of seven months, why may it not be so for ten years ? I hope the hon gentleman will accede to the reasonable request from this side of the House, and will show cogent reasons why, at any rate, he should not loosen, with regard to these particular plans, that principle which he says has been inaugurated in his department, and that he will see his way to allow this motion to pass.

Mr. FOSTER. Just one word more, if the House will allow me. If the First Minister were here I would make an appeal to him with reference to the principle involved in this matter ; as he is not here, and the Minister of Finance I imagine, is leading the House, I will say to him that I think it would be a pity if affirmation were to be made that the House assembled here has not a right to have a document such as this brought down if it wishes it. If this motion is negatived, of course it will affirm that principle. I call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that I do not think any real reason has been given why the public interest would be harmed if they were brought down at once. Then if we have not a reason given, is it not rather perilous to affirm a principle which in effect would be this, that the House is not master of the documents which one of its servants, in the form of a member of the government, has in his possession, and has kept sealed in his possession for months ?

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid that I cannot agree with my hon. friend that the House is about to affirm any dangerous principle. Certainly that is not our intention ; nor is it the intention of this House to affirm the principle that parliament has not a right to every public document in relation to all public affairs. But it is a question of discretion. It is a constant practice for a minister, here and elsewhere, when a motion is made for papers, to say that in his judgment it is not wise to submit those papers to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that sufficient without a reason ?

Mr. FIELDING. The minister has given a reason. My hon. friend may not accept the reason. For myself I would say that any unfinished transaction might not necessarily be a proper matter to submit to the House. Any matter which is pending and left unfinished might properly be withheld from the knowledge of the public until the discussion is completed. In that aspect of the question, the minister does not say that the House has no right to these papers, he simply says that in his judgment, and for the reasons he has given, he thinks it would not be wise to bring these papers down at the present time. There is no danger in affirming a principle of that character. We are only affirming what is done in all parliaments under the British system for reasons which, in the mind of the minister, he deems to be sufficient. Sometimes hon. gentlemen might regard them as insufficient, but that is always a matter of opinion and judgment.

Motion negatived on division.

PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY IN THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES—PRESENTATION OF DOCUMENTS.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The House will hardly desire to proceed further with the Orders. Before moving the adjournment, if any hon. gentleman has nothing else to bring up, I desire to submit some papers to the House. I lay on the table a copy of the School Ordinances of the Northwest Territories, chaps. 29, 30 and 31, passed in 1901. I also lay on the table a memorandum giving a summary of legislation relating to subsidies to the provinces. These are documents which have been asked for by hon. gentlemen opposite. They are both printed, and will be in the distribution office to-night or to-morrow morning. I have sufficient copies to-night to hand a few around. I also submit a statement showing the areas of the provisional districts of the Northwest Territories, and other information with respect to lands in the Northwest Territories, numbers of settlers and so forth, these being papers which were asked for. They are not in printed form, and I think it would be better to suspend the rule at once and ask the House to agree to have them printed. I would therefore move that the rule be suspended for the purpose of having these printed.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that all ? Is there nothing else to come before the House in connection with the Northwest Territories ?—Because the First Minister promised that before the sitting closed we would have something with regard to amendments to the Bill.

Mr. FIELDING. Immediately on the adjournment I will send to my hon. friend a copy of the amendment, which will be placed on the notice paper. I do not think I

need to read it, but I will furnish my hon. friend at once with a copy.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 21, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

VACANCY.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that my attention having been called, by the hon. member for Toronto North, in his place, to the fact of the demise of Edward Frederick Clarke, Esq., member for the electoral district of Toronto Centre, I have, in accordance with section 8 of chapter 13 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

THE TELEPHONE QUESTION.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General moved :

That Messrs. Bergeron and Geoffrion be added to the committee appointed on Friday last to consider the telephone question.

Motion agreed to.

PACKING AND SALE OF CERTAIN COMMODITIES.

Bill (No. 121) to amend the Act respecting the packing and sale of staple commodities —Mr. Fisher—read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1—dimensions of apple boxes, penalty ; certain packages excepted.

Mr. HENDERSON. I regret that I am again obliged to enter my strongest protest against the passage of this Bill in the form in which it is at present worded. I do not conceive that it is in the interests of the trade of Canada that the Bill should be so worded. The hon. minister has told the House in discussing the resolution on which this Bill is founded that the fruit associations of this country have described the size of box in which apples should be packed for export. I think the minister should have laid upon the table of the House some resolution of some fruit association to show us where the authority came from for fixing the special size of box which is prescribed in this Bill. In sections of the country where the fruit industry is extensively carried on there is a very strong protest against the size of box here prescribed, and it is the more strange to me that the hon. minister should have given us that information, inasmuch as the gentlemen from whom I obtained information are members of fruit associations, and no doubt were present at some of those meetings when the matter of the size of the apple box was discussed. The difference between the minister and myself is this : I have proposed that a box should be designated in the Act, the size of which would be some well known quantity. For example, I suggested that the box should contain one-quarter of a barrel. The standard barrel of apples is a well known measure. In the old country apples are sold by the barrel, and people there understand what a barrel of apples is. We have fixed by law the size of a barrel of apples and the quantity is known amongst us—and, I believe, correctly—as three bushels. If we are going to authorize the shipment of apples in boxes containing less than a barrel, I contend that these boxes should contain some well defined, specific quantity that would be well understood by the purchaser in the old country. The box defined by the Minister of Agriculture is a nondescript box which represents practically nothing specific. It is not one-fourth of a barrel ; it is not one-third of a barrel ; it is no definite fraction of a barrel that the people will understand. It is less than one-third of a barrel and it is larger than one-quarter of a barrel. To my mind, the box that would hold one-quarter of a barrel would be a very much better package than one that contains no definite fraction of a barrel. When this matter was last discussed, the Minister of Agriculture almost insinuated that my object in advocating a smaller box was that the shippers in this country might take advantage of the buyers in the old country and sell them a smaller quantity with a view of enhancing the price. I had no such intention or thought, but I do tell the minister that the use of the box which he has described will have the effect of defrauding the people of the old country. The purchaser will naturally ask how much there is in the box, and he will be told it is a bushel, or one-third of a barrel, when, as a matter of fact, it is not.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How much is it short ?

Mr. HENDERSON. It is very considerably short. The minister shakes his head, but I can tell him that he is all wrong ; he has taken his information from young men, who have not the experience of practical men in the business, who have investigated the matter. Three boxes of the size prescribed in this Bill will not fill a barrel ; a fact which has been demonstrated by practical test. The box which the minister proposes will contain the contents in cubic inches of one-third of a barrel, but he forgets that there is much waste of space when you pack three or four packages instead of one barrel, there being a large amount

of space in each package that is not filled and you would require three packages, each containing a larger cubic space than exactly one-third of a barrel, to give the quantity of fruit that would go into one barrel. There is where the difference comes in, and whether the package is square or round it matters not. In the section of the country in which I live the people have practically tested this. They commenced with a large box and they kept reducing it in size until they discovered a box that would practically hold exactly one fourth of a barrel. The minister has failed to make allowance for the greater waste of space in three smaller packages as compared with one large package. It is not a good plan for us to legalize what I call a nondescript box ; a box that will not hold one-third of a barrel and which holds more than one-fourth of a barrel. If the seller tells the buyer that this package contains one-third of a barrel that statement is untrue. It contains the cubic capacity of one-third of a barrel but it does not contain one-third of the quantity of apples that would go into a barrel and so a fraud will be perpetrated. I again appeal to the Minister of Agriculture that he should not destroy the trade, because the adoption of this box will certainly have that effect. In a couple of years the people of the old land will discover that a fraud is being practiced upon them ; that they are not getting the quantity of apples they expected to get, and consequently the Canadian apple trade will be injuriously affected. Surely the minister can avail himself of further information for the purpose of determining the size of a box that will contain exactly what it is represented to contain. I believe that the box which the minister proposes is too large, and I would rather favour a reduction in its size. If the minister prescribes a box that will contain a full quarter of a barrel, it would be very much better for the apple trade generally, This package, which the minister provides for in the Bill, is going to be detrimental to the apple shippers as a whole, and it is going to be peculiarly detrimental to those in my section of the country who now use a box of a certain size, and who will have to change the size of the box and educate the people of the old country up to the change from the now customary sized box. I trust the minister will not press the measure without satisfying himself that the box he prescribes does contain one-third of a barrel, and that it is therefore such a box as can be used without giving any unfair advantage either to the buyer or to the seller.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not agree with my hon. friend from Halton, that this Bill, is going to injure the trade of the country. I understand that this box is exactly one-third of a barrel, but that when you empty a barrel of apples into three of these boxes they would contain about three ordinary sized apples less than the contents of the barrel. That would not be a very serious injury to the trade. The Minister of Agriculture deserves a great deal of credit for introducing a Bill of this kind. I have had a great deal of experience in furnishing packages in which to ship apples, and I know that during the last few years the apple trade has been injuriously affected because of the defective barrels in which the apples were shipped. The barrel when it is dry is taken into the orchard, and, if it gets wet the staves swell, the hoops burst and the barrel is liable to fall to pieces. Last year many apple barrels were made out of green timber, and I venture to say that when they reached the old country many of them were broken to pieces. That injures the sale of our fruit in the old country, and therefore I say that the minister is to be congratulated on attempting to provide a proper package. In the contruction of boxes it matters very little whether the material is dry or green, because when properly put together the box is not liable to be broken, and besides that, boxes will pack closer than barrels on ship-board, the consequence of which is that they will occupy less space and the freight rates on apples will be less than they are to-day. I think, therefore, this proposition, instead of being an injury, would be a great benefit to the trade.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) has appealed to me not to put this Bill through. He says I have spoken of resolutions which he has not yet had an opportunity of knowing or seeing. I have those resolutions under my hand, and I will take the opportunity of reading them to the hon. gentleman.

The fruit growers of British Columbia, where they use the box exclusively, have discussed the question of the size of boxes frequently at their associations for a number of years. At their annual meeting in 1902 they reaffirmed a resolution adopting the size 10 in. x 11 in. x 20 in. In the years 1903 and 1904 no objection was made to these dimensions and the conclusion is that, all things considered, this box is satisfactory.

The Ontario Fruit Growers' Association discussed the matter at their annual meeting in Walkerton, in December, 1902, but decided that the matter might stand over for one year, during which time a committee appointed for the purpose would secure all the evidence and experience of Ontario shippers and submit it at the annual meeting in 1903. The committee met during the fruit season in St. Catharines and Grimsby and considered a large number of different sized boxes in the packing houses. They also conducted a wide correspondence upon the subject and submitted their report at the Leamington meeting in November, 1903.

The following resolution was passed at that meeting :

Your committee would recommend that the Canadian commercial apple box be one of which the cubic contents are about one-third of the Canadian commercial apple barrel, and measuring inside ten inches deep, eleven inches wide and twenty inches long ; and that the Canadian pear box be one-half the capacity and one-half the depth of the apple box ; and that the secretary communicate with the secretaries of the fruit-growers' associations of the other provinces in reference to uniformity in this matter.

This motion, moved by E. D. Smith, M.P., and seconded by Wm. Rickard, M.P.P., was unanimously carried.

In December, 1903, at Hemmingford, the Quebec Pomological Society passed the following resolution :

That we recognize the necessity of having boxes of uniform size for the exportation of apples, and recommend the trial of the size mentioned, viz., 10-inch by 11-inch by 20-inch.

This motion was carried unanimously.

In January, 1904, the Nova Scotia Fruit Growers' Association met at Bridgewater, N.S., and passed a resolution recommending that the box 10 x 11 x 20 be adopted as the standard box for Nova Scotia. This motion was moved by Secretary S. C. Parker and seconded by G. H. Vroom, and carried unanimously.

In February, 1904, the Prince Edward Island Fruit Growers' Association met at Charlottetown, and the following resolution was passed :

That this association formally adopt the box package 10 x 11 x 20 inches (inside measurement) as recommended by Chief MacKinnon, and already adopted by the associations of Nova Scotia, Ontario, Quebec and British Columbia.

These resolutions are clear and definite, and they give the dimensions which are provided in this Bill. So far as the fruit growers are concerned, there is no question as to this matter ; and I may say, in reply to my hon. friend, that these associations are composed not only of fruit growers, but of a large number of other people who are interested in the fruit trade ; and at these meetings none of the objections put forward by my hon. friend were mentioned. At any rate, there is no record of them, as these resolutions were passed unanimously. I take the following passage from the address of Inspector Maxwell Smith before the British Columbia Fruit Growers' Association :

This package, measuring 10 x 11 x 20 inside, is the box that has been recommended by your association for a number of years, and which has also been endorsed by the Ontario Fruit Growers' Association at its meeting in Leamington about two months ago. So we are making some progress towards a uniform box.

There has been a demand for a uniform box, and the size provided in the Bill is that which has been unanimously endorsed by these people as the best one to adopt. I appreciate fully that there may be some slight diversity of view ; but at the meetings where the people particularly interested discussed these questions, those diverse views were either not brought forward at all or were not supported sufficiently to enable them to be put on record. Let me give one or two other statements in regard to this. Mr. Brandritk, the secretary of the British Columbia Fruit Growers' Association, says :

This association recommends a box having a capacity of 20 x 10 x 11, inside measurements, and we are of the opinion that having always used boxes we are in a better position to advise as to the requirements than our eastern friends can be. However, what we want is a lawful standard box, as at present anything is a box of apples, from 35 to 50 pounds.

Mr. G. W. Hunt, the manager of the Ottawa Fruit Exchange, says that the 'Ontario Fruit Growers' Association cannot do better than join with the other provincial associations in recommending the size 10 x 11 x 20.' He also says : 'Growers have resorted to all manner of packages, we have received this year (1903) boxes ranging in size from 18 inches long, 10 inches deep and 12 inches wide to dry goods cases containing about two barrels and a half.'

Now, I want to quote just one other thing, which is a fair discussion of this whole question. This is an extract from a letter of Mr. G. W. Hunt, of the Ottawa Fruit Exchange, a gentleman who has handled a great deal of fruit as a business man :

Growers have resorted to all manner of packages this year. We have received boxes ranging in size from 10 x 12 x 18 to dry goods cases, containing about two barrels and a half. I would recommend a medium size, holding as nearly as possible one bushel. This package would be very convenient for more reasons than one. The principal one that I would mention here is the fact that a great number of our Fameuse or snow apples go to the United States, and if we use a bushel box we pay duty for that and no more, but if the box holds less than a bushel we pay for a bushel anyway, and the duty is 25 cents a box.

Mr. Vroom, fruit inspector, having examined the London market in regard to the number of different boxes, says :

I heard a great many complaints about the Canadian box on account of the variation in the size. A box containing forty pounds is about the right size for the English market.

Not many boxes are wanted for the export apple trade. In fact, only a few choice apples should be shipped in boxes. The barrel is the proper package for the great bulk of Canadian apples.

Mr. Russell, a very large dealer in Glasgow, writes as follows :

In regard to packing of apples in boxes I consider this package should only be used for No.

1 fruit, as the demand for apples packed in this way is only for better class trade, and, in fact, anything apart from really fancy stock sells as well if not better, in barrels than in boxes. This package should weigh on an average from 50 to 54 pounds gross, and the use of Excelsior among the apples (unless for soft varieties) should be discontinued.

The 20 x 11 x 10 box is what is commonly known as the California package, and is adopted almost universally there. Mr. Wm. Wilson, the proprietor and inventor of the Wilson case, also a packer and shipper, says :

One-quarter-barrel-case, 18 x 12 x 9, holds just 28 quarts, or about 40 pounds of apples, and is equal to one-quarter barrel of 112 quarts, the former size of the barrels, and, while 18 x 12 x 9 is a very economical size case for packing apples, it has no exact proportionate relation, either to the standard bushel or barrel of to-day.

One standard bushel case can be made for twelve cents, whereas the quarter-barrel costs ten cents.

The cost of dock dues in Britain is charged per package, within certain limits, so that bushel cases would cost same as quarter-barrels.

One bushel, being a standard measurement everywhere, as well as an exact proportion of a barrel, is, therefore, the only proper standard for a national package, whereas calculations made by the quarter-barrel would only produce confusion and friction between buyer and seller.

Half-bushel cases are also very convenient, and in exact proportion for the finer fruits.

Bushel cases have an advantage over barrels in ocean freight, for while five barrels are charged as one cubic ton, it takes about twenty-four bushel-cases to make forty cubic feet.

My hon. friend will see that what I stated in general terms before the committee is endorsed by the resolutions passed by these various associations. My hon. friend must not suppose that I was casting any reflection on those he represents, when I said there was difficulty in the English market because the people there did not know what they were getting when they got a Canadian box of apples. There is a temptation no doubt, when selling by the box, to sell as small a quantity as possible, and therefore it is in the interest of the trade that a minimum standard should be fixed for Canadian boxes just as for Canadian barrels. Everybody knows when he buys a Canadian barrel what he is getting, but he does not when he buys a Canadian box.

Mr. HENDERSON. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman as to the desirability of having a standard box, but I do not regard the standard he prescribes as a suitable size inasmuch as it does not contain the one-third of a barrel, which is the well understood measure in the old country. The hon. minister will not undertake to say that the box prescribed in this Bill will hold a bushel of apples or one third of a barrel.

Mr. FISHER. My information is distinctly that three of these boxes will not fill a barrel, so that each must hold less than a bushel. On the other hand, four boxes such as I have described will fill a barrel completely. When the apples are sold, the purchaser will inquire how much the box contains, and when told that it contains a quarter of a barrel he will understand exactly what quantity he is getting. On the other hand if he is told that it contains a bushel and then finds it does not, he will consider that he has been deceived. I notice that some of the resolutions read in this way. They approve of the box recommended by Mr. McKinnon, but how do we know that Mr. McKinnon ever tested the box so as to see whether it really contained a bushel or not ? We have no information that he did and no guarantee that the box will contain one-third of a barrel. There is nothing to be gained by rushing this Bill through, and I would suggest that the minister should take a standard barrel of apples and three boxes of the capacity prescribed in this Bill and see whether the contents of the three boxes will fill the barrel. If they do, then I shall withdraw my objection. But I think he will find that the barrel will be short, not merely three or four apples, as the hon. member for York (Mr. A. Campbell) says, but more than a pailful.

Mr. FISHER. I have not myself measured the boxes, but I take the statement of those who have. Of course, if you take three or four small packages and then take a large package, which is the multiple of them, you will get a little more into the large package than you can into the individual small ones. If you take a very large apple like the Alexander, you will find that they measure differently in the barrel from the small apples. The larger the individual fruit, the greater the air space between them and the greater the difficulty of packing them into a small package.

Mr. HENDERSON. There would be a difference in weight.

Mr. FISHER. Certainly, according to the variety of apples. You could not take weight for a standard at all.

Mr. BLAIN. How will those boxes be stamped as regards the quality of the apple ?

Mr. FISHER. There is nothing about that in this Bill.

Mr. BLAIN. How will the purchaser know whether the box contains number one or number two apples ?

Mr. FISHER. They have to be stamped under the Fruit Marks Act just as a barrel or any other package.

Mr. BLAIN. The Fruit Marks Act will apply to the box the same as to the barrel.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will these boxes be marked '$\frac{1}{3}$ barrel' or '1 bushel'?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think that, as a matter of fact, these boxes are marked as to their capacity. It is simply a Canadian box of apples, and the box used will be a standard box. At present they use any size they choose.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member said that a box would contain a bushel of apples. If the statement of my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) be correct, three of these boxes of apples will not fill a barrel, but it will take a pailful or more in addition to the contents of three of these boxes to fill a barrel. If that is the case, we shall get the name of playing sharp with our English cousins by adopting this size of box. I think the minister should accept the proposition of the hon. member for Halton and put this Bill off until to-morrow, and, in the meantime let the test be made. If the statement submitted to the House by the hon. member for Halton is correct—and it is made on the authority of an apple packer and shipper—the condition of affairs is a serious one, and this House should hesitate before passing this legislation. But if the minister is right, and if the apples that fill three of these boxes will, with the addition of two or three apples, fill a standard barrel, that fact can be shown by the practical test and no harm will come from delaying this Bill for twenty-four hours.

Mr. FISHER. I explained to the committee that three of these boxes, probably would not hold quite so many apples as a standard barrel will.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will there be the difference of a pailful?

Mr. FISHER. There will not.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) says there will, and he has shown that the statement is made on high authority. Why not make the test?

Mr. FISHER. The test has been made, and the difference has been shown to be only two or three apples.

Mr. MILLER. I do not think it makes any difference whether the statement made to the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) and by him submitted to the House is correct or not. Whether the box of apples holds one-third of a barrel or not, so long as the size is fixed, it can be bought and sold as a standard Canadian box of apples. In Canada we know that, throughout the season, strawberries are sold in boxes said to contain a quart. We know they do not contain a quart, but we can see what they do contain, and any difference does not affect the strawberry trade. In the same way, the standard will be fixed for the Canadian box of apples, and when the customer buys a box of apples he will not consider whether that box is one-third of a bushel or not.

Mr. HENDERSON. I may tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller) that he may get into trouble if he undertakes to sell strawberries in a box containing less than a quart each, for that is the standard size.

On section 2,—commencement of Act:

Mr. FISHER. According to the printed Bill this Act is to come into force on January 1, 1906. I have stated that we do not wish the standard to apply to the present season's trade. The 1st of January next will be too early, and so I wish to change the date to 1st June, 1906. That will enable the trade of the coming season to be worked off.

Mr. HENDERSON. Could not the minister extend it to 1st of January, 1907, and so give an opportunity to men who have provided themselves with a large quantity of box-material to use that material and not be compelled to lose it? For, of course, this material must be given time to season, and so a stock of it must be laid in in advance. Why not postpone the coming into force of the Bill and not put these people to too great loss?

Mr. FISHER. January 1st is not a good date for the trade, and it is in the interest of the trade I am speaking. The apples are packed, of course, in the late summer and fall and are sold all through the winter. If the Bill were brought into force on 1st January, part of the crop might be sold in the way they have been sold hitherto, while the other part would come under the provisions of this Bill.

Mr. HENDERSON. Half a loaf is better than no bread.

Mr. FISHER. I think that if they work off this season's crop, they will have all the opportunity necessary, and by fixing the time for the Bill to come into force at 1st June, 1906, they will have an opportunity to work off the whole crop.

Amendment agreed to.

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

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Lighthouse and coast service—construction of lighthouses and aids to navigation, including apparatus $500,000.

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). There are some points on which the committee at its last sitting required information. I have

that information now. The first point was as to the Lurcher lightship :—

This lightship was built at the Polson Iron Works, Toronto, under contract, for the work on the Lurcher Shoal, about 16 miles WSW. of Yarmouth, N.S. It was absolutely necessary that this vessel should be on her station during the winter of 1903, and to enable her to do this she had to leave Toronto before the work was quite completed. She had a very hard time indeed in getting through the ice, &c., of the canals as far as Quebec; in fact, had it not been for the work of Mr. B. H. Fraser, assistant chief engineer of the department, she could not have got through even as far as Quebec.

The captain, officers and crew were sent up from Yarmouth to meet her in Quebec, and after provisioning she left that place at six o'clock in the morning of the eighth of December, being the very last ship to leave the port of Quebec that year.

Mr. Douglas Stevens, government steamboat inspector, and one of the most well known, trusted and efficient in Canada, under whose superintendence this vessel was built, left her in Quebec, with captain Koenig, of the D. G. S. 'Druid', who took charge of her on her way down. The lightship encountered very heavy gales of wind and steamed through 280 miles of packed ice before arriving at Summerside, Prince Edward Island. Naturally, encountering this ice knocked her out very considerably, and on arriving at Halifax, here she proceeded after provisioning and coaling at Summerside, a certain amount of repairs had to be done. These repairs were done under the superintendence of Mr. Douglas Stevens, and Mr. Salmon, who at that time was not busily engaged in the department, was sent down to correct her compasses and to see her moored on her station. After the repairs had been finished as speedily as posible in Halifax, the lightship left that port for her station and Mr. Salmon, for personal reasons, did not go and moor her in her proper position, but returned to Ottawa. She was placed on her station by the departmental officers in Halifax, in what they considered the best possible way, taking into consideration that the shipping interests had been informed that the lightship should be in her position on a certain date, and the shortness of time at their disposal.

In reference to mooring the 'Lurcher' on this occasion, it must be borne in mind that this is the first proper lightship the government have ever had. That her station is probably the most exposed point on the whole American continent, being exposed to the entire sweep of the Atlantic, and the tides and rips of the Bay of Fundy. United States lightships in various places are continually breaking away from their moorings, and the same thing occurs on the English coast. On this occasion the 'Lurcher' after being on her station a short time, broke away and had to steam into Yarmouth harbour. Mr. Salmon was again sent down from Ottawa to Yarmouth to have this lightship properly moored, but instead of going out on the vessel and mooring her in her proper position, he remained in Yarmouth a few days, and for private and personal reasons again returned to Montreal, without seeing the vessel properly moored. He then proceeded to write a most scathing and unwarranted memorandum on the work performed by Inspector Douglas Stevens. This report was so absolutely incorrect and so ridiculous, that the department took no notice of it; it simply showed Mr. Salmon's entire ignorance of the matter.

The Lurcher lightship, as well as the Anticosti lightship, are acknowledged by experts everywhere to be two of the best vessels of their class ever built, and it was simply owing to Mr. Salmon not carrying out his instructions when sent down on two occasions, but returning for private reasons of his own, without seeing the vessel properly moored, that she broke adrift.

Since that time the Lurcher has been moored under the direction of Commander Spain, and a plan of the manner in which she is moored is attached. She has withstood this season the heaviest gales that have been experienced on the Nova Scotia coast for the last thirty years, and is still moored in her place, and on Commander Spain visiting her some three weeks ago, she was in her proper position and not likely to break adrift again.

This is only another case of insubordination on the part of Mr. Salmon in not carrying out his instructions, and after being unfortunate enough to be connected officially with the man for some time, I quite agree with the opinion of a very well known master mariner, who having had dealings with Mr. Salmon and speaking of him as a seaman, referred to him as a combination of ignorance, arrogance and pomposity, with ignorance predominating.

Commander Spain shows how she is moored now, and how she has remained in her place without moving any way from that time.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the minister laid on the table the report of Captain Salmon, which was asked for some days ago ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It was considered perfectly worthless.

Mr. BLAIN. It seems to me rather a strange attitude for the minister to assume to read a statement criticising a gentleman's conduct as an employee of his department, and at the same time refuse to lay upon the table the report that gentleman sent in to the department when it was asked for from this side of the House.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have no objection whatever, I will produce the report at eight o'clock this evening.

Mr. AMES. Then it would be permissible to continue the discussion of this Lurcher lightship after the report has come in ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes. Now there is another matter which I wish to bring before the committee in regard to the range lights at Midland. I have a memorandum thereon which will read :

Entering Midland harbour from the lake there are two ranges of lights the Midland point and the Midland range lights (in the town). In the Midland point range two fixed white lights are shown from the 7th order lenses. They were established in 1900.

Two years before I entered the department.

On the 28th of May, 1904, in a memorandum, the chief engineer states that there is some complaint about the visibility of the range on Midland Point, and instructions were given to trim any trees which might obscure the lights. There is no complaint from any resident of Midland or from any mariners entering the port on the file re the Midland Point (outer range).

The Midland range lights in the town of Midland were established in 1901 and were recommended by the chief engineer, Colonel Anderson. The apparatus is a square tubular lantern with ruby glass in the front and a silvered reflector behind the electric lights. These lights cost $150 to install.

A contract was entered into with Jas. Playfair to furnish 50 candle power lamps for each light for the sum of $50 per annum. The town of Midland took over the electric light plant and a new contract was made with the town for the sum of $125 per annum, and in this contract the candle power was raised from 50 to 64 in each light and the town undertook for the increased sum to undertake all repairs to the lights, maintenance of poles, lanterns, wire, &c., which under the old contract was paid for by the department.

There is no complaint on the file from any person with reference to the character or quality of these lights. No lighthouse apparatus was sent to Midland of a better class than for the electric lights, but spare oil lamps were shipped to that point to be used in the event of a breakdown in the electric light plant.

(Signed) F. GOURDEAU.

Mr. BENNETT. I am glad the minister has stated now what the power of the lights is. When it is considered that one of the smallest lights used in an ordinary room is of sixteen candle power, and that at a distance of nearly a mile from the water edge the minister's officers think that a lamp of only four times that power is sufficient to guide ships entering the harbour, of Midland, all I can say is that I have my opinion of the minister's officers. However, as the minister says that this official, who has such an extraordinary knowledge of the requirements of the trade of the lake, thinks it is sufficient to have a light four times the strength of an ordinary room lamp, up on a hill nearly a mile from the water's edge, I sympathize with the minister in having such an official.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The information I have from the officer is that the reflector doubles the lighting power of the lamp so that each lamp would be over one hundred candle power.

Mr. BENNETT. I would remind the minister that if you go into any ordinary village or small town he will find that the lights on the street are from 1,000 to 2,000 candle power. The minister's official seems to have more knowledge, apparently, than the minister has, because the minister bows to him. But I think when the minister talks it over with him he will come to the conclusion that he had better change his opinion. After Colonel Anderson, if it is he who was responsible, had sent to Midland the two lamps, there was political influence enough to cause the then minister to send back those lights, and to substitute these electric lights. I am sorry the present minister was not in the department then, because I do not think he would have allowed that to be done. The minister is not to blame for these lamps at Midland except for their continuance, for these lamps were there when he came into office. Now I appeal to him whether when he considers that these lights are only four times the strength of an ordinary light placed in a small private room, he still thinks, with his official, that they are powerful enough when placed nearly a mile from the water's edge, to light vessels coming into the bay. I tell the minister again that last fall a vessel coming in at night mistook some of the other lights, and as a result was piled up on the shoals in the middle of the bay, and during the night or towards morning she took fire.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I am not responsible, as the hon. gentleman says, for the installation of these lamps, but from the information that I gather from my officers, I would have done the same thing because two or three lamps of that kind have been installed in the port of Montreal to my knowledge.

Mr. BENNETT. Sixty-four candle-power?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Seventy-five candle-power, red lights, so as to distinguish them from others and with reflectors. They are perfectly satisfactory, and we have had no complaint from anybody. On the contrary we have been complimented because there were no lights of this kind before and the mariners were exposed to be misled by the similarity of lights. It is the same in the case of Midland.

Mr. BENNETT. How far would those lights be from where the vessel would be approaching ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I would think about a mile and a half.

Mr. BENNETT. When the vessels come around the point they are five miles away from the lights and they are approaching the shoals when they are three and a half miles away.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I say about a mile and a half, because the channel to the harbour at Montreal at the foot of the current is not straight so that the light could not be seen until you turn the corner. The corner would be about a mile and a half away. I know as a matter of fact that in Quebec there are red lights of this kind, that are seen at a distance of 5 miles, from the Island of Orleans, and

there is no trouble whatever. I know this personally as I have been on board steamers coming up to Quebec and I have seen how satisfactory these lights are. There is no confusion with the others, because there is only the one pair of red lights.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Have there been any complaints with regard to these lights from the shippers ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the harbour master at Midland reported that any vessels have gone on that shoal ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Never.

Mr. BENNETT. What do you pay the harbour master ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I think he is paid by fees, the amount you will find in the report.

Mr. BENNETT. I think it would be fair to have the harbour master find out if vessels have been piled up on this shoal ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Surely the hon. gentleman does not expect me to go looking for complaints ?

Mr. BENNETT. I have made complaints and the minister told me he would not pay any attention to them.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I find from the report of my officers that the complaint is not reasonable under the circumstances so that really the hon. gentleman is not going to ask me to search for complaints. If the lights are not sufficient it is for the marine men to say they are not.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not know that this case reflects any credit on the minister's officials because at first he put in lights that were too small.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The hon. gentleman knows we are improving every day and do not refuse to improve, but when there is no call for improvements we do not make them.

Mr. BENNETT. All right; pile up the boats then.

Mr. AMES. Who paid for the repairs that were made to the Lurcher lightship after she reached Halifax ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The department.

Mr. AMES. As I understand she left Toronto in an unfinished condition, and on the way down suffered considerable damage which was repaired at Halifax at the expense of the government.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, because the damage was caused by the ice.

Mr. AMES. And the contractor was not asked to make good any portion of the repairs ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No.

Mr. HYMAN. They were just the ice repairs.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes. There is another matter which has been brought up and which I might dispose of now. That is the Parry Sound buoy contract.

Previous to 1898 the buoys in the vicinity of Parry Sound were all spar buoys, with the exception of one bell buoy, and the work was carried out by contract.

In 1898 three gas buoys were established in the vicinity of Parry Sound and tenders were asked for the maintenance of these buoys, and the following tenders were received, which were solely for the maintenance of the proposed new gas buoys:

	Per annum.
James Playfair, vessel owner, Midland	$ 300 00
Galna & Danter, contractors Parry Sound	900 00
A. W. Clarke, mariner, Parry Sound	1,000 00

And later the tender of James Playfair was withdrawn as he informed the department that he had made a mistake.

The chief engineer, Colonel Anderson, reported on these tenders as follows :

I strongly recommend that none of these tenders be accepted, but that the service be done on the basis of payment for actual work until we are in a better position to judge of its actual cost. Mr. Playfair's offer, which was withdrawn, was not a desirable one to accept under any circumstances, because Midland, where Mr. Playfair's plant is, is about forty miles away from the nearest buoy and I believed the price was less than the work could be properly done for. I cannot recommend the acceptance of either of the other tenders, because I think they are higher than the work is worth, and I think we can do the work by the day very much less per annum. The buoys (spar) have heretofore been handled by Captains A. W. Clarke and E. S. Pratt, the contractors for the other buoy service at Parry Sound. These men own four steamers ferrying and towing in Parry Sound, and are themselves local pilots and directly interested in maintaining an efficient buoy service. They are also in close touch with the masters of all the large vessels coming into the Sound. It was they who put the buoys out, and the way they handled the work was particularly satisfactory. Therefore to maintain the service on the basis of a charge of $25 per day for tug and scow, work on shore to be charged according to the time occupied by the men employed, would, I believe, result in work being done for less than the tenders, and I am certain that it would be done in a more thorough manner. I would impress upon the department the necessity for prompt and efficient service in connection with this gas buoy service, and it is because I believe Captain Clarke is in the best position to do satisfactory work that I so strongly recommend that it be left in his hands.

Accordingly, from 1898 to 1900 the Parry Sound spar and gas buoy service was carried out by contract for the spar buoys, and

by days' work for the gas buoys at the following cost:

In 1898..	$1,143 00
In 1899..	1,441 25
In 1900..	1,646 50

In December, 1900, Captain Clarke made an offer to enter into a contract with the department for three years to perform its buoy service for the sum of $1,400.

The chief engineer stated that Captain Clarke was building a new tug equipped with derrick for handling the moorings and strongly recommended that his offer be accepted. An allowance was made later to Captain Clarke of $75 per annum for the maintenance of one iron buoy at Three Star Shoal.

On the termination of Captain Clarke's contract in March, 1904, it was renewed for the sum of $1,600, being an increase of $125 per annum for substantially the same reasons as advanced by the chief engineer in recommending the acceptance of Captain Clarke's tender in the first instance.

The addition of three gas buoys and a gas beacon at Kilbear Point, being added to the contract, Captain Clarke was allowed the sum of $1,000 per annum additional, the additional price being based on the cost of the contract held by him and because it was efficiently performed.

The establishment of a buoy depot at Parry Sound will lead the department to undertake the buoy service in Georgian bay with its own steamers and under its own officers and will eventually lead to the cancelling of all buoy contracts in Georgian bay.

Reference has been made to the proposed establishment of a buoy depot by the depot at Parry Sound. I thought I had made myself fairly understood by the committee the last time. I thought I had explained completely that the government had entered into negotiations with the Ottawa Bank or its representatives to purchase a property at Parry Sound for $5,500, that the property consisted of about three acres of land on the shore, with a wharf constructed which would accommodate our department and with a large stone building which had been used for some time as a manufacturing establishment and that there was a boiler, engines and other machinery on the property.

The negotiations were suspended because some one had intervened and tried to get an option on the property for $7,500 or $2,000 more than we offered. We dropped the matter at the time, but I have since learned that our bargain is a good one and that it is in the interest of the House and the country that we should pay $5,500 for this property. There is some little difficulty as to the right to a passageway which can be settled with the Ontario government. I believe that the purchase of this property for $5,500 including costs, commissions &c., is a good purchase. We could not get any property in the neighbourhood at any such reasonable price, and then we would have to erect the buildings and buy the machinery.

Mr. BENNETT. The misapprehension that existed the other evening as to this matter was caused by the ignorance of the official of the department who visited the place, and who assured the minister that the premises were at Parry harbour while as a matter of fact they are not. I have made inquiries since, and I now know the site. It is known as the old bobbin factory, but it is not located where the official of the department said it was. Knowing something about the matter now, I do not think that the price mentioned is out of the way. It is due to the minister that I should compliment him for discovering that some party friend had attempted to put up a job on the government and make $2,000 out of the deal. It is to the credit of the minister or his officials that they discovered this trick and succeeded in stopping it. As to the buoys, the minister has given this contract to Mr. Clarke apparently without tender for $2,600. It is only fair that there should be tenders called for that service. Mr. Clarke is not the only man who owns a boat there, nor is he the only man who is competent to do the work. I do not know that Mr. Clarke is deserving of any great solicitude from the government, because he is the very man who interposed and tried to make the department pay $2,000 more for this site; the minister knows that.

Mr. PERLEY. I am sorry I was not here the other day to explain the misunderstanding which arose with reference to the purchase of this Parry Sound property from the Bank of Ottawa. This property was taken over by the Bank of Ottawa some years ago, it having been used as a factory. The buildings and boilers were then valued at $5,000 and the Bank is now getting $5,000 net; the other $500 going for the usual commissions and costs. The committee may be satisfied that the price is a reasonable one, and I may mention that the town of Parry Sound thought of buying the property last fall at exactly the same price.

Mr. AMES. The other night the Minister of Marine intimated that it was his intention to ask a considerable additional amount for the perfection of the aids to navigation in the Gulf and River St. Lawrence. Will the minister tell us if this present vote is intended to complete existing work, or whether it is to be applied to new work. The minister promised that he would at some convenient date give a full statement of the new work which is about to be done during the coming year in the river and gulf, and we would like to have that statement from him either now or on the supplemen-

tary estimates, whichever is more convenient to him. The minister has of course taken cognizance of the resolution of the Montreal Board of Trade, passed on the 31st of January, 1905, which has been forwarded to him, and which for the information of the committee I shall read :

That whereas the aids to navigation in the Gulf and River St. Lawrence are still inadequate to the requirements of the St. Lawrence route and the safety of shipping and passengers, and

Whereas the aids to navigation, so far provided, have been recognized by underwriters, some of whom have made slight reductions in their rates to the advantage of the whole Dominion, and

Whereas an additional reduction can be confidently looked forward to on the completion of the required aids to navigation.

Be it resolved, that the government be urged to provide in the estimates a sufficient sum of money to complete the absolutely required improvements to the lighthouses, fog signals and other appliances, which required improvements were submitted by the Shipping Federation of Canada to the Commissioner of Lights, and understood to have been afterwards approved by the Lighthouse Board, and

Be it further resolved, that the government be asked to carry out these improvements in their entirety this year.

This resolution refers to a series of recommendations submitted by the Shipping Federation of Canada, which the minister has also in his possession and a copy of which was forwarded to me on the 24th of February by Thomas Robb, the manager. It would be very acceptable to the commercial and shipping interests of Montreal, if the minister should give us in detail the improvements in the aids to navigation which in consonance with that report, will be initiated or completed during the coming season. The minister will remember that this report refers to Belle Isle high light, Belle Isle low light, Cape Bauld, Cape Norman, Point Amour, Flower Island, Greenly Island, Point Rich, Cape Race, Cape Ray, St. Paul's Island. northeast point, St. Paul's Island, southwest point, Bird Rocks, Bryon Island, Pictou Island, Heath Point, West Point, Anticosti, Cape Rosier, Matane, Fame Point, Father Point, Maughers Beach, Gannet Rock.

The reason I call attention to all these items is, that the minister may bring to his mind the report of the shipping federation, which I understand has been submitted to and approved by the lighthouse board, and which I trust will in due time receive his concurrence. We should like to have a statement from the minister as to what he intends to accomplish this year.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have not the slightest objection to inform the committee and the country generally as to what the department contemplates. It is of the greatest importance that it should be known in this House and all over Canada and in other countries that this government is not relaxing in any way in the programme which was laid down by my predecessor in regard to improvements to Canada's national route. I do not think anybody in this House or outside will accuse me of having delayed in any way the work of the department since I took it over. I must put before the House the resolutions that have been passed at different times in respect to this matter. The following resolution was adopted by the Shipping Confederation of Canada in Montreal on the 27th of December, 1904, and bears out entirely the programme of the department and encourages it in continuing the important work that it has undertaken :

Be it resolved, whereas the present year is drawing to a close, the members of this federation unanimously desire to record a vote of thanks to the government for the many improvements and aids to navigation, which have resulted in the lowering of insurance rates, and may lead to further advantages in this direction, when the entire system of improvements are completed.

Be it further resolved, that it is gratifying to the public at large, as well as the federation, to know that there is some prospect of navigation being prolonged, and it is to be hoped that the enterprise of the government, in providing two ice-breakers, will meet with the success it so well deserves. It is to the credit of the Minister of Marine that the latest methods and devices have been tried, as by extending the period of navigation even for a few weeks will be a national benefit, besides instilling hope in the breast of all Canadians that the day may not be far distant when the St. Lawrence waterway will be open to navigation during the entire year.

And be it further resolved, that the president sign a copy of this resolution which is to be forwarded to the premier, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Honourable Raymond Préfontaine.

(Sgd.) HUGH A. ALLAN,
President.

The resolution of the Montreal Board of Trade is communicated to me in the following letter :

The Montreal Board of Trade,
Montreal, February 6th, 1905.

Honourable Raymond Prefontaine,

Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Ottawa.

Sir,—I have the honour to communicate the following resolution with regard to aids to navigation in the Gulf and River St. Lawrence, which resolution was adopted at the annual meeting of this board held on the 31st ultimo. :

That whereas the aids to navigation in the Gulf and River St. Lawrence are still inadequate to the requirements of the St. Lawrence route and the safety of shipping and passengers, and

Whereas the aids to navigation, so far provided, have been recognized by underwriters, some of whom have made slight reductions in their rates to the advantage of the whole Dominion, and

Whereas an additional reduction can be confidently looked forward to on the completion of the required aids to navigation,

Be it resolved, that the government be urged to provide in the estimates a sufficient sum of money to complete the absolutely required improvements to the lighthouses, fog signals and other appliances, which required improvements were submitted by the Shipping Federation of Canada to the Commissioner of Lights, and understood to have been afterwards approved by the Lighthouse Board, and

Be it further resolved, that the government be asked to carry out these improvements in their entirety this year.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) GEO. HADRILL,

Secretary.

P.S.—Communicated to the right honourable the premier, also.

(Sgd.) G. H.

These resolutions were passed on the information that the question had been studied very closely by the department, and that the officers of the department had been called upon to work out a complete system of aids to navigation generally, so as to make the route of the St. Lawrence as safe as it could be made during day and night and as late as possible in the season ; and if we could possibly lengthen the period of navigation as far as Quebec at least for three or four weeks in the fall and two or three weeks in the spring, we would confer a great benefit upon the whole trade of Canada. In pursuance of this programme, as everybody knows, last year a vote was taken to provide winter navigation between Murray Bay and St. Denis in the lower St. Lawrence. This question had been agitated for some time, and no practical result had been attained. We ordered the construction of a vessel to provide that ferry during the winter if it was at all possible. The 'Champlain,' was put on that route early in the fall, and did fairly good work under the circumstances. As everybody knows, the winter has been one of the most severe that we have had in the memory of the oldest inhabitant of the province of Quebec, and, except during a few days, the vessel made the passage, and was a great boon to the people of the north shore, who, like some of the people on the coasts of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, are deprived at this time of the year of the necessary feed for their cattle. The 'Champlain' was delivered at Quebec on the 15th of October, the contractors fulfilling their contract to the letter, and the boat has given entire satisfaction. The second boat was the 'Montcalm,' a larger boat, costing $300,000. She was constructed in Paisley, Scotland, by the firm of Miller & Ferguson, and was delivered at the proper date, the contractors fulfilling their contract to the letter. She was delivered at Quebec, and was put at work breaking the ice in the direction of Cap Rouge. While people have criticised the work she did, I think the criticisms were unfounded in every way. She did splendid work ; but, with the heavy winter we have had, and although she was provided with six extra blades for her propellers, they were one after another broken at different dates. She had therefore to stop this heavy work after having gone a mile and a half above the Quebec bridge, and she has been laid up and is waiting for the supply of those six blades, which have been ordered from the contractors and are expected to arrive in Halifax in two or three days, after which it will take only one day to put them in place. So that she will again begin the work she has left unfinished, and I sincerely hope and trust that she will succeed finally in opening the gorge.

It is the intention to send this boat, the 'Montcalm,' as soon as she has got through her work at Cap Rouge, down as far as Belle Isle—down the gulf anyway, so as to help the incoming steamers, which may be embarrassed by the ice. That has been specially requested by the Shipping Federation. As regards that boat, I think the government has shown its desire to help shipping and bring about an earlier opening of navigation and give greater safety. Contracts have been given to establish another light at Beaujeau shoal, about fifty miles higher than La Traverse, where one pier was erected three years ago, which has given much satisfaction to the shipping trade. This pier, we hope, will be up and the lights in operation by the fall. It will be an important improvement, which will cost, I think, $25,000. As regards the other aids, I have a list of what we contemplate doing this year with the $500,000. But, as I said the other day, we will not be satisfied with that sum. It will be necessary to vote some more money in the supplementaries to complete some works begun last year and start new works absolutely necessary. The following works are to be done in the province of Quebec :

St. Marys Island, new station..	$ 25,000
Cape Race, improve tower..	5,000
Birds Rocks, new fog alarm.....	20,000
St. Pauls Island, new fog alarm.....	20,000
Seven Islands, new fog alarm.....	9,000
Buildings for submarine signal stations	25,000
Natashquan, Escoumains, Cape Bauld, Cape Norman, Rimouski, new towers.	11,000
Quebec wharf and workshop.....	10,000
General account, including large repairs, inspection, &c.....	25,000
	$150,000

In British Columbia, we propose to do the following work :

Point Atkinson, new fog alarm.....	$ 20,000
Race Rocks, new fog alarm.....	20,000
Pine Island, new tower.....	7,000
Green Island, new tower.....	6,000
Entrance Island, new tower.....	5,000
Seals Island, new tower.....	1,750
Union Bar, new tower.....	1,750
Maude Island, new tower.....	3,500
Burns Island, moving light.....	2,000
General account including large repairs, inspection, &c.....	20,000
	$ 87,000

In Ontario, the following is the list of the new works to be done :

Burlington, new tower	$ 2,000
Rondeau, new tower	2,000
Victoria Island, fog alarm	15,000
Improvements to existing fog alarm	20,000
Welcome Island, new light	5,000
Sister Island, moving light	1,000
Inspection	5,000
Colchester reef protection	5,000
Large repairs	20,000
	$75,000

In New Brunswick, we propose to do the following :

Wharf accommodation	$25,000
Large repairs	22,000
Inspection	3,000
	$50,000

In Nova Scotia :

Dartmouth, wharf and stores	$15,000
Mauger Beach, repairs to breakwater	5,000
Grand passage, new dwelling	3,000
Budget, Herring Cove, Bass River, Amherst River, Fisherman Harbour, Emmings Island, new towers	6.000
General account, including repairs, inspection, &c	25,000
	$54,000

Prince Edward Island :

Souris, new light	$ 1,000
Indian Point, repairs	6,000
General account, including large repairs, inspection, &c	10,000
	$17,000

These figures total up as follows :

General account	$ 65,000
Quebec	150,000
British Columbia	87,000
Ontario	75,000
Nova Scotia	54,000
New Brunswick	50,000
Prince Edward Island	17,000
Steel buoys	10,000
	$508,000

The apparatus will be provided for in the supplementary estimates. These apparatus are procured from the only firm in the world from which they can be procured at reasonable prices, namely, Chance Brothers, in England. There are three firms which furnish them—a firm in France, another in Germany and Chance Brothers, in England. I inquired about prices from the three, and Chance Brothers offered the best prices and conditions and material and everything. It is that firm which supplies the American government, so that we will have just as good a system of lights as any country in the world.

Mr. AMES. Does the hon. minister expect during this coming season to practically complete his plans for the illumination of the St. Lawrence gulf and river ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We hope to be able to complete the plans we have laid out, but there is always a certain proportion of uncertainty. Sometimes the orders are given and the material is not delivered. Sometimes it is more difficult to erect a piece of construction when it is far out at sea, or where there are storms and difficulties in the way. In most of the cases in the gulf we are prevented from proceeding by way of contract, because we could not get, except at extravagant prices, contractors to come and take charge of the work. They would have to provide very large plant, for which the government would have to pay. We are trying as much as possible to do these works by day's work with our own men. We send them from different points, especially from Quebec, with material and everything they require. In some of these remote places there is no possibility of getting labour and material. In British Columbia we have abandoned almost entirely the idea of giving out contracts in remote places. We send out our own men and steamers and material, so as to have the work done efficiently and at less cost.

Mr. AMES. My hon. friend has stated that some years ago there had been, after consultation, a definite plan arrived at for the improvement of the Lower St. Lawrence and the gulf. Do I understand the minister to say that he expects that by the end of the present working season this plan will be practically completed ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I fear I have left the committee under a wrong impression. What I stated was that, if I get supplementary estimates to cover the plans shown by the drawings and charts I have laid on the table, I shall be able to do so much of the work this season that next year I hope to finish the whole. It was estimated at the time that it would cost from $3,500,000 to $4,000,000. We have expended about $2,000,000, and, so far as we can see the work will require the expenditure of about $2,000,000 more. The work will go on as rapidly as possible. At the present we are suffering from the want of help in the engineering branch. This is not a difficulty confined to my department. The Department of Public Works and others are in the same position—the engineers and draftsmen required are not to be had. I have personally inquired from McGill and Laval Universities to secure men for this service. I hope that we shall be able, with the help we can procure to complete the work laid out this season.

Mr. AMES. I understand, then, that it will require this year and probably one year more to complete the works under the plan that has been followed by the department for some years. When that plan is fully carried out will all the recommendations in this document from the shipping federation have been fulfilled ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, except any minor new points that may be discovered as we proceed. I have here a plan which shows what is to be done in 1905-6, and any hon. gentleman who consults it will see that the department is not going blindly at this work, but has taken it up systematically to follow the recommendations of the shipping interest of the board of trade of Montreal.

Mr. BLAIN. May we expect any marked decrease in the rates of marine insurance because of the expenditure of this large amount of money ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We sincerely hope for a considerable decrease. Still insurance companies are loath to reduce rates. This matter is working itself out gradually, as is shown by the resolution passed by the board of trade and the shipping interest, which declares that there has already been a reduction. Some vessel lines have benefited more than others. I have been trying to get at the figures but it is not easy to do that at once. I know that the first to obtain the reduction of insurance rates were the Canadian Pacific Railway boats, probably because the company enjoys great confidence and the boats were supposed to be manned in first-class style. Other lines have also obtained reductions. What these reductions are we do not know yet, but, of course, it will all be known in time.

Mr. BLAIN. The reason I ask is, because the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Sutherland) made the statement in the House a few years ago that one of the reasons for expending so much on the improvement of the St. Lawrence, was that we should thereby have a considerable decrease in marine insurance, besides helping materially the shipping interest of Canada. I suppose the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) is keeping that point in view and is pressing it. Because, it would be a very serious matter if, after the expenditure of millions in these works on the expectation of a decrease in insurance rates, no such reductions were actually made. The House will expect the minister to regard this as part of his duty as well as the expenditure of the money.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is no doubt that safe navigation will secure this reduction by itself, even if it is not pressed. But, having in view the reduction of the insurance rate, and keeping this before the insurance people—and the British people especially, who control most of the marine insurance—I am sure of a favourable result. We keep in constant touch with Lloyds and the best authorities in Great Britain so as to keep them well informed of what we are doing and of what our plans are for improving the navigation of the St. Lawrence and making it as safe as possible. As regards the lighting by gas between Montreal and Sorel—and lower down for we have added 33 miles more to this system—the improvement has facilitated navigation so as to give quicker access to the port of Montreal and so shorten the trip by six or seven hours, making almost an extra trip during the season. All these aids to navigation tend to reduce the cost of freight, and so give advantages which reach the people of Canada generally, for Montreal is the national port and the reduction of freights to that port has a tendency to reduce the cost of goods to the consumer.

I have now the information asked for by my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) with regard to the harbour master of Midland. The harbour master of Midland is Mr. John White. His salary is $300 a year, paid out of fees. In 1902, he collected $316.50 in fees, returning $16.50 to the department ; and in 1904 he did not collect sufficient to pay his salary.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the minister state what the harbour master does for this $300 ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. He is obliged to fulfil his duty as harbour master.

Mr. BENNETT. I live in the town and I would like to know what the duties are.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. He has to look after the buoy service, to place the vessels in the port and otherwise to fulfil the duties of harbour master. These duties are statutory, and I refer the hon. gentleman to the statute.

Mr. BENNETT. I would ask the minister if he would request the harbour master at Midland to make a report as to whether any vessels have at any time been grounded on the shoal in the bay.

Mr. AMES. I would ask the minister to tell us what steps he is taking in order to make it thoroughly known in all shipping centres of the world that these improvements in the St. Lawrence are being prosecuted. As we know, insurance rates in the St. Lawrence are much higher than at New York; but shippers also know that owing to the improvements which have been made during the last ten years the rates have been cut down one-half. We have reason to believe that the rates can be still further reduced, because many of the best English companies are not insuring at all on the St. Lawrence route, but we think that the better acquainted they become with the St. Lawrence route and the great endeavours which the people of Canada are making to render that route secure, possibly it may result in a general reduction of rates by more companies competing. That being the case, the reduction in insurance means a reduction in freight, and a general benefit to all Canadian shippers and all owners of

ships. So I would ask the minister what steps he is taking to make thoroughly known the great improvements of the last four or five years, at all points where it may do Canada good.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I intend early this season after the estimates are put through to have some of my officials prepare a complete statement showing exactly what has been done and what is going to be done during the season in order to complete the whole system a year hence. I intend to have that statement carefully prepared and circulated all over the world, so that people the world over may know what Canada is doing to improve the route, and what advantages the port of Montreal and the St. Lawrence route offer to shippers.

Mr. AMES. I would like the minister to tell us what is the illuminant which he uses and proposes to use in the most modern of his new lighthouses, particularly those that are for a long distance. He has told us that in lighting the St. Lawrence between Montreal and Quebec he is introducing acetylene gas. These light buoys are only to be seen at a comparatively short distance, and I would like to know what is the latest and most modern illuminant which the minister is using for lights which are expected to be seen forty or fifty miles away.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We intend to use the best. There are two kinds of very powerful lights, one is the petroleum vapour, and the other is acetylene gas under mantle. We use either the one or the other, and sometimes we use both kinds.

Mr. AMES. The reason I asked this question was because I had been informed that while the acetylene light is excellent for a comparatively short distance, for lights which need to be seen at a great distance, petroleum vapour has been found to be superior. There is another matter I would like to have explained, that is, in connection with the store holders that the minister uses for his acetylene. I see that this year by P—89 of the Auditor General's Report $136,643.97 were paid to George T. Merwin, of Montreal, for gas holders. This gentleman, I believe, is the agent for the Safety Car Heating and Lighting Company of New York. This money, I suppose, went out of the country. Is it true that none of these articles can be made in Canada, and has the minister any hope to offer us that the time will come before long when any of these goods can be made in Canada? It seems a pity that we are spending for this one item $136,000 abroad.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The matter is very easily explained. I myself put the same question to my officers when the first order was presented to me for approval, and I was informed and I have since confirmed that information that they could not be procured in Canada or in the United States, that there were only a couple of places in Germany and France, Germany especially where they could be obtained because these holders are welded in a certain way and it would require a very large amount of money $150,000 to $200,000 to fit up the plant. I inquired at different places at the Laurentian Works, in Montreal, the Polson Company, in Toronto, and the Bertram Engine Works in Toronto, in fact I inquired all over, in order to see whether it was not possible to procure these holders in Canada, but none of these firms had the plant and they could not be procured here. I may say, that after experimenting there is some one in the business who will I think within a short time be able to furnish these holders to the department but, in the meantime, we have of course to order them where we can get them on the best conditions possible. There is nothing to prevent us buying them here if we can get them.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before passing away from the item, 'construction of lighthouses and aids to navigation' I wish to remind the minister of——

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Of Bronte.

Mr. HENDERSON. Of Bronte, exactly. I am very glad that the minister remembers so well. It is rather an important place, it has an industrious population and some time ago I drew attention to the fact that it was very desirable to erect on a pier that was being built there, a lighthouse to guide the fishermen on dark nights in the fall of the year towards the harbour. Frequently in pursuing their occupation as fishermen they are kept out in the open lake, and have nothing to direct them to port. A lighthouse could be constructed there at a very moderate expense indeed, of sufficient height to light them home to a place of safety. This light would not need to be kept burning during the whole year, but only for a limited part of the year and it would certainly serve a very excellent purpose. I hope that the minister's memory also recalls the fact that he promised to erect this lighthouse and I also hope that in furtherance of that he will see that during the curent fiscal year this lighthouse is provided. I am sure they will gratefully remember it if it is done. I am not finding fault with the minister for not having this done now, because he explained that he wanted to erect it near the end of the pier. The pier must now be approaching completion, and I am quite sure the minister will make good everything he has said and do for these people what I have asked on several occasions and what he has promised.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I must inform the hon. gentleman that as I stated last year the reason for the delay was the fact that the pier had not been finished and we intended to put the light at the end of the pier. The pier will be completed, I hope, before the 1st of July and if it is completed, I will promise the hon. gentleman that I will place the matter before the lighthouse board by whom I am led in these matters and in which there is no politics, and I am quite sure that if it is wanted as the hon. gentleman says he will be satisfied.

To provide for the establishment of Marconi stations, $100,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The explanation is as follows :—

In 1903-4, the sum of $18,847.31 was expended in equipping Marconi stations.

Equipping Fame Point..	$ 5,000 00
Equipping Heath Point..	5,000 00
Westinghouse electric generator..	985 00
Submarine cables and reels.. ..	6,350 00
Freight and other expenses.. ..	1,513 31
	$18,847 31

In 1904-5, to 30th November, the sum of $29,276.85 has been expended. The expenses consisted in fitting out the steamers 'Minto' 'Stanley' and Canada' with wireless apparatus and the expenses of the ships while engaged in the service. The amount expended is as follows :

Fame Point station..	$ 5,000 00
Cape Race station	5,000 00
Cape Ray station	5,000 00
Apparatus for 'Stanley' and 'Minto'..	3,106 42
Labour at Belle Isle..	1,992 00
Building station at Belle Isle..	2,547 21
Wages of men employed at stations and expenses of 'Stanley' and 'Minto'	6,631 22
	$29,276 85

The sum of $55,000 will be required to be put in the estimates for the new Marconi stations which have been contracted for at Cape Rich, Newfoundland, and Whittle Rocks and Seal Island and Partridge Island, also increasing from low power to high power stations, to allow communication between Fame Point and Heath Point; Heath Point and Cape Ray; Heath Point and Whittle Rocks; Whittle Rocks and Cape Rich; and Cape Rich and Point Amour, and Seal Island and Partridge Island. Also to allow for a day and night service between said stations.

Mr. AMES. When the Marconi contract was entered into by the government, if I am rightly informed, it was provided that if it should not prove to be a success the government should have the opportunity of withdrawing from the contract. Evidently it has been regarded as a success because the department are now asking a vote to continue the stations already established, and to establish new ones. I would like the minister to let us know how generally the shipping inerests are equipping the vessels which come into the gulf with that apparatus which may render it possible for them to transmit messages to the stations of the Canadian government. It is a very important feature of the situation, inasmuch as while we may expend money in equipping stations it is absolutely necessary that the shipping interests should on parallel lines equip their ships, and unless they do so the expenditure on the part of the Dominion government will be more or less abortive.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They have been very satisfactory. Six of the Allan boats have been fully equipped and the Allan Company have testified to the advantage of these stations. I think these stations are very important and necessary and they will be especially valuable in the spring of the year.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. How many land stations are equipped and how many do you propose to equip ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The following have been equipped. Fame Point, Heath Point, Point Armour, Belle Isle, Cape Ray and Cape Race. It is proposed to equip stations at Point Riche, Cape Whittle, Halifax, Sable Island, Seal Island and Partridge Island.

Mr. OSLER. Had we not some special agreement with the Marconi Company ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That was with regard to a special station for transmission of messages across the Atlantic.

Mr. OSLER. The government, as I understand it, were to receive some special consideration on account of that contract.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is not in my department, but I think it was agreed that we should have the benefit of all the improvements that Marconi made as well as special rates on messages.

Mr. OSLER. We must have had more than that for a payment of $80,000.

Mr. AMES. What government vessels are equipped with the Marconi system ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The 'Minto,' the 'Stanley' and the 'Canada.'

Mr. AMES. Do they receive special rates?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We merely have to pay the cost of the installation on each of the ships which amount to $1,550.

Mr. AMES. Marconi is a young man and a very live inventor ; I would like to know whether there is any provision in the contract which gives us the use of the

new inventions which he may make from time to time ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That is provided for in the contract.

To provide for submarine signalling bell, $70,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The shore stations are to be located as follows : South Point Anticosti, Cape Rosier, P.Q., Matane, P.Q., Beaver Island, N.S., and Scatterie, N.S., and the submarine bell buoy stations at Negro Head, N.S., Beetson Rock, N.S., Brazil Rock, N.S., and Little Hope, N.S.

5 plants for electric shore stations.	$15,000
10 electric submarine bells at $1,050.	10,500
30,000 ft. specially designed cable at 33⅓c.	10,000
30 tripod bell anchorages at $600..	18,000
4 submarine bell buoys at $2,500..	10,000
Cost of installation, anchors, &c.	6,500
Total..	$70,000

None of these installations have yet been made but the first clause of the contract says :

The said company hereby bind and oblige their heirs, executors and administrators, and they hereby promise, covenant and agree to install on board any lightship or Dominion steamer, or at or near any lightship or upon any buoy or at any station in the waters of Canada, as may be required by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, their submarine warning signal, in a complete and perfect state, with all improvements that may be made by the said company from time to time, and shall provide all patent attachments, comprised in the said submarine warning signal and its apparatus during the terms of this agreement.

The contract has been laid on the table of the House. This signal bell system was studied by the officers of my department as far back as 1903 and my attention was drawn to it by the owners of the largest steamship lines plying the St. Lawrence. The officers of the department were present at some experiments with which they were perfectly satisfied. The apparatus consists of sinking a bell in the water at a depth of 8 or 9 feet which can be wrung by electricity, and by means of the receiver on board a ship—something like a telephone—the bell can be heard up to a distance of ten miles in some instances. The bell rings in storms and fogs and can be distinctly heard in the pilot-house of the ship, giving an indication as to whether it is on the starboard or port side and also the location of the particular bell which is heard, so that the position of the ship can be exactly ascertained. I had an opportunity of being present, together with the Messrs. Allan amongst others, at an experiment made between Boston and New York in connection with this apparatus, and it was found to work very satisfactorily.

After this last experiment the parties interested began negotiating with the department for the installation of the apparatus. It took a good deal of time for us to come to an agreement, but at last we came to an agreement, which is the foundation of this contract. None of the apparatus is installed at the present moment, but we have contracted to install a certain number. There is in the report of the Department of Marine a very complete report on this subject. The bargain made is a pretty good bargain, the best that could be made under the circumstances. The parties have made a similar contract with the American government, the terms of which are not at all as favourable as those which we have obtained. In order to guard against our paying too dear for the use of the apparatus, it was provided in the contract that they could not charge Canada any more than any other country, so that if they were going to give the apparatus to other countries at a cheaper rate than to Canada, they would be obliged to reduce the rate to us. The following report shows what has been done in the United States :

Submarine signalling in United States.

By permissive arrangement with the United States government submarine bells had been installed on the following United States' lightships, viz. :

Sandy Hook, Fire Island, Nantucket Shoal, Cornfield Point, Brenton's Reef, Vineyard Sound, Pollock Rip, Pollock Rip Shoals, Boston, Cape Elizabeth.

These bells are operated under service conditions on the lightships. The Submarine Signal Company state that Appropriation Bills which recently passed the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President, contained items for fog signals, $210,000. Submarine signalling being especially mentioned.

In addition to the above, the Naval Bill carries $3,000,000, any part of which is applicable to submarine signal work.

The department is further informed that Admiral Mauncy is to begin the installation at once of receiving apparatus on the United States warships, and includes also sound producing with the Morse alphabet code as well as the receiving apparatus.

The department is informed that the appropriations having passed, the details of the arrangement are now in the hands of the United States Lighthouse Board.

The Submarine Signal Company has concluded a contract with the North German Lloyd's Steamship Company to install the receiving apparatus on 122 steamships. Contracts have also been concluded with the Hamburg American Line, the Metropolitan Steamship Line, the steam pilot boats of the harbours of Boston and New York, SS. 'Indian' of the Philadelphia Line, and J. Pierpont Morgan's yacht 'Corsair.'

The Canadian Pacific Railway have authorized the installation of receivers on their ships.

The maximum rental charged to Canadian ships is $500 per ship per year. In the contract with the North German Lloyd the maximum rental may be $850 per ship per year.

So that we have made a pretty good bargain. I would refer the committee to the report of the Commissioner of Lights, published in the report of the Department of

Marine, on pages 63, 64 and 65. Before entering into another contract, the department and myself took the precaution of consulting the shipping interests, and I took part in a meeting of the Chambre de Commerce and the Board of Trade of Montreal, held on the 30th of May, 1904. We had made no contract at that time, but I thought it was necessary to consult the people interested. I quote from the 62nd annual report, page 10 :

Aids to Navigation in River and Gulf.

Submarine signal bells.—Your council very willingly arranged, at the suggestion of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, for a special general meeting of the board on 30th May, for the purpose of affording an opportunity to Commander Spain of the Marine Department to explain the working of the submarine signal bells which the minister proposes to place at danger points throughout the Gulf of St. Lawrence. The meeting was also attended, on the invitation of the council, by the president and several members of La Chambre de Commerce. The Hon. Mr. Prefontaine, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Commander Spain and Mr. J. F. Fraser of the department, addressed the meeting with regard to the proposed installation of these signal bells, and upon the conclusion of the addresses the following resolution moved by Mr. Robert Munro, your second vice-president, and seconded by Mr. H. A. A. Brault, president of La Chambre de Commerce, was carried by acclamation :

Resolved, that the thanks of this meeting of members of the Montreal Board of Trade and of La Chambre de Commerce du District de Montreal, are hereby accorded to the Hon. Raymond Prefontaine, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, for having visited this board to address this gathering with regard to the proposed action of his department, in placing at danger points in the river and gulf the submarine signal bell system, and that Commander Spain and Mr. J. F. Fraser, commissioner of lights, are also thanked for their interesting and instructive explanation of that system.

That the minister is congratulated upon the lively interest he has manifested in the work of safeguarding the St. Lawrence route, by providing aids to navigation in the shape of lights, buoys, &c., and that it is believed that the installation of the submarine signal bell system will be a very efficient additional means to that end,

That this meeting hereby presses upon the Dominion government the urgent need of prosecuting most energetically all works in connection with making the St. Lawrence, as the national waterway of this country, safe for night and day navigation, so that disasters to shipping may be avoided and the reduction of marine insurance rates be secured.

The department went on with their negotiations with the proprietors of the system, and finally, towards the end of August, the contract was signed. Now, we want to go on with a part of the work, and that is the reason this item is put in the estimates.

Mr. DANIEL. I understand that the 'Lurcher' lightship is to have one of these bells. That lightship is stationed at the mouth of the Bay of Fundy, at a place where, when it is foggy, the lightship is enveloped in fog, and I thought that if the minister were favourable, it would be a good plan to place one of these receivers on board the largest pilot boat crossing those waters. The pilot boats are cruising in those waters all the time, and I think that, as the whole matter is in the experimental stage, it might be well to place one of these receivers on board a large pilot boat which is cruising in these waters all the time, and you would get more information in that way than by means of the steamer 'Lansdowne' which is supplied with a receiver. The largest pilot boat is sixty-five tons, and the pilots on board are very particular about keeping regular log statements of all occurrences. I would like the hon. minister to put one of these receivers on the largest pilot boat cruising right in the very place where the lightship is located.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I shall certainly take a note of my hon. friend's suggestion. We are awaiting to see the results of our experiment and will try to get the best system installed.

Mr. BARKER. I see by the papers brought down theat the department has entered into two contracts with this signal company—one on the 8th August 1904, and the other on the 10th August 1904. What is the meaning of these two contracts ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. One is for the signal and one for the receiver. They will be both in operation. The two appliances are to be put on the two boats, the 'Minto' and the 'Stanley.' The others are to be installed at the different stations.

Mr. BARKER. I understand that the hon. minister has entered into one contract under which he pays a royalty of $2,000 for each station where this appliance is used. The royalty ends at a certain time when he has paid $100,000 in all.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. When we will have installed 50.

Mr. BARKER. That means $100,000. But in addition I understand the minister pays for the cost of that apparatus itself plus 25 per cent.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. On the installation in the ships.

Mr. BARKER. But in addition to that, does he not pay for the cost of putting it in ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We pay for the receivers on board the ship the same price as other ships pay.

Mr. BARKER. I am speaking for the lighthouse where the bell is put. You pay $2,000 royalty and also the cost plus 25 per cent of the bell itself.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. The other agreement, I presume, refers to the charges for the receiver, putting it on board the ship ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Exactly.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to know for what term this contract is entered into ? I can quite understand that where you pay a royalty the term is of no consequence. You pay the royalty once for all, but you also pay a sum per annum in connection with the apparatus itself.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We pay an annuity for the use of the receiver on the ship.

Mr. BARKER. For what term have you entered into the contract ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No term.

Mr. BARKER. The language of the contract is during the term of this agreement, and I cannot find any term provided for.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is no term.

Mr. BARKER. You trust to each other's interest to keep good friends. I see in the correspondence that the minister informed Mr. Whitney, of Boston, that the department was in communication with the British Admiralty about this apparatus. There is nothing to show what the result of that correspondence was. Will the minister be good enough to tell us ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We just informed the British Admiralty of what we were doing.

Mr. BARKER. Did you never get an answer ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The ordinary acknowledgment.

Mr. BARKER. They never communicated to you whether they considered the thing favourably or not ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They did not express an opinion. The only correspondence that exists, as far as I can remember, later was the communication from Lord Strathcona asking us for a report. This report was required by some British colonies which wanted to know how the system was working and what we thought of it. As it had not been installed we could not very well give an opinion.

Mr. BARKER. You have had no confirmation of you own judgment ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We have it from what the United States are doing at present.

Mr. BARKER. In February last it appears that in several lighthouses on the coast of Massachusetts it was installed.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That was an experiment which was conducted at the cost of the inventors at the time. They continued the experiment between Boston and New York, and lately they have succeeded so well as to convince the American government of the advantages of the system and the American government has increased the number and made contracts with their different lines of steamers.

Mr. BARKER. Is that recently ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In the course of the last season.

Mr. BARKER. In the minister's report to Council at page 25, he says :

> Thirty stations will be required for the St. Lawrence to the Atlantic seaboard, and it has been estimated that the cost of equipping these stations will be $5,000 more or less according to location.

How is that $5,000 made up ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. If you install a bell in a lightship, it will not cost $5,000 to install the system on board the lightship or at a convenient place where we have already a lighthouse. At certain points it is necessary to put up special buildings for the apparatus ; we have to make special landings and so on. That will make the difference in the cost. But we cannot say that it will cost a certain sum at any particular station.

Mr. BARKER. That apparatus would not cost anything like $5,000, would it ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No ; but some large buildings must be erected to put in the machinery to produce the electricity. There are places where there is special exposure to the sea, and more or less expense must be incurred in the construction of the building. It depends also on how far you are going to carry the bells on shore.

Mr. BARKER. That would not be very material. It was the equipping of that station that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Préfontaine) said would cost $5,000. And this Order in Council is dated August 10th, the very day of the contract. I have been trying to find out what that means. The report to Council says there are to be about thirty stations, and they are to cost $5,000 each. But I rather gather that the cost will really be some hundreds of dollars for each station—something less than $1,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That is the Order in Council. But the contract does not read that way. The contract reads that there is to be $2,000 for royalty.

Mr. BARKER. But the royalty would not be part of the cost of equipment.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We put it all the same, and we calculated that the stations would cost about $5,000 each to complete, and in the contract we have provided how this $5,000 shall be spent. There is to be $2,000 royalty and 25 per cent on the cost of whatever machinery they furnish us. And then there is to be added whatever else

may be expended for machinery and for necessary buildings.

Mr. BARKER. I gather that the cost of the apparatus is about $500. Add 25 per cent to that, then allow $2,000 royalty, and you have a total of about $2,600 for the apparatus. If you allow $150 for the men going to the station and installing the plant you will get not more than $2,800 altogether. I do not see where the $5,000 comes in.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We do not know the number of men required for the installation in each case. Of course, while we allow $5,000, if we can get off with an expenditure of $3,000 or $3,500, so much the better.

Mr. BARKER. I again call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the Order in Council. This is of the same date as the contract. Going carefully through the contract, I find that that $600 is the cost of the apparatus, about $150 will be the cost of putting it in and $2,000 will be the allowance for royalty. There is nothing about buildings or anything of that kind.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. But if the hon. gentleman will refer to the contract he will see that the words are very clear. It may not be clear in the Order in Council, but it is clear in the contract.

Mr. BARKER. The contract no doubt followed the report to Council at the interval of not more than a few days.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Although the Order in Council may bear the same date as the contract, the report to Council may have been made long before.

Mr. BARKER. Perhaps a week.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. To my knowledge, the matter was studied a long time before the Order in Council was passed and the contract authorized.

Mr. AMES. It has been explained that this system comprises a receiver, which is in the hold of the steamer, and a transmitter, which is really the submarine bell. These two parts are both absolutely necessary ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. AMES. The government have taken the initiative and are prepared to spend $150,000 in placing these submarine bells at dangerous points. I would like to know if the minister took precautions to secure guarantees or promises on the part of general shipping that they would supply themselves with the necessary transmitters, so that the invention might be fully useful, or whether it was left entirely to the initiative and energy of the inventor ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We exacted the condition that they should secure the acceptance of at least thirty receivers, and unless this is done we will not undertake it.

Mr. AMES. That was one of the conditions of the contract—that at least thirty ships should be equipped with the receiver, outside of the ships of the department ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Fisheries—Salaries and disbursements for fishery inspectors, overseers and guardians, $110,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the minister brought down the report of Captain Salmon ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. A very interesting document, not so much for the hon. gentleman as for his colleague from Montreal (Mr. Ames). The document is rather lengthy, and I do not think it is necessary to read it. But I will read the answer of one of the most respectable officers that this department has ever had in its employ, Mr. Douglas Stevens, of St. John. He was appointed under the former government, and was kept on by the present government until last December, when he died. Mr. Stevens was the special officer appointed by the department to look after the construction of boats that were built for the department. He was sent half a dozen times, I think, to England to visit various navy yards, and to look after works of very great importance. In this case he was sent to superintend the work of construction of the 'Lurcher' lightship, which was installed on the shoal opposite Yarmouth. He did not please Mr. Salmon. When Mr. Salmon was detailed to put the 'Lurcher' on the shoal he disobeyed the orders of the department with regard to the proper mooring of the vessel. He came back with an extraordinary report, blaming everybody and everything. In answer to that report Mr. Stevens addressed the following answer to the deputy minister :

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your leter of the 19th instant, inclosing copy of a report from Captain Salmon on 'Lurcher' lightship in which he reflects strongly on my inspection in connection with the building of this vessel, and also virtually censures the department itself for certain parts of the plans and specifications. In my reply I will take the various items in Captain Salmon's report in rotation.

In the first place, as Colonel Anderson's letter of January 23rd clearly defined the purpose for which Captain Salmon came to Halifax, namely, to take the 'Lurcher' lightship out to her station and requesting me to assist him in facilitating the work in this respect, I therefore did not see the necessity of discussing with him all the details of the repairs to this vessel, which in his report he states I had done, but took him through the vessel, and merely explained matters generally to him and informed him of the difficulties I had ex-

perienced in getting work done at all because of the severe weather. I also expressed to him my anxiety to get the vessel in a fit condition to proceed to her station at the earliest possible moment.

Captain Salmon's opinion as to my supervision of these repairs and of the repairs themselves would be of some value if he himself were capable of forming an opinion upon technical work of this character. I hope to show, before this reply to his report is closed, that this is another case where a little superficial knowledge is a dangerous thing, and that Captain Salmon is actuated either by spleen against myself for some reason that I cannot explain or that he has been prompted to write out this report by other people who might think that it might be to their advantage to have me censured, or that he considered this a good opportunity for self glorification at my expense, and through his not being familiar with the plans and specifications to which the 'Lurcher' was built at the exepense of the department as well. Whether you are aware of the fact or not, the rumour has since Captain Salmon's appearance on this vessel at Halifax, got spread abroad that the government has been victimized by having a very poorly designed and built vessel handed over to them, rumours which are entirely false, and which would never have arisen except through ignorance of the elementary principles of ship building, and a painful want of discrétion on the part of some party or parties unknown, who gave rise to them. (See Captain Salmon's telegram from Yarmouth, February 3rd). The impression that a person unacquainted with the facts would gather from Captain Salmons's report is that by dint of great personal exertions on his part he got the ship ready for sea in fifteen working hours from his arrival, whereas all he actually did was to rush some provisions aboard at night in heavy rain and borrow a length of hose to fill the water tanks. With reference to Captain Salmon's remark about Captain Tinling's report that I held back the ship for a day, I would say that this was done to accommodate Commander Tinling, who informed me that the weather was not suitable for swinging a ship to adjust compasses. Long before Captain Salmon came, I pointed out to Mr. Hutchens that the electric mast head lamps could not be used for oil lamps, and if oil lamps were required they would have to be provided. I gave him every facility, assistance and information regarding the lights, fog signals, &c., to be published for notice to mariners. With regard to the statement about the provisions, I neither know nor had anything to do with this matter, which matters I considered to be best left to the agent and Captain Larkin. Had I permitted Captain Larkin to have his state-room quarters refitted in the extravagant and expensive manner he contemplated, there would have been nothing heard about the carpenter's so-called bad work. The statement that everybody employed on the vessel was endeavouring to spin out the job as long as possible is a disgrace to the man who made it.

I flatly deny his statement that I omitted to test rivets and would say that had I been at Yarmouth, not one of the so-called defective rivets would have been removed from her bows, nor stem, nor would the ship have gone to Yarmouth on any such paltry excuse, and any practical man knows that if you start cutting out rivets, the work must be recaulked; further, any man accustomed to this class of work knows well that he can take a hand hammer and with a pretense of testing, make as many slack rivets as ever he likes in countersunk work. If, as he states, additional rivets were put in the stem, he has weakened the stem at that point to the extent of the material cut out, as all the riveting in the stem, as well as in the other parts of the ship was strictly in accordance with Lloyd's rules.

With reference to his remarks about the steamer being badly strained, I can only say that such was not the case when the vessel left Halifax. Putting cement in the bows only adds weight where it is most hurtful without adding a particle of strength.

The fitting of an ejector, which I suppose he means instead of what he calls an injector, was totally unnecessary in the forepeak as there is a pump provided in the vessel for draining that part of the vessel by means of a hose.

If Captain Salmon allowed the vessel to go to sea from Yarmouth with a badly strained stem, plastered up with cement, he has incurred a grave responsibility.

The five unfilled holes were never intended for rivets, but were for the deck planking bolts which extended beyond the breakwater, and I am satisfied that those were the holes that permitted the water to reach the forepeak. The other items referred to in the paragraph from which I have been quoting, are too trivial to need any comment.

I will now endeavour to answer Mr. Salmon's statements about my gross carelessness.

The hawse pipe fitted for the harbour anchor was made precisely from the drawings furnished by the department, and the anchor which came from England just before the ship was rushed away from Toronto, was discovered to be too large, only as the vessel was leaving the wharf, and there was not time to remedy it, but a larger hawse pipe was sent to Halifax by the builders and fitted there, and I am satisfied myself that the anchor came in through the hawse pipe.

In all my short experience of about thirty-five years constantly among steamboats, I never yet saw a pump rigged over the bows to get the anchor pulled out.

Captain Salmon has already expressed his opinion that the strained bow and so-called defective rivets was due to butting the ice on voyage from Toronto to Halifax, and such being the case, I fail to see how I could be expected to discover them at Toronto. whether asleep or awake.

How does he know that the bulkheads were not water tight when he never tested them ? I am quite satisfied that they are. In vessels with open bilges, no double bottom, and no cargo, air and sounding pipes are only useless lumber.

Captain Salmon's remarks with reference to the stem being in three pieces are entirely wrong, and the stem, so far from being weakened by the way it is put together (Mr. Salmon's valuable opinion to the contrary, notwithstanding) is much stronger at the joint than at any other part of the stem, as great care was taken in making it so, and further, before this was done, a sketch was submitted to the department and approval was obtained.

Mr. Salmon's criticism of the department for consenting to substituting two large tanks incorporated into the structure of the ship, in-

stead of twelve tanks, is more amusing than instructive, and is only a further illustration of the amateurish manner in which this gentleman has taken upon himself the responsibility of criticising and depreciating this vessel.

If he were acquainted with only the elementary principles of hydraulics, or were even aware of the practice prevalent in the British navy, up to a very recent period, he would know that a loose weight of water free to move in a water chamber on board ship has exactly the opposite tendency to what he thinks, for instead of tending to cause the ship to roll, it acts as a brake and prevents rolling. If Captain Salmon has any doubts on this subject, I would refer him to White's 'Naval Architecture.' This book only costs five dollars, and it will afford him much interesting and profitable study.

With reference to the quarter pipes, all those called for in the plans and specifications are provided as required, and any seaman should know enough to serve the ropes with parcelling where they pass through chocks and are liable to chafe.

I must plead guilty to Captain Salmon's charge that there are no deck houses provided on the vessel, but as such are not called for by the plans and specifications, this is a direct criticism of the department, not of me.

With reference to man-holes in tanks, it may be impossible for Captain Salmon to find means of access to the insides of these tanks, but it is quite easy for any one to do so who has a mind to look.

The men's bunks were put up according to plans, but proved rather narrow, and I had them widened before Captain Salmon put in an appearance. His opinion about the heating arrangements is not very valuable, as I lived on board with thermometer ten degrees below zero and did not find any inconvenience.

Captain Salmon's statement about the hatches being big enough to receive the boilers is another reflection upon the plans and specifications.

As to his remark that a carpenter should be a permanent member of the crew, this is only in accordance with a suggestion I had already made to the department and also to Captain Salmon. How could he have expected the boats holding the reversing gear bracket to break, when he had never seen them ?

During a trying voyage full speed from Toronto to Summerside, Prince Edward Island, I found a means of getting rid of all the ashes without the aid of the ash ejector, or a hole in the deck which would be both dangerous and detrimental, and I think Captain Salmon went beyond his instructions in giving such an order. I fail to understand this remark that all the ports in the ship are put in wrong. Stronger or better sidelights were never put in a ship, and moreover, they are put in properly. As for the five ports in the neighbourhood of the water line, they are placed in accordance with the plans and have already gone through more ice, to my perfect satisfaction, than they are ever likely to meet again, and this without even the covers on.

Captain Salmon does not appear to be aware that a large number of first-class ocean liners have at least one tier of sidelights submerged when the vessel is deep-loaded.

It was no discovery of Captain Salmon's that the contact breaker was too slow, and ample provision had previously been made to take care of the defect. The device was in accordance with plans, but I am having another device prepared, and will submit it to the department in due time, so that we will not have a repetition of this difficulty on the other vessel.

No hand rails were called for in the saloon by the specification, but the builders fitted them, thinking they would be useful.

I was unaware that Captain Salmon was a marine engineer as well as master of a vessel, as his remarks regarding exhausting of auxiliary engines into hot well would imply. Would it surprise Captain Salmon to learn (in spite of his statement to the contrary) that none of the auxiliary engines on the 'Lurcher' do exhaust into the hot well. Consequently it will be unnecessary in this case to take the benefit of his past experience and break the connection with the hot well.

Captain Salmon's criticism of the plans and specifications can best be dealt with by the department. No departure from them has been made, without the consent of the department, and every change which has been made has been a great improvement to the ship, which any practical man must admit.

Captain Salmon's opinion with respect to the propelling machinery of the vessel is about of equal value with the rest of his assertions. In this connection I would simply ask if the boilers were reversed, where would he have his smoke boxes, and how would he sponge his tubes. It really seems a great waste of time to have to reply to such ridiculous criticisms.

The compass arrangements are all in accordance with specifications and plans. If they do not happen to suit Captain Salmon's ideas so much the worse for Captain Salmon, and it has nothing whatever to do with a marine engineer being appointed inspector of a captain.

As a rule, captains of ships know practically nothing about the technical construction of a ship anywhere below the rail, and I think that this reply to his report shows that he is no exception to the rule.

Captain Salmon takes ten lines of closely typewritten matter to describe to the department that a saloon chair capsized between Halifax and Yarmouth, an important event which he was not on board to witness.

Will Captain Salmon kindly point out which is the out-of-the-way corner in which the large filtering grounds could be placed practically and connected to deck and tanks. With regard to Captain Salmon's report about the frames in the stem (bow ?) being flared, by which I presume he means bevelled, I would say that this is another instance of a ship master trying to express an opinion about matters which he does not understand. He is apparently trying to show that the vessel would be better constructed if built with camp frames instead of square. Somebody has evidently been posting him, but he has not quite got on to the idea Camp frames are sometimes used, but only in extremely bluff-bowed ships and not in the case of vessels of 'Lurcher's' type. It would be very interesting to have Captain Salmon point out how he would deal with the frame at the collision bulkhead if his idea were carried out.

Captain Salmon is evidently of the opinion that the policy of the present government in fostering the building of steel ships in Canada is all wrong, but fortunately for this country, those who are at the head of affairs think differently. I am personally satisfied, and can prove that the 'Lurcher,' so far as her hull is concerned at any rate, is stronger, and in work-

manship can stand comparison with the best of our latest importations from the old country.

I have no desire to make any comment upon Captain Salmon's criticism of the captain or chief officer.

As to the engineer, he was recommended to me by Mr. Roche, M.P., and beyond this recommendation I knew nothing further about Mr. Chapman, nor on inquiry could I find any one to say a word against him.

The galley was built according to plans and is evidently big enough for the boats built in the United States. I have seen galleys no larger where they were, able to cook for 150 men.

There is no connection between any of the fresh tanks and the sea by which salt water could get ingress, and if any salt water got in, it got there by carelessness through the filter pipes from the upper deck.

The department is already aware of the condition in which the 'Lurcher' left Toronto and the anxiety on the part of all concerned to get the ship on her station for the benefit of navigation, and some things had to be left undone until such time as she got to her moorings. In fine weather, with the assistance of a carpenter for a while, and the work of the engineers on board, any work left unfinished could be completed without any trouble.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
DOUGLAS STEVENS,
Inspector of government steamers.

F. GOURDEAU, Esq.
Deputy Minister of
Marine and Fisheries.

That is the letter of Mr. Douglas Stevens inspector of government steamers. I would not stoop so low as to put this man named Salmon alongside of Mr. Stevens for respectability, honesty, intelligence and honourable life and conduct. I hope the committee will understand that in a matter of this kind I have no preference for one or the other, but from what I know of Mr. Douglas Stevens—a gentleman who does not belong to our political party, but who is a faithful and loyal officer not only of this government but of the former government—I think there is no further comment to make.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister has read the statement of an officer of his department condemning another officer.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Answering the other officer.

Mr. BLAIN. Does not the minister think it fair that he should read the statement of the other official so that the committee may have an opportunity of judging between them ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The document is on the table of the House and anybody can take communication of it and read it. For my part I would not undertake to read it because the party I have mentioned, Salmon, has never answered Mr. Stevens letter ; he never dared to answer it.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister has changed his mind very much since last year about Captain Salmon. The minister told us last year that he proposed to make certain changes in his department and that not only had he gone all over Canada for a competent officer to take charge of this branch of the department, but he had gone to the old country as well and found Captain Salmon there. The minister should give us some reasons for changing his mind.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The explanation is very simple and I have already given it two or three times to the House. I was left under the impression that this officer was competent and that he was a loyal trustworthy man in whom we should have confidence. But I discovered personally as well as from the facts that come to my knowledge in the department, that he was not at all worthy of the confidence that was placed in him. Mistakes of that kind will happen. You may take a man into your employment on the recommendation of others and you may give that man your implicit confidence, but to your regret he may turn out to be a perfect and a regular blackguard.

Mr. BLAIN. The explanation is not very satisfactory. The minister says that he was deceived in the selection of Captain Salmon and I suppose the committee will have to accept that, but the minister is unfair to Captain Salmon in refusing to place on 'Hansard' the statement made by him so that it may be read in conjunction with the statement made by the other officer. I will read from 'Hansard,' 1903, a statement made in this House by the minister himself, with respect to Captain Salmon whom he is now condemning in such strong terms. The minister then said :

Last year we inaugurated a system of holding investigations into every casualty that occurred. The members of the committee will recollect that this was done at the special request of the Board of Trade in England, in order to render the service as effective as possible. . . . We have replaced Captain Smith, deceased, by Captain Reginald Salmon, at a salary of $2,000. This department is being thoroughly reorganized under a very able officer and we try to make it as effective as possible. Captain Salmon is an officer of the Royal Navy Reserve holding the rank of lieutenant. . . . Captain Salmon is a commissioner of investigation under the law and he has associated with him two expert assessors. . . . We have had a great deal of difficulty in finding a man qualified as Captain Salmon is to take the position at $2,000. It was only after a good deal of inquiry in Canada and England that we succeeded in getting Captain Salmon. He had been employed in Canada on the surveys by the British government, and he became attached to Canada and accepted the position.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have admitted, and I will admit it again and again that I was grossly deceived. From what I know now of the individual he should never have entered into the service of the department.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the minister mean that Captain Salmon was incompetent ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In every way.

Mr. BARKER. I wish the minister and the committee to understand that I am not in the least opposing the use of this bell apparatus for which a vote is here asked. I believe that double the money might be well spent if the apparatus is likely to be successful ; but the minister knows the skill with which persons who are introducing patent inventions manage to get them taken up by government departments or other people. In this case I understand that three lighthouses on the Massachusetts coast were fitted up with this instrument and that the minister was asked to inspect these. That is the usual course ; the minister is told that the invention has been adopted and the minister in good faith thinks it is all right and he also takes it up. Then the inventor goes to Washington and tells the people there that the Canadian Minister of Marine has taken it up and that he is in communication with the British Admiralty.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is a great honour to me if there should be so much talk in Washington.

Mr. BARKER. Not too great a one. The inventor gets it into the minds of the people that everybody is after this invention. Now, it may be a very good one, an excellent one, but when the minister is asking authority to order fifty stations to be equipped with it, and every station he equips will mean a royalty of $2,000 in addition to paying a charge for the thing itself, for its installation, and for the receivers on the vessels of the government and the vessels of the public that are to use it, I think we are entitled to inquire carefully into it. I have no suspicion on the matter at all ; but I think it is right, before we enter into the expenditure under these circumstances, that we should use a little care and perhaps a little criticism on the subject. Now, I find, in looking over the correspondence, that the hon. gentleman made a report to Council on the 10th of August, and in that report he refers to a previous report of his own of the 8th of July. That previous report is not among the papers. I do not ask that it be produced; I shall be quite content if the hon. gentleman can say what the nature of it was. In that report the hon. gentleman submitted to Council that it was advisable that special officers of the department should be sent to report upon this invention; but I do not find among the papers produced a single reference to such a report. When we are spending so much money, I do think we ought to know not only that the minister recommended such an investigation, but that it took place, and what the officers said about it. That is the only question I want to ask in addition to those which I have already asked. I do not say this with the slightest intention of interfering with the use of this appliance. I shall hope that it will be a successful one, and if it is, it will be of the utmost value to the country.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. If the hon. gentleman had taken the trouble to look at page 67 of the report of the Marine branch of the department, he would have seen that we took all the necessary precautions to ascertain the value of the invention. That report says :—

On behalf of the Shipping Federation of Canada, Captain Archibald Reid, port warden for Montreal and surveyor to Lloyd's Register, London, reported :

The submarine signal apparatus is easily understood and manipulated by any person who will devote his attention to it. At 8.40 a.m. heard the sound of the bell on the Vineyard Sound lightship, which at first was somewhat faint to my untrained ear, and appeared to be mingled with the whirr and swash of the sea alongside the vessel, but it soon became very distinct, and louder and louder until it was abeam of the vessel at 9.05 a.m., when it gradually became fainter ; the sound was so plain that all the gentlemen in the room that were standing near me heard the sound passing all through the receivers which I was holding to my ears. When approaching the lightship, the steamer was manœuvred so as to bring it on both bows, its bearing and location was almost accurately ascertained by the manipulation of the transmitters ; this was done at all the stations where the bells are placed. The time elapsed was twenty-five minutes from the time I first heard the bell till it was abeam (verified by the men and officers outside as I could not see the vessel.) The speed of the vessel was fifteen knots per hour, she therefore must have been from six to six and a half miles off when first the sound was heard.

At 4.15 a.m., when trying the instrument the writer heard another bell on the ss. 'Herman Winter.' This vessel is fitted with a bell in the forepeak which gives four strokes at intervals sounded by machinery. At 4.22 a.m. he passed abeam, elapsed time seven minutes, both vessels going about fifteen knots, so that she must have been about two and a half miles off when the bell was first heard. I heard the bell on the starboard bow (she was expected to be sighted on the port bow). Shortly after the green light was reported on the starboard bow, she crossed to port, the observer detecting the change.

At 7.43 a.m. we heard the bell on the Pollock Rip shoal right ahead or nearly so, striking 7.3. Seven and then three strokes. At 8.12 a.m. Pollock Rip shoal lightship abeam, time elapsed twenty-nine minutes, or about seven miles distant when first the sound of the bell was heard.

Besides that, I heard it myself.

Mr. BARKER. Is that a report from the hon. gentleman's officers?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No. Captain Reid is not one of my officers ; he is a port warden of the port of Montreal ; he is a Can-

adian public officer. If the bells do not work, there is no payment.

Mr. BARKER. If you order fifty of these, you will pay $100,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No, not a cent unless they work. It is after the proof of the pudding that we pay for it.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to point out with regard to this matter that a gentleman on this side of the House moved for all papers relating to it. Now, I find, in reading these papers, and I have read them with a good deal of care, not for the purpose of finding fault, but merely trying to do my duty, that a report of a particular date was referred to by the minister, and he refers to an inquiry by his own officers. I do not criticise him for using the officers of another department; but it is not fair to members of the House that important reports appearing in blue books should form part of this matter, and that no reference should be made to them in this return. My attention was called to some of the words the hon. gentleman read.

Some of the sentences he read are almost identical with the report made by an American agent to another company with reference to the same inquiry, and I thought that perhaps it was the same report. I, of course, accept the hon. minister's assurance but the coincidence is a strange one.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I hope that the hon. gentleman does not imagine that any of our officers could have copied some other reports. I am aware myself personally, having followed this thing from the beginning, that anything done in this matter was done above board and not at the suggestion of any one; and everybody who knows Mr. Whitney, of Boston, knows he is not a gentleman who would try to impose upon any government or corporation anything which was not perfectly right and honourable.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman says he has looked into this matter personally from the beginning. He will not deny that other members have a duty to perform just as well as he has. I would like to read an answer which the hon. minister gave to a question put last year on this subject. Before six o'clock I read from the hon. gentleman's own report that he told his colleagues in Council some time last year that the installations would cost about $5,000 a piece. We see now the cost is $2,800 or $2,900 each including all the expenses. Would he allow me to quote from Hansard of 28th April, 1904, page 2187:

Mr. KAULBACH. Has the government purchased from a Boston firm or company a number of submarine signals? If so, how many have been obtained? At what price? On whose recommendation were these submarine signals purchased? In what countries are they in use, and to what extent?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, three had been ordered. Cost $1,200 each. On the recommendation of the deputy minister, the commander of the marine service and the commissioner of lights.

These are the reports which we would like to see.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They are all published.

Mr. BARKER. I do not know whether the reports the hon. gentleman has mentioned are the reports of those three particular officers. We have had a jump from $1,200 to $5,000, and now the price is $2,800.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In April, 1904, this matter was yet under study and the question of purchasing some of the system meant those which should be used on board of our steamers and not those that were to be installed. Those that were to be installed could not cost less than the amount mentioned. It only meant those that were to be used as receivers on board the steamers. Instead of purchasing three we only purchased two—one for the 'Stanley' and one for the 'Minto.' All this information is in the report of the Marine Department which was laid on the table at the beginning of the session. Surely I cannot be expected to repeat the same reports. The other day a return was asked of certain papers. We produced the papers asked for and again another motion was carried asking for the same papers which had already been produced. We put on the table a document stating that by reference to the return already produced on such a date, all the information asked for could be obtained.

Mr. BARKER. There is no reference here to the blue-book.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The blue-books are in the hands of everybody.

Mr. BARKER. You might as well refer us to the Encyclopedia Britannica.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. If hon. gentlemen would take the trouble to read the blue-books, they would get more benefit from them than from reading the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. BLAIN. In the report of Captain Salmon there are some very important statements which require some explanation from the minister. Captain Salmon says:

I had to call Mr. Stevens' attention to the slackness displayed by the carpenter employed. There were a considerable number of these men on board, and as far as I could see they did little more than put in time, and all the work that had been done by these men was disgracefully bad. By dint of continual supervision and constantly urging the men, the repairs were effected in time for her to sail on Wednes-

day the 26th June, and Mr. Douglas Stevens said that everything was tight and seaworthy in the hull and all the engines in good working condition.

This is a very serious reflection on the employees in the hon. gentleman's department. We should have some statement from the minister either admitting the truth of the report or denying it. Then Captain Salmon goes on to say :

I could not help seeing that everybody employed on the vessel was endeavouring to spin out the job as long as possible.

This is an important statement. The 'Lurcher' is a new vessel, constructed in Toronto by the Polson Company, at a cost of about $90,000. Captain Salmon, whom the minister recommended as a worthy man for this important position, says this of the vessel :

I am informed that the plans for the vessel were obtained from the United States, being the oldest form of lightship in existence and, Mr. Stevens, further acquainted me with the fact that the vessel was a very decided improvement on these plans. In this I do not agree. I consider that the 'Lurcher' is a very poor copy of the original plans and specifications and these plans and specifications are almost obsolete in the United States.

Surely the minister did not adopt an obsolete plan imported from the United States ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The fellow was absolutely wrong.

Mr. BLAIN. I am only quoting from this gentleman whom the minister recommended to us so highly.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. But this happened lately. It is only lately we have discovered that he was a rascal—that is all. We did not know that before.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that the vessel was an up-to-date one ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Up-to-date—the best.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister says he only discovered it lately.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We did not discover lately that the vessel was up-to-date, but we discovered lately that the man was a rascal.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to draw the minister's attention to this one other clause before I sit down :

Mr. Chapman was incapably drunk on the vessel leaving Halifax and also the day before she sailed from Yarmouth, and from information supplied to me by the marine superintendent of the Dominion Atlantic line, who has personal experience of this man, I find that he is nothing more or less than an incompetent drunkard. On leaving the wharf at Yarmouth to anchor off Bunker Island this man was so troublesome that Captain Larkin had to use violence towards him and threaten to lash him in his cabin to prevent him from interfering in the engine-room.

These are very serious statements against officers that are still in the employ of the government. I would expect the minister either to stand up and say, this is a correct statement and that these officers have been disciplined, or else in fairness to them, that he would say that the statement is inaccurate that these men are not drunkards but are discharging their duty faithfully. Referring especially to this man Chapman, Captain Salmon says that he is a drunkard which means that he is unworthy of the position to which he was appointed.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. He was dismissed on the spot.

Mr. BLAIN. Then on that point the report is correct. What about the balance of it ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Of course, we did not take Captain Salmon's word for it. The man was dismissed after an investigation.

Mr. BLAIN. Evidently there is a good deal wrong in the hon. minister's department. I am glad he is going to have a house-cleaning.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. With a large number of employees, such a thing as this will happen in the experience of the department. A man gets drunk ; the fact is ascertained ; he is dismissed. What more is there to say ? It is only losing the time of the House to talk about it.

Mr. BLAIN. We are discussing this document which the minister has furnished. I am quoting the hon. minister against himself—that is all. This is the report of a man who, the hon. minister told us last year, was worthy of a position in his department at a salary of $2,000 a year. But now the minister condemns him. This is the first opportunity we have had to examine this report. Surely he will not say that that is not wasting the time of the committee. Surely we on this side have some rights.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. But why should the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) insist upon holding me responsible for the fault of a mariner who was recommended but who, on being engaged, proved himself unworthy of the position he was given ? These things will happen under the most careful management.

Mr. AMES. Will the minister say why there is an increase of $25,000 in the salaries and disbursements of fishery overseers ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Now we get down to business. In 1903-4 our expenditure under this head was $105,111.40. We had a vote in the main estimates of $85,000 and in the supplementary of a further vote of $25,000 was asked. Now, so long as I am

at the head of the department, I will take a very strong stand against asking a certain amount in the main estimates and then coming down to the House asking for a supplementary vote. I speak now, of course, not of the services the expenditure upon which cannot well be foreseen, but of such services as this in which the amount of expenditure can be estimated in advance. When we have a fixed charge, I do not think we should ask in the main estimates for $80,000 when we know that we shall require $100,000, trusting to make it up by a vote of $20,000 in the supplementary estimates. It is better to face the music and say; the expenditure last year was $105,000; it cannot be reduced; let us ask at once for what we need and have no more discussion about it.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I do not rise to criticise the minister, except that I would like to know whether it is his intention to carry out the resolutions of the Montreal Board of Trade and the Shipping Federation with regard to the aids to navigation that we have been asking for for a number of years. I have no doubt that he remembers the resolution passed by the Montreal Board of Trade on the 31st of last month which resolution is, in part, as follows:

> Be it resolved that the government be urged to provide in the estimates a sufficient sum of money to complete the absolutely required improvements in the lighthouses, fog signals and other appliances, which required improvements were submitted by the Shipping Federation of Canada to the commissioner of lights and understood to have been afterwards approved by the lighthouse board.

Every session for the last five years, the Montreal Board of Trade and the shipping interest have asked for these aids to navigation. They have been promised them a great many times, and I hope the minister will carry out the pledges made.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This subject came up this afternoon, and the programme of the department was fully laid before the committee. We hope that, at the end of the season of 1906, all the lighthouses and other aids to navigation will be in such a condition that the board of trade and the shipping interest, will be satisfied.

Mr. AMES. Perhaps we cannot hear too much of a good thing, and certainly any news of improvement in the St. Lawrence is a good thing. But the hon. member for St. Lawrence division (Mr. Bickerdike) will find, when he consults 'Hansard' to-morrow, that this is the third time to-day that that board of trade resolution has been read.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Not too many.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I have brought that question up every session, and no doubt I will have to do so two or three times more.

Mr. PREFONTAINE.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the minister's department issued any pound fishing licenses?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. None by the federal government.

Mr. BENNETT. I remember a return was moved for as to how many pound net licenses were applied for by Mr. Dyment, M.P., Algoma. I have been watching for the return, but so far I think it has not been brought down.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No Dominion licenses are now issued in the province of Ontario.

Mr. BENNETT. I have before me a copy of the return moved for by an hon. gentleman opposite: 'Correspondence between the Department of Marine and Fisheries and Mr. Dyment, M.P., as to licenses issued to one T. H. Jackman, Killarney.' Were any licenses issued to Mr. Jackman at all?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We have nothing to do with that.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister has not explained in detail the reason for the increase of $25,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I thought I had explained that there is no increase whatever, it is only apparent. Last year there was voted in the main estimates $85,000 and in the supplementary estimates $20,000. That has been going on for the last three or four years, not voting enough in the main estimates to pay what was absolutely necessary and was contracted for, and then meeting the deficiency in the supplementaries. We want to stop that, and so we ask now for the exact amount we shall require. We spent last year $110,111. There is no use voting $80,000 in the main estimates and then coming forward every year for $25,000 in the supplementaries. Next year I will have no supplementary estimates.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the estimates were properly prepared, the sum we voted last year, in both the main and supplementaries, was $85,000. It is usual to prepare the estimates, giving in the first column the total for the last year, and adding together the main estimate and the supplementary. This year he is asking for $110,000, or an increase of $25,000 over the total vote of last year. We want to know what he is doing with that $25,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We will have to take a suplementary estimate for this year to make up the amount to $110,000; but next year there will not be any supplementary estimate of $25,000 to cover the deficit of the year previous.

Mr. TAYLOR. How did the department come to expend $110,000 last year, when he asked for $85,000 and said that would be sufficient?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We had to pay for the salaries, and I have explained that we did not ask for enough the year previous.

Mr. TAYLOR. Last year the minister came down with an estimate to cover the expenditure. Now he says he has over-expended by $25,000 the amount voted last year. What has become of that $25,000 ? A few years ago we ran the fisheries independent of the province of Ontario. To-day Ontario has taken over a great portion of the fisheries, and notwithstanding that, under my hon. friend's administration, the expenditure is going up by leaps and bounds. A few years ago this service was done for a great deal less money.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The country is going backwards, I suppose, according to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR. We want to know what is done with the money. What has become of that $25,000 that was over-expended last year ? Last year he stated that $85,000 would be sufficient for the service, and he has expended $25,000 more than that. Surely the committee is entitled to know what has become of the money. What is he going to do with this $110,000 ? He has an estimate in his hands showing how this $110,000 is going to be expended. Let him tell us what he is going to do with it. How much was paid for salaries ? I have in my eye now a member who sat on this side of the House supporting the government, and when he was defeated he was appointed fishery officer at a large salary—Mr. Hurley. How much is there in the estimates for Mr. Hurley for next year ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have a memorandum giving a full explanation of the vote for 1903-4. For 1903-4 the vote was $105,000, and we expended that year $110,000. This vote was arrived at by adding $85,000 of the main estimates and $20,000 in the supplementary estimates. In order to avoid asking for a supplementary amount for 1905-6, a vote of $25,000 required for the fiscal year commencing July 1st next is included in the main estimates. In comparing the appropriation last fall with the $85,000 voted for 1904-5, there is an apparent increase of $25,000 over the current year; but to complete the expenditure for this year the sum of $25,000 will appear in the supplementaries, thus bringing the total to $110,000, the same as we ask for next year. The expenditure for the seven months of the current fiscal year, up to January 1st last, was $71,487, and it is estimated that the sum of $28,500 will be required to complete the payments coming in the current fiscal year. This amount is made up of the unexpended balance of the current appropriation and the $25,000 which will appear in the supplementaires. In 1897, negotiations were pending between Ontario and Quebec and the Dominion government as to the jurisdiction, and a sum of $85,000 was placed in the estimates pending a final settlement. It was subsequently decided that the federal government must provide for some federal protection, and for this purpose three inspectors were appointed in Ontario, and provision was made for protection in a portion of the gulf of St. Lawrence. This expenditure, which, in Ontario, amounted to $7,600, and in Quebec to $4,500, was not anticipated when the vote for $85,000 was taken, consequently from that time on various sums, averaging $25,000 a year, have been placed in the supplementaries. To avoid that in future, this sum is now added in the main estimates. The total amount for the last fiscal year amounted to $85,583.03, made up as follows. I presume hon. gentlemen do not desire me to read all these particulars ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am asking for a detailed statement of how the hon. gentleman proposes spending this $110,000 for which he is now asking?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The detailed expenditure is as follows :—

Ontario, three inspectors, salaries, $3,600; expenses, $923.43.

Quebec, four inspectors, ten overseers, salaries, $3,466.66; expenses, $1,363.

New Brunswick, three inspectors, salary and expenses together..	$27,664 34
Nova Scotia, three inspectors ..	30,000 00
British Columbia	15,000 00
Yukon..	1,400 00

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend stated that for New Brunswick there was an expenditure of $27,000 for three inspectors.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. And the general expenditure. We have three inspectors but there are other disbursements for other officials which covers the amount.

Mr. TAYLOR. In that statement my hon. friend has said that he had three inspectors for New Brunswick and that the expenditure was $27,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There are three inspectors in New Brunswick and a staff of overseers and fishery guardians, and the expenditure has been $27,664.34, including everything.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is everything ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. (reading).

Fisheries, New Brunswick, Chapman, R. A., Moncton, salary $1,100, travel and outlay, $368.69.

Harrison, H. E., Oromocto, salary $400, travel and outlay, $134.87.

Pratt, John H., St. Andrews, travel and outlay, $107.97.

Then follow the salaries and disbursements of the overseers and wardens and special guardians, to be found at page T—110 of the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend has the same estimate amount in his estimate for this year as the amounts in the expendi-

ture for last year which he has just read ; there is no increase or decrease.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will my hon. friend tell me the total expenditure for Ontario with three inspectors ; what their duties are, and their salaries ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. (reading).

Salaries of officers, Ontario,$3,600 ; disbursements of officers, $943.

A total of $4,500.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who are the officers for Ontario and what are their duties?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That will be found in the report on fisheries. The inspectors for Ontario are : A. G. Duncan, Marksville; J. M. Hurley, Belleville; O. B. Sheppard, Toronto, each with a salary of $1,200.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will my hon. friend tell us what Mr. Hurley's duties are ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. At page XI of the report will be found :—

Inspector J. M. Hurley, of Belleville, says : Fishing along Lake Ontario, from Cobourg east, Bay of Quinté, and on the St. Lawrence river, for whitefish and herring, has been better than for several years past.

Fishing for coarse fish has also been very good, and the season of 1904 may be considered a very profitable one to the persons engaged in this industry in eastern Ontario.

The waters over which my inspectorate extends abound in sporting fish, and anglers have had a splendid season. As an example of this during the season, a black bass weighing five and a half pounds was taken in the Bay of Quinté, and at Glen Island a very large maskinongé was captured. A black bass weighing six pounds two ounces was also taken in the River Trent. This is supposed to be the largest fish of this species ever taken in these waters.

Mr. TAYLOR. For writing that report Mr. Hurley practically gets $1,200 ? I ask what his duties were and what territory he covered and that is the answer ? Every one knows that a large maskinongé was caught, we all saw it advertised in every paper in the country. We all know that it was a big fish story to advertise the hotel up on the point there, that it was the best fishing ground in the Dominion, and that a large maskinongé had been taken there. Mr. Hurley produces his report and gets $1,200 for writing that page. I understand that the Ontario government practically has charge of all fishing waters in Ontario, and that Mr. Hurley simply sits at home and makes out his account for travelling expenses and his salary of $100 per month which the minister pays, and all he does is to write a report saying that there was a big maskinongé and some black bass caught.

An hon. MEMBER. And some suckers.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes and some suckers too.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I notice in the Auditor General's Report that F. H. Markey is credited with $10 for a fishing lease on the Nelson and other rivers, and on Great Slave lake. This lease is for 21 years renewable for another 21 years or for 42 years in all. Have any operations been carried on during the past year under this lease, and by whom.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Operations have been carried on.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Have the terms of the lease been complied with ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Oh, yes.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What are the terms of the lease ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have not the lease here, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) had it last year for six weeks and I suppose he read it.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The minister was so certain about the terms being carried out that I thought he had the terms at his fingers' ends.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I know from the report in the department that the terms of the lease have been carried out. The matter was looked into and my information is that the conditions were carried out. We have not a report further than last year when they started work, but of course we will see that every provision of the lease is fulfilled.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Has that lease been transferred to any person ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It was granted to Mr. Markey to be transferred to the British American Fish Corporation.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Has it been transferred ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not think we have any regular transfer made.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Mr. Markey had the option of transferring it, but the minister represented last year that Mr. Markey was acting on behalf of the British American Fish Company, and the lease itself says :

The said lessee shall not transfer his interest in the present lease except to the British American Fish Corporation Limited to which letters patent have been granted by the Governor General in Council; without obtaining the written consent of the Minister or that of some other person or persons authorized to grant the same.

It would appear from the lease therefore, that Mr. Markey was really acting for himself, and he had the option of transferring his lease to that one company but not to any other company unless he got the con-

sent of the minister. Has Mr. Markey obtained the consent of the minister to transfer it to any other corporation, or, is the lease now in his own name ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is yet in his own name ; it has not been transferred.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The minister distinctly stated last year that he made it a rule not to grant a lease except to persons who were in the business. Is Mr. Markey a lawyer of Montreal, in the fish business ? The receipt for the $10 is in Mr. Markey's name so that if Mr. Markey is running this on his own hook, the policy of the minister is not carried out. Mr. Markey is not in the fish business and the minister left the impression on the House last year that he was merely acting for the British American Fish Company. Mr. Markey apparently has paid the $10, and in doing that has he fulfilled all the terms of the lease.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Mr. Markey has paid the $10 according to his lease, and he has done so with the intention of transferring the lease to this company which is really doing the work. Mr. Markey is a lawyer in Montreal, and I cannot say that he is carrying on fishing operations. The work is being done by the British American Company and according to that information given by the inspector of that district they have done all the development work the lease calls for.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Have they spent $1,000 during the past year ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They spent a good deal more than that.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. It is really the Fish Company that is doing the work ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, but the transfer has not been completed.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. There was a good deal of dissatisfaction last year with regard to this lease and the minister said he would send an officer up to make a report. I would like to have that report.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The inspector has made a report in which he states that the whole trouble has been overcome, and that it came only from a rival company who were exploiting in some other waters there and did not want to see any one else in their territory.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Is that a written report ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Will the minister have any objection to bring down that report ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No.

Mr. AMES. Who are the British American Fish Corporation and where is their domicile ; is it a Canadian, a British, or an American company ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I think most of them are domiciled in Selkirk, Man.

Mr. AMES. If you were sending a letter to the British American Fish Corporation, Limited, where would you address it ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. To Selkirk.

Mr. LAKE. There was a lease granted to John K. McKenzie for the exclusive right of fishing in Lesser Slave Lake and Lake Athabaska ; for what term does that lease run ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. For nine years, but if the hon. gentleman wants special information about it he is welcome to any document in the department.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Are any returns made to the department of the annual catches under these leases.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That would come from the local inspector.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Has this Mr. McKenzie the power in his lease to transfer or sub-let ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. He has the right to transfer with the consent of the minister.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Has he sub-let his lease ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. He has not sub-let it ; I think it was transferred to the Northwest Fish Company.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Who constitute that company ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not know ; it is a Canadian company.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I ask because of an item in one of the Winnipeg daily papers which I will read to the minister :

Winnipeg, February 18.—A report has been brought to the city by fur traders from the Lesser Slave Lake district to the effect that Butterfield & Dee, a firm which is conducting fishing operations on a large scale there, has already taken out 100 tons of whitefish and proposes to take out 300 tons more before March. The exclusive franchise to fish in the Lesser Slave Lake was given by Hon. Raymond Prefontaine, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to Mr. McKenzie, of Selkirk, Manitoba, by a lease signed on May, 14, at a rental of $10 a year from 1904 for nine years. This matter was called to the attention of the House of Commons on August 9, 1904, by Nat. Boyd, then member for Portage la Prairie. A similar concession was given about the same time to a Montreal lawyer to fish in the Nelson and other rivers in the district of Keewatin and Grand Slave Lake for 21 years for $10 a year. Exclusive fishing rights in James Bay were given in the same manner to Archie McNee.

From the procedure in the case of the Lesser Slave Lake it is evident that the franchise has been sub-let to an American firm, which

is conducting operations on an enormous scale. It is announced that the company proposes to take out 700 tons of whitefish next winter. At that rate, it is claimed, there would soon be depletion.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. From what paper is that ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I am not sure. It is a slip which was sent to me from one of the Winnipeg dailies.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It must be a fish story, because there is no possibility of anything of that sort having happened.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Does the minister say the lease has not been sub-let to the gentlemen mentioned here ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It may have been transferred to the company, as in the other case, with the consent of the minister. They had no authority to sub-let it to anybody else. As regards the quantity, that is perfectly ridiculous. They have to come out by Slave lake, they cannot come out otherwise, and it would cost about $2 per cwt.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. There is a great deal of dissatisfaction with this policy of blanket leases covering a great deal of the inland waters, lakes and rivers, in that part of the country. There is an impression abroad that some of the political favourites of the hon. gentleman have been granted these leases for many years, and that they are trafficking in them and at the same time depleting these waters. The settlers are debarred from trading in the fish, only being allowed to catch what they require for their own consumption ; but American firms can come in and secure from the hon. gentleman's department these long blanket leases. The settlers condemn this policy and I do not think it is defensible at all.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I am informed by my inspector that since these lakes were opened to fishing, it is a fact that American capital has gone into these enterprises. I know nothing of the statements the hon. gentleman has read. I am responsible for the leases, but they have always been granted after due consideration, and after a good deal of discussion, and on the responsibility of the members from those districts. If the wrong is so great that it requires to be looked into at once, I will certainly look into it and have an inspector make a report, and see if the complaints are well-founded. I have already since last session sent an officer to see if the complaints were well-founded, as they were presented before the House, fortunately the report was that there was no such serious ground of complaint. If the hon. gentleman takes the responsibility of saying that there are good grounds of complaint, I will have a full report made on the subject.

Mr. LALOR. What is the size of one of these lakes—Great Slave lake, for instance ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is an immense lake. I do not know the size of it.

Mr. LALOR. Then, do I understand the minister to say that he leases the fishing rights in one of these immense lakes for a term of twenty-one years for $10 a year, and also some of the rivers at the same rate ? That must be a surprise to the country as well as to some of the hon. gentlemen's supporters who sit behind him. He might as well give it away for nothing, because $10 a year does not amount to anything. It seems to me a ridiculous state of affairs that fishing licenses are given away in that manner. I am surprised that the gentlemen who sit behind the hon. minister do not rise and condemn that sort of thing.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They would if it were true, but it is not.

Mr. INGRAM. Perhaps it would be as well to put on record the size of this lake : it is one hundred miles long by thirty miles wide. I understand that there are also several rivers included in this.

Mr. HERRON. I understand that these are some of the best inland fisheries perhaps on the continent. Are there any more good fisheries there, and does the hon. minister propose to continue this system of fishing leases until they are all taken up ?

Mr. INGRAM. Do they continue fishing there late in the season?—because I notice that this lake does not freeze up until Christmas.

Mr. LALOR. The minister, in answer to my remarks, said that his supporters would condemn it if it were true, but it is not true. Would he please explain in what way it is not true ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Look at the lease.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Well, I will read a portion of one of the leases to show the extent of waters covered by it. After the preamble, it says :

> The minister, under authority of the Fisheries Act, doth hereby demise and lease unto the lessee, the right to fish with nets, or in any other legal manner, to take and catch all kinds of fresh and salt water fish, and sea-foods of any kind, in and upon the waters of the Nelson river and its tributaries, from West river to its mouth ; also the estuary of the Nelson river, from Cape Tatnam to Owl river, extending three miles from shore ; also Hayes river and tributary waters, in the district of Keewatin ; also that portion of the Pigeon river and tributary waters, in the district of Keewatin ; also the waters of Great Slave lake, in the district of Mackenzie.

All these waters are blanketed by this lease, which is practically a monopoly. The only reason the minister gives to show that it is not a monopoly is that the settlers and Indians are allowed to fish for their own local consumption. But they are not allowed to sell.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They can sell to the company, and the company want to buy all they can get.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. In this agreement, the hon. gentleman will see that certain rights are reserved to the Hudson Bay Company, and the settlers are allowed to fish only for their own consumption.

Mr. LAKE. I understand this is an exclusive right for ten years to the lessee of Slave lake.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There are certain districts where licenses can be issued. I think they are about ten miles on each side of the stations.

Mr. INGRAM. And the stations are to be located about how close ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Ten miles on each side.

Mr. INGRAM. No ; I think it is one in fifty.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That is in the Markey lease.

Mr. INGRAM. So that in a lake 100 miles long, a station in the centre would bar any one else from coming in ?

Mr. LAKE. Are these leases put up at public auction and tenders called for ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No.

Mr. LAKE. There is apparently another lease let for two smaller lakes to Coffee & Merritt. They apparently pay $200. Is that a lease subsequently given ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I am informed that this lease to Coffee & Merritt was issued about the same time on Cumberland lake. I am informed that the settlers and everybody around the lake are perfectly satisfied with the operations of this company.

Mr. LAKE. I would like to know whether these fisheries will come within the jurisdiction of the new provinces ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That question has not come up yet.

Mr. LAKE. I suppose that small inland lakes in the other provinces come within the jurisdiction of those provinces ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I notice something in the press about Lake Manitoba being closed to fish, is that so ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It has been closed for summer fishing.

Mr. LAKE. I notice in the Fisheries report that during the last two or three years the applications received at Ottawa are very numerous from parties wishing to develop the fishing industry in the more remote waters of Canada. Are any of those fisheries referred to going to be put up to public tender ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That question has not been brought up yet.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Why is Lake Manitoba to be closed ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It has been represented that Lake Manitoba is a shallow lake and a spawning ground and has been fished year after year, so that it is time to give it a rest and allow it to become replenished.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister said a few moments ago that the expenditure in 1892-93 was $105,000. Let me refer him to Sessional Papers, vol. 24 of 1891, page 54. He will there find that the actual expenditure of the Conservative government during the year 1889-90, in connection with the fisheries, for fishery overseers and wardens —just the same item as my hon. friend is asking $110,000 for—was $65,873.32. And at that time the Conservative government had charge of the whole of our fisheries. Since then the Ontario fisheries have been handed over to the Ontario government. At that time the Conservative government looked after the fisheries of the Dominion, including Ontario, and the total expenditure was $65,000. My hon. friend has increased that expenditure to $110,000, and is doing less work. He is not doing the same amount of work, because he is not paying a lot of officials in Ontario whom the Ontario government are paying. Yet he asks $110,000 to do what the late Conservative government did for $65,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Does my hon. friend think there have been no increases in the Northwest Territories and British Columbia ?

Mr. TAYLOR. We had them in 1891 just as well as now.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There was no expenditure then.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will my hon. friend tell me how much revenue Mr. Hurley received for licenses in the district he had charge of ? He got $1,600 and travelling expenses.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The hon. gentleman evidently does not know that this government does not issue licenses in Ontario.

Mr. TAYLOR. Did Mr. Hurley get any revenue ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We could not get any revenue when the Ontario government issued the licenses.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yet you paid him a salary.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, because we are obliged to under the law. My hon. friend does not know that yet.

Mr. TAYLOR. I know we are not obliged to employ Mr. Hurley when the Ontario government are paying men for looking over the same ground and when the Ontario government are getting the revenue. Mr. Hurley, like the other two inspectors

in Ontario, is simply drawing his salary and doing nothing.

Mr. AMES. Before we leave the question of these fishing leases, we are entitled to certain information. Whether that can be given now or not will depend on whether it is in the department. But what this House ought to know is whether these licenses are being operated by those to whom they were issued. If not, to whom have the lessees sub-let their privileges? If they have sub-let them, what are the sub-lessees paying, and what quantity of fish is taken out? We ought to have some idea as to the value of these fisheries and what the government of Canada should get from these fishery leases. Here we have a couple of lakes comparatively small, which, as my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) has pointed out, are leased for $200 a year, and yet we have larger lakes leased by the same department for $10 a year. Whether the minister can give us this information at the present moment I do not know. But certainly Mr. F. H. Markey, advocate, of Montreal, did not lease these for his own use. J. K. Mackenzie, general storekeeper, of Selkirk, did not lease it for his own use. To whom did they sub-lease it? How much are they getting from those to whom they sub-leased it, and how much do those who have sub-leased get from the fishing privilege? That is what we want to know, and we want to know it in order that we may gauge the value of these unknown privileges in the Canadian Northwest.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. If the hon. gentleman would put his question in writing I would be glad to try and get the answer. It is difficult to procure the information. The lease was granted only last year, so that they have only had one year's operations.

Mr. BARKER. The minister must admit that the questions put by the hon. member (Mr. Ames) are important. Any landlord owning property would certainly make such inquiries, in order that he might know——

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have said I would inquire, and my word is not an idle word. I will do my best.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. minister will allow me—the hon. member (Mr. Ames) admits that he cannot ask the minister to give this information on the spur of the moment; but I think that the minister might state to us so that it might go on 'Hansard' that he will make the inquiries so that when we meet next year, or this year when the supplementary estimates are under discussion, he will give us the information. Will he give us that assurance?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. With the greatest pleasure—I have already given it.

Mr. TAYLOR.

Fisheries—salaries, building and maintenance of fish-breeding establishments and lobster hatcheries, $150,000.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Is the minister going to erect any more lobster hatcheries this year?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Perhaps it may be of interest if I state briefly the condition of this service. The expenditure of the fish breeding service for the year 1903-4, was $109,286.07, and the appropriation $110,000. The expenditure for the seven months of the current fiscal year to the 31st of January last is $97,133.17, leaving a balance of $42,866.84 to complete the year. In the province of Ontario the following hatcheries are in operation:

Sandwich whitefish hatchery.
Newcastle salmon trout hatchery.
Ottawa general hatchery.
Belleville bass ponds.

The distribution of fry from these institutions was very successful last spring and they are now in operation with a full supply of eggs undergoing incubation. Instructions have been given for the selection of two sites on the great lakes suitable for the erection of a large whitefish hatchery and a salmon trout hatchery, which will be done on the opening of navigation, in order that, if at all possible, buildings may be erected in time for operation next fall. During the past year experiments have been conducted in retaining the young fry until they reach the age of six months before being distributed. These experiments have proved a great success. The hatcheries in the province of Quebec are as follows:—

Tadousac salmon hatchery.
Magog general hatchery.
Gaspe Basin salmon and lobster hatchery.
Lac Tremblant trout hatchery.
St. Alexis trout hatchery.
Lake Lester retaining ponds.

The establishments in New Brunswick are as follows:—

Restigouche salmon hatchery.
Grand Falls salmon hatchery.
Newcastle salmon hatchery.
Shippegan lobster hatchery.
Shemogue lobster hatchery.

The establishments in Nova Scotia are:—

Margaree salmon hatchery.
Bedford salmon hatchery.
Bay View lobster hatchery.

In Prince Edward Island a trout hatchery is about completed and will be operated before the winter is over with salmon eggs which are at the present time awaiting to be brought from the Restigouche hatchery. There is a lobster hatchery also in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. How many hatcheries are there on the Straits of Northumberland?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. One at Shemogue and one at Charlottetown.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Have there been any established since last session ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, there has been one in British Columbia—the Harrison lake hatchery. There is also the Skeena river hatchery. We are building another one on Birkenhead river, British Columbia.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I suppose the minister has had brought to his attention the resolution of the Selkirk Board of Trade in reference to the necessity of additional fish-hatchery facilities on Lake Winnipeg. Has the minister responded to the resolution or considered what action he will take ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Some time ago I gave instructions to Mr. Cunningham, the inspector, to visit Lake Winnipeg, and inspect sites for the establishment of a hatchery there. He will proceed on that mission in a few days.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. It is very important because the board of trade recognize that at the rate at which fishing is going on in these waters it will be depleted very soon, unless the lake is re-stocked with fresh ova. They are anxious that some new establishment should be provided as soon as possible.

Mr. AMES. I desire to draw the attention of the minister to a condition of affairs, of the existence of which he is probably well aware and which seems to me to call for action as soon as a remedy can be provided. Last summer I spent some weeks in the immediate vicinity of one of the salmon hatcheries and had opportunity to visit the hatchery daily and also to observe on several of the rivers the work that the men of the department were doing. It seemed to me that the service of putting the salmon fry into the various rivers eight or ten miles from the north was very well done and would bring about beneficial results. But on the rivers I visited at that time, the York, Dartmouth and St. John rivers, emptying into the Gaspé basin, one thing that I could not help noticing was the fact that the government of Canada stocked the rivers and the province of Quebec depleted them. It seems to me that some understanding is absolutely necessary if the work of one government was not to be neuturalized by the other. I remember going up the York river in a canoe and finding it almost impassable owing to the facts that nets ran out from one shore two-thirds across the river, then from the other shore two-thirds across, and so on up. With a school of salmon starting at the mouth of the river, if one or two individual fish actually got up the river, it would be almost a miracle. All this time the Dominion government is depositing hundreds of thousands of small fish up the river. But these fish are practically all taken out by these nets. Cannot the government arrive at some understanding with the provincial government whereby estuary fishing for salmon may be limited to such an extent that the efforts of the government of Canada shall not be neuturalized by the fishing licenses that the provincial government give for a mere pittance. I know in Bonaventure county a similar river which I occasionally visit where there are six stands of nets which are leased for an average of $6.30 each. Those stands of nets practically take all the salmon in that river. Yet the Dominion government, at great expense, is endeavouring to distribute young salmon all through the rivers in Bonaventure and Gaspé counties. I understand that the matter is at present under litigation, but are proceedings being pushed with all possible diligence ? Is every effort being taken to arrive at a conclusion ?—because it seems to me that at the present time the praiseworthy efforts of the Dominion government are being practically nullified by the fishery licenses of the provincial government.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I must state to the committee that this is a very large question, which has been agitated since 1898. Very clever men have considered it, and the result has not been satisfactory. The question is only now ready to be submitted to the Supreme Court in order to obtain a determination of the respective rights of the federal government and of the provinces. There are many questions relating to the fisheries that are now claiming the attention of the government. At the present time we are face to face with some difficulties with the United States, for instance, as regards fisheries in international waters. Since I have been minister I have been trying to arrive at some common understanding regarding that, so that each side will protect its own fisheries, and I hope to be able to report progress next session. The question has become acute especially as regards Mississquoi bay, and the Americans are now convinced that there must be an international commission in order to settle the difficulties which have arisen and which are likely to arise unless we come to some satisfactory understanding. These things move slowly between governments, and even between the federal government and the provincial governments. Although this matter has been a subject of discussion many times and a subject of conferences, it is only at the present moment that a case is ready to be submitted to the Supreme Court to determine the respective jurisdiction of the federal government and the provinces. Nothing of importance has yet been done. I understand the federal government could stop the expenditure and say, all right, let the provinces look after this thing. But that

would mean the destruction of one of the most valuable assets of the Dominion. Our fisheries yield a revenue of from $20,000,000 to $25,000,000 to our people every year, and of course the importance of that interest requires that we should move with great caution. But I hope this matter will be settled within a short period. When I took charge of the department in 1903, I found it was already a pending question. Within a year or two I certainly think it will be settled. But this question also involves a great number of others, such as increased subsidies to the provinces. I have had interviews with delegations from the several provincial governments, and as I say, we have prepared a question to be submitted to the Supreme Court.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I would like to draw the attention of the minister to the necessity of propagating trout in the province of Nova Scotia. Some fifteen or twenty years ago there was an abundance of speckled trout in nearly every lake and river, but from many of them they have disappeared to a large extent. There is a fish hatchery at Bedford, and so far as I know there is no good reason why that hatchery should not, in part at least, be devoted to the propagation of trout. I have been surprised to learn that when our people in Nova Scotia asked for spawn to place in some of those lakes and rivers they were told that the only kind of spawn they could get from the government was whitefish. Millions of these white fish have been put in the lakes there. Now, they are not a fish that will take a fly, and they are no good whatever for sport, and so far as I understand the law, it is not legal to use a net in the lakes of our provinces. Therefore, putting whitefish in these lakes seems to me to be idle and useless. I think there is no fish that would suit our people so well as the trout; and as we now have a hatchery in the province devoted partly, I understand, to the propagation of salmon, if the minister would arrange to devote that hatchery, to some extent at least, to the propagation of speckled trout, I think he would be doing a very acceptable thing to the people of that province.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I may tell the hon. gentleman that during the last five years no whitefish have been distributed in Nova Scotia. At the present time trout are being propagated at the Bedford hatchery, and I understand there are 25,000 speckled trout in that hatchery to be distributed, and there will be more next year.

Fishery protection service, $220,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the explanation of the $60,000 increase?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Some of our cruisers have been enlarged in order to do more effective service. The 'Vigilant' a twin screw steamer, is now in commission taking the place of the 'Petrel' on the great lakes. The 'Petrel' carried 22 men, while the 'Vigilant' will carry a crew of 53 men all told. The same remark applies to the 'Kingfisher,' which is replaced by a larger vessel. The 'Canada' sailed from Halifax on February 1, for an instructional cruise to the West Indies, and it is expected that she will return in time to be used in performing the duties of fishery protection vessels. Heretofore fishery protection vessels have not been in commission in the winter and this will involve an increased expenditure. The 'Vigilant' will now be employed on the Atlantic coast. These changes account for the increased expenditures. Everybody is aware and I think every one will bear me out in the statement that when we had the 'Petrel' on the great lakes she was a laughing stock to our neighbours on the other side of the line. Any fishing vessel could get away from her and the American fishermen could poach all around our lakes and waters and would scarcely be troubled by the cruise of the 'Petrel.' Last year we decided to replace the 'Petrel' by a fast boat of 21¾ knots. She is a credit to the Canadian fleet, and I hope that with this vessel we will keep our friends within limits and will be able to see that due protection is given to our fishing men and our fishing grounds.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman, although he has given a great deal of information in reference to his having larger boats and larger crews has not given what I think the opposition are entitled to, a detailed statement of the increased expenditure. He has named one boat that has a larger crew but he should say that the expenditure in connection with this boat will be so much, for the next boat so much and so on making $60,000 increase.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I thought the hon. gentleman would easily calculate the difference.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is the duty of the hon. gentleman and his department in asking a vote to state how much the increased expenditure will be.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The difference in expense between a crew of twenty-two and of fifty-three is easy to calculate.

Mr. TAYLOR. That depends on what the hon. gentleman is paying the men.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We are paying the ordinary salaries for officers and seamen. Able bodied seamen get $30 a month, which would mean an expenditure for the 'Vigilant' of about $25,000 more than before. She burns about three times as much coal as the other. The expenditure is about one-third more and it is not extravagant to ask $60,000 more when we have three vessels of importance. However, if my hon. friend

wants a detailed estimate I shall have one prepared and will submit it when we are discussing the supplementary estimates which will be brought down for these same boats. I have no interest direct or indirect in the matter except that I want the service to be done properly and in a fit manner for the country.

Mr. TAYLOR. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the minister going to do with the 'Petrel'?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The 'Petrel' is going to be used in the lower provinces, on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. INGRAM. Taken away from the upper lakes altogether?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the department have control over the regulations? Do you specify in any way as to the use of pound nets and gill nets, the number to be used and the territory to be taken up, how closely they are to be placed, &c.?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, we have the control of that and frame the regulations.

Mr. INGRAM. How are the licenses for the use of gill nets and pound nets issued?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They are issued according to the regulations, although of course I have not the regulations in my mind at the present moment.

Mr. INGRAM. Take Lake Erie, for instance. Has the department regulations as to the space that a pound net shall occupy? or the space of a gill net license and how they will be located?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Oh, certainly.

Mr. AMES. Perhaps the minister will give us a little fuller information with reference to the policy of the government with regard to naval militia. I understand the introduction of the 'Canada' into the service has been a step in that direction, and that the vessel is being used as a training ship for naval militia. Is it the intention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and of the government to bring in this session any Bill with a view of establishing a naval militia carrying out still further the idea of the 'Canada'?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I am unable to make any official declaration on this question at the present moment.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I wish to bring to the attention of the minister a resolution passed at the last meeting of the Maritime Board of Trade, held at Moncton, on August the 11th, with respect to lobster fisheries. It reads as follows:

Whereas, the rapid decline of the lobster fishery, as shown by the reports of the fishing affairs in the maritime provinces, is viewed with alarm by the board, and as the decline appears to be greatest in those sections where illegal fishing is carried on.

Resolved, that it is desirable that the government take active measures to enforce the regulations for the protection of the lobster fishery by instructing the officials of the Marine and Fishery Department to suppress illegal fishing after the season in their respective districts.

Further resolved, that fishing stations for educating our fishermen be established by the government at suitable places along the Atlantic coast and the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

And further, that it is desirable that the government take into consideration the reorganization of the fishing service with the view of bringing it up to a higher state of efficiency.

That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and to the maritime members of parliament.

I presume the minister received a copy of this resolution and that he has probably in his mind some means of reorganizing this service. This matter has been up before this Maritime Board of Trade and nearly all the boards of trade of the maritime provinces for many years, and it seems that the manner in which the service has been conducted does not meet the approval of these boards of trade and of men interested in the fishing industry to a great extent. It is true that for the last year or two the government have been establishing hatcheries along the coast which are doing a great deal of good and meeting with the approval of men engaged in that business, but the Maritime Board of Trade think that more of these hatcheries should be established, and at a meeting held at Moncton, on August 17th, 1904, the following resolution was passed:

Whereas, lobster hatcheries have proven to be of great value in conserving our fisheries;

Resolved, that in the opinion of this board it is advisable in order to preserve the lobster fisheries, that hatcheries be established along the coasts of the maritime provinces at such places as will enable the spawn of lobsters caught for canning purposes all to be collected and hatched, and that the government be asked to prohibit the fishing of lobsters by 'curleys,' as these 'curleys' are fished close to the shore and only small lobsters are taken.

I take it that if these spawn are collected and taken to the hatcheries a great deal of good would result to the lobster fishing industry. Is the minister in possession of any report which would show the benefit that has accrued to the fishing industry by reason of the erection of the cold storage plants and their maintenance at the different points?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The matter is under consideration.

Mr. PERLEY. A few days ago the Minister of Railways, in answer to a question, said that there was no fish-way at the Carillon dam, and that the reason one had not

been built was that the government did not feel warranted in spending $10,000 in its construction. Under the Fisheries Act, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, when he thinks it is in the public interest, has the power to order the building of a fish-pass at any dam or slide, and this power has been freely used when private owners have built such dams and slides. I am informed that previous to the building of the Carillon dam large quantities of fish, specially shad, came up the Ottawa river to the sand bars, where they spawned and were caught in large numbers by the residents there. Since this dam was built none of these fish have been caught, and numbers of poor people who formerly depended on this fishing have been deprived of their livelihood. Will the minister ask the Department of Railways to put in a fish-pass at this dam ? It is hardly a good reason to say that it would cost too much, in view of the fact that private owners are ordered to build fish-ways no matter what the cost. Perhaps some of the other departments might spare the minister a little of the money which is not expended to such good purpose in the public interest as it would be in the building of a fish-way at the Carillon dam.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I am informed that it would cost $10,000 at the present time to build a fish-way at the Carillon dam, and the quality of the fish passing there not being very high, the government did not feel justified in incurring the expenditure. For the last two or three months it has been represented to the department that there was a new style of fish-way which would cost a comparatively small sum, and which might be suitable in this and other cases. We are asking for a special report in reference to this matter, and if the new fish-way suits the Carillon dam, it might suit other places, where we now feel indisposed to spend a large amount of money. We are asking this year a little more money for this service, because we think the time has come when we should establish these fish-ways in as many places as possible, in order that the inhabitants may have the opportunity of catching fish for food.

Mr. PERLEY. Will the minister keep the Carillon dam in mind ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Oh, yes. Not only the county of Argenteuil, but the counties along the North river are very much interested in this matter.

Mr. AMES. Has the report made by Mr. Matheson with reference to certain frauds in the distribution of fishing bounties been brought down ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have just received the report, and I will place it on the table within a couple of days.

Oyster culture, $7,000.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What is being done in connection with oyster culture ?

Mr. PERLEY.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is a statement with reference to the matter in the annual report of the department.

Mr. LEFURGEY. This is a very important question, and it deserves a great deal more attention than it has received in the past. The greatest natural oyster beds possibly in the world are in Prince Edward Island, and they are being depleted year after year. If this should continue, then within a few years one of our most remunerative fishing industries will be in such a condition that there will be no profit in it for the fishermen or any one else. The government should now take drastic measures to protect the oysters and to promote oyster culture.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have had this matter under serious consideration for the past year. I think we will be able to adopt proper means to protect this industry as it should be protected, and I am awaiting further information on the matter. I hope to be able, before the end of the session, to announce what plan we have adopted, and how we will proceed in the matter.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The only reason I bring the matter up is because I know the production of oysters in Richmond bay is not nearly equal to what it was ten years ago, and it is growing less from year to year, and the oysters are smaller. It is a very important matter for the department to take up.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I will get a special report from the experts.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Has the minister taken into consideration the plea that was put in by members on both sides of the House last year that fishing bounties be paid to lobster fishermen ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We have studied the question, but it is a very difficult one to decide. We could not take it up until the whole question of the fishing bounties is considered.

Some resolutions reported.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. gentleman inform us what business he proposes to take up to-morrow ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There is an order of business set for to-morrow which will perhaps occupy the whole day.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. gentleman inform us if it is intended to continue the discussion day in and day out until the matter is disposed of?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Perhaps it will be better to discuss that point to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, House adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 22, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PROVINCE OF ALBERTA—FINANCIAL TERMS.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved :

That the House do to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions :

1. Resolved, that the following amounts shall be allowed as an annual subsidy to the province of Alberta, and shall be paid by the government of Canada, by half-yearly instalments in advance, to the said province, that is to say :—

(a) for the support of the government and legislature, fifty thousand dollars ;

(b) on an estimated population of two hundred and fifty thousand, at eighty cents per head, two hundred thousand dollars, subject to be increased as hereinafter mentioned, that is to say :—a census of the said province shall be taken in every fifth year reckoning from the general census of one thousand nine hundred and one, and an approximate estimate of the population shall be made at equal intervals of time between each quinquennial and decennial census ; and whenever the population, by any such census or estimate, exceeds two hundred and fifty thousand, which shall be the minimum on which the said allowance shall be calculated, the amount of the said allowance shall be increased accordingly, and so on until the population has reached eight hundred thousand souls.

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

3. Resolved, that inasmuch as the public lands in the said province are to remain the property of Canada, there shall be paid by Canada to the said province annually by way of compensation therefor a sum based upon the estimated value of such lands, namely, $37,500,000, the said lands being assumed to be of an area of 25,000,000 acres and to be of the value of $1.50 per acre, and upon the populatiton of the said province, as from time to time ascertained by the quinquennial census thereof, such sum to be arrived at as follows :—

The population of the said province being assumed to be at present 250,000, the sum payable until such population reaches 400,000 is to be one per cent on such estimated value, or $375,000 ;

Thereafter, until such population reaches 800,000, the sum payable is to be one and one-half per cent on such estimated value, or $562,500 ;

Thereafter, until such population reaches 1,200,000, the sum payable is to be two per cent on such estimated value, or $750,000 ;

And thereafter such payment is to be three per cent on such estimated value, or $1,125,000.

4. Resolved, that as additional compensation for such lands there shall be paid by Canada to the said province annually for five years to provide for the construction of necessary public buildings, one-quarter of one per cent on such estimated value, or $93,750.

He said : I have to inform the House that His Excellency has approved of these resolutions, and consents to their submission to the House.

Motion agreed to.

PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN—FINANCIAL TERMS.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved :

That the House do to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions :

1. Resolved, that the following amounts shall be allowed as an annual subsidy to the province of Saskatchewan and shall be paid by the government of Canada, by half-yearly instalments in advance, to the said province, that is to say :—

(a) for the support of the government and legislature, fifty thousand dollars ;

(b) on an estimated population of two hundred and fifty thousand, at eighty cents per head, two hundred thousand dollars, subject to be increased as hereinafter mentioned, that is to say :—a census of the said province shall be taken in every fifth year reckoning from the general census of one thousand nine hundred and one, and an approximate estimate of the population shall be made at equal intervals of time between each quinquennial and decennial census ; and whenever the population, by any such census or estimate, exceeds two hundred and fifty thousand, which shall be the minimum on which the said allowance shall be calculated, the amount of the said allowance shall be increased accordingly, and so on until the population has reached eight hundred thousand souls.

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

3. Resolved, that inasmuch as the public lands in the said province are to remain the property of Canada, there shall be paid by Canada to the said province annually by way of compensation therefor a sum based upon the estimated value of such lands, namely, $37,500,000, the said lands being assumed to be of an area of 25,000,000 acres and to be of the value of $1.50 per acre, and upon the population of the said province, as from time to time ascertained by the quinquennial census thereof, such sum to be arrived at as follows :—

The population of the said province being assumed to be at present 250,000, the sum payable until such population reaches 400,000 is to be one per cent on such estimated value, or $375,000 ;

Thereafter, until such population reaches 800,000, the sum payable is to be one and one-half per cent on such estimated value, or $562,500 ;

Thereafter, until such population reaches 1,200,000, the sum payable is to be two per cent on such estimated value, or $750,000 ;

And thereafter such payment is to be three per cent on such estimated value, or $1,125,000.

4. Resolved, that as additional compensation for such lands there shall be paid by Canada

to the said province annually for five years to provide for the construction of necessary public buildings, one-quarter of one per cent on such estimated value, or $93,750.

He said : I have to inform the House that His Excellency has approved of these resolutions, and consents to their submission to the House.

Motion agreed to.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved second reading of Bill (No. 69) to establish the government of the province of Alberta.

(Mr. Speaker having put the motion, both Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. R. L. Borden rose at the same time.)

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon friend wanted simply to put a question, I would certainly give way to him, but if it is his intention to address the chair on this measure, perhaps he will allow me the privilege of a few remarks before he does so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I took it for granted from the right hon. gentleman inclining his head, that he meant he was not going to speak and that I was to go on.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am glad that this debate is starting in such an auspicious manner and that both sides are apparently in very good humor and in a very good frame of mind for the discussion. When some time ago I presented this Bill to the House, I stated that there were certain questions connected with it which were of paramount importance and which in fact were the essence of the whole measure. The first was the number of provinces to be created ; the second was the ownership of the land ; the third was the financial terms to be granted ; and the last was the education system. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) rose immediately after me, but confined his remarks for the moment to two of those questions only—the ownership of the lands and the school question. With regard to the ownership of the land, my hon. friend re-asserted the position he had often maintained on the floor of this House as elsewhere, namely, that the land should go to the provinces to be owned and managed by them. On the school question my hon. friend was reserved. He did not announce any policy, but very wisely said that, in his judgment, the subject was one which ought to be approached with calm and moderation. The press which follows and supports my hon. friend took, notwithstanding this advice of his, a very different attitude. On the land question it said very little, if it said anything at all, but upon the school question it offered a very violent opposition. Perhaps I may not be out of the way in saying that the press which supports my hon. friend has spared no effort to inflame the public mind upon an ever delicate subject.

In the course of the years I have been in this House, many have been the occasions in which parliament has had to face and to solve questions, simple enough in themselves, but complicated and rendered difficult by sudden outbursts of passion. And here again I may repeat what I had the opportunity of saying some few days ago, that in using this word 'passion.' I do not want to convey any offensive sense. I recognize, we all recognize, that passions are very often the outgrowth of noble sentiment ; but let this sentiment be ever so meritorious, if it goes beyond a certain line, it may become blind, unthinking, unreasoning passion. In 1875 on the New Brunswick school question, in 1889 on the Jesuit Estates questions, in 1896 on the Manitoba school question, several parts of the country—now one part, now another—were roused to a high pitch of excitement.

Since my conduct on the present occasion has been assailed, perhaps I may be pardoned if I refer for one moment to myself, and say that upon every one of these questions, I have endeavoured, so far as I know—and successfully I think—to act on the very principle of the constitution under which we live. In 1875, being then a young man, I supported the government of Mr. Mackenzie which refused to interfere with certain legislation passed by the legislature of the provinces of Quebec of which the Roman Catholic minority complained. That minority complained that this legislation was an invasion of their rights and forced an intolerable burden upon them. But, as it was established that at the time of confederation New Brunswick had no system of separate schools, it followed as a consequence that this parliament had no jurisdiction in the matter, and the government of Mr. Mackenzie, very properly, I think, refused to interfere and disallow that Act it was asked to disallow. In 1889, having become leader of the party to which I belong, I supported the government of Sir John Macdonald when they refused to accede to the request of a section of our fellow countrymen to disallow the Act of the legislature of the province of Quebec to settle what was known as the Jesuit Estates question. In 1896, I opposed the government of Sir Mackenzie Bowell when they endeavoured to force upon the province of Manitoba a system of schools which, according to high judicial authority, the province of Manitoba had a right to reject and which it had rejected by action within the scope of its legitimate authority. And in this year, 1905, when two provinces are to be brought into the Dominion, in which provinces there is a system of separate schools such as we have in the province of Quebec and Ontario, I stand again, as I believe, upon the rock of the constitution of Canada when

I say that this parliament should, according to that constitution, give to the minority in the new provinces the same rights and privileges that are given to the minorities in the new provinces of Quebec and Ontario. Sir, what seems to me this very proper legislation is opposed throughout the length and breadth of our country—no, I will not say that,—but in certain portions of our country—and in the name, I might almost say the sacred name, of provincial rights. But it is remarkable that the men who at this day, are insisting the most upon what they call provincial rights have taken no heed of the fact that, in the very letter of the constitution on which they rely there is an abbreviation of provincial rights wherever there exists in any province a system of separate schools. Provincial rights are the basis of our constitution. All parties now admit these rights and recognize them, whatever may have been their position in the past. But, Sir, it is an old saying that there is no rule without its exception; and, in the very letter of the constitution, an exception has been made concerning provincial rights wherever there is a system of separate schools in any province. Now here is the law upon this point. The words which I use now may grate upon the feelings of some, may seem harsh to the ears of others, may seem harsh to my own ears, but, Sir, here is the law. Section 93 of the constitution says:

> In and for each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education——

If the law stopped there, if there were no other words to qualify this general provision, such legislation as is now before the House would never have been introduced. But the law does not stop there; there are words which qualify the general proposition:

> ——subject and according to the following provisions:—
>
> 1. Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the union.

Here you have the fact proclaimed, the principle laid down, that wherever there is, in any province, a system of separate schools, the provincial rights are abbreviated and the legislature can do nothing to prejudicially affect the rights of the minority who have the benefit of this clause. But, though these facts are plain, still, at the present moment, they seem to be ignored; and, even on the floor of this House the attempt is sometimes made to cast upon myself, who have always held these views, the imputation that at one time or other, I held different views. The other day my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) quoted some words of mine in this House spoken on this same subject, in which I gave due praise to the Liberal party, especially of the province of Ontario, for the stand they made in favour of provincial rights. These are the words of mine that he quoted:

> Sir, I am to-day as firm a believer as I ever was in the doctrine of provincial rights. I take as much pride as ever I did in belonging to the great party which in the past carried that doctrine to a successful issue, an issue, indeed, so successful that we rank among the advocates of that doctrine to-day the most prominent of the men who opposed it in the past. And when the historian of the future shall refer to the first twenty years of confederation, the brightest page he will have to record will be the page in which he will trace the efforts of the Liberal party to maintain inviolate and intact the liberties and independence of the local legislatures. And I am proud to say that among the names which shall de revered in the hearts of their countrymen, as the names of those who stood foremost in the fight, will be the names of Edward Blake and Oliver Mowat.

My hon. friend stopped there. Had he read a little further, he would have found that I qualified the statement I made by saying that, in the matter of education, provincial rights were not supreme, but they are abbreviated by the very letter of the constitution. I continued as follows:

> I agree with the Prime Minister in this view, that it would have been wiser for the fathers of confederation to have adopted the American principle of local independence. But such, after all, is not the principle which has been adopted. On the contrary, the principle of our constitution is this: that while in all other matters the powers of the local legislature are almost independent, in the matter of education, a supervisory power has been given to this government, in so far as separate schools are concerned.

So that, in 1893 I held the views I now hold, and I am acting exactly in accordance with the opinions I proclaimed twelve years ago and which so far as I remember, I have always held. This being well established, this being I believe, impossible of denial—that the rights of a province are abbreviated whenever there is a system of separate schools—yet we are told that this cannot be adopted because the provinces referred to in this legislation are not now provinces, but are simply territories. If I understand that argument correctly it means that if the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan already existed and were to come to-day and ask to enter confederation, they would come with their system of schools, and that system would apply mechanically and parliament would be forced to give it to them; but as they come as territories, they are not to have the same privileges as they would have had, coming as provinces. Now, in the name of common sense, what does it matter, so far as law and order is concerned, whether these territories are now territories or are now provinces? If under the

law we gave them in 1875 they established a system of schools, is not that system of schools as dear to them as if they had been erected into provinces ? If they have acquired rights thereby, are not those rights as sacred as if they had been erected into provinces ?

Now Sir, it seems to me that this argument cannot bear examination. But if we are to take some of the newspaper articles and some of the speeches I have read, what is the supreme reason and argument that is advanced why this principle of the constitution should not apply to the Territories? It is because parliament is omnipotent, it is because parliament is not bound to respect the acts of a former parliament, it is because the parliament that was elected in November, 1904, is not to be bound by the parliament which sat in this House in 1875. Well, Sir, if that view is to be taken, if we are to say that parliament is supreme, I have nothing more to say. Parliament is supreme indeed, parliament is supreme, and may even go to the length of disobeying the moral laws which bind all governments and all men. It is open to any man to break his word, it is open to any man to violate his engagement, it is open to any man to trample under foot his plighted troth. Now if it is open to any man to do that, it is also open to an assembly of men; and if it be the view that parliament is not bound by the acts of any preceding parliament, that parliament may violate its plighted troth, then we have a double opportunity on this occasion to signalize ourselves, because not only can we remove from the minority the system of separate schools which they have had for many years, but we can correct another invasion of provincial rights which is far more reaching than the violation of provincial rights in the matter of education. If it be true that in 1875, parliament introduced separate schools into the Northwest Territories and gave to the minority the privilege of those schools, it is equally true that in the year 1881 this parliament for ever abbreviated the powers of those new provinces in the matter of taxation ; it is equally true that in 1891 this parliament decreed by an Act passed here, passed against the protest of the minority in that parliament, decreeing for all time to come, not for one year only, or ten years, or one generation, but for all time to come, that the Canadian Pacific Railway and all stations, station grounds, workshops, buildings, yards and other property, rolling stock and appurtenances required and used for the construction and working thereof, and the capital stock of the company, should for ever be free from the power of taxation by those provinces. It was decreed also that no municipal body created by the provinces could levy taxation upon the Canadian Pacific Railway, its stock, its buildings, its workshops and its capital stock. Sir, is not that an invasion of provincial rights far more reaching in its consequences than the invasion of provincial rights which is complained of in the matter of education ? But does anybody in this House think of removing from the Canadian Pacific Railway the powers and immunities which have been granted to that company? Does anybody in this House think for a moment of giving to those new provinces the power to levy taxation upon the Canadian Pacific Railway? No, we respect our engagements. Then I ask if we respect our engagements in the one case, why should we not respect our engagements in the other case?

But Sir, that is not all. I find no better testimony in favour of the principle which is embodied in this Bill than the letter which was written to me some days ago by Mr. Haultain, Premier of the Northwest Territories ; I want no better testimony of the soundness of the position which we have taken than the ipsissima verba contained in Mr. Haultain's letter, and which I will read to the House.

> The territory included within the boundaries of these proposed provinces was 'admitted into the union' on July 15, 1870, and immediately upon the creation of these provinces the provisions of section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, become, as a matter of indefeasible right, a part of their constitution.

That is to say, as a matter of 'indefeasible right' the provision of section 93 of the British North America Act becomes part of the constitution of the Northwest Territories. Now, let me repeat, what is the disposition of section 93 of the British North America Act :

> In and for each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provision :—
>
> 1. Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the union.

Therefore, if I understand the English language, it means this, according to Mr. Haultain's own admission, that in this matter of education the rights and privileges of the minority are secured against any prejudicial legislation which might be passed. Now, Sir, there is this difference between Mr. Haultain and myself with regard to this point. Mr. Haultain argues that this section 93 applies automatically, that this House has nothing to do but simply to admit the province and immediately it becomes subject to section 93 ; whereas the position we take is while the provision is embodied in section 93 it has to be introduced legislatively by this parliament into the constitution of the Northwest Territories.

Upon this point I might go further. On a previous occasion I spoke at some length on this point, and I will not go over the same ground again. However, it may not be inopportune on this occasion to inquire what is the history of clause 93 in the British North America Act, how did it become a part of the British North America Act? Sir, we live in an age of such intense excitement, we are moving with such rapidity, our lives are so much engaged in business occupations, that history is very soon forgotten, and what is the event of to-day is forgotten history to-morrow. It may not therefore be inopportune to look into the causes which led to the introduction of this section of 93 into the British North America Act. It was introduced at the suggestion of Mr. Galt, in the interest of the Protestant minority of the province of Quebec, at a time when he was champion and representative of that minority in the old parliament of Canada. I have quoted on a former occasion, and I may be permitted to quote again, the language of the Quebec resolutions which formed the embryo of section 93 of the British North America Act. We find that section 43 of the Quebec resolutions, concludes as follows :

Education, saving the rights and privileges which the Protestant or Catholic minorities in both Canadas may possess as to their denominational schools at the time when the union goes into operation.

That was section 43 which guaranteed separate schools both in Ontario and Quebec, but did not go further. Now, Sir, it is a matter of history that the Protestant minority in Quebec at that time was not altogether satisfied with their condition under the system of separate schools such as it was. They wanted the system extended and improved, and they wanted this to be done before confederation, so that under the new constitution the rights and privileges secured to the Protestant minority could not be interfered with by the new legislature of Quebec. Mr. Galt, who at that time as I said was the champion of the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec, and was also a member of the government of that day, spoke upon that subject at a meeting held in the town of Sherbrooke which he represented in parliament. In the month of October, 1864, just a few months after the Quebec resolutions had been adopted by the conference, Mr. Galt used the following language :

He would now endeavour to speak somewhat fully as to one of the most important questions, perhaps the most important that could be confined to the legislature, the question of education. This was a question in which, in Lower Canada, they must all feel the greatest interest, and in respect to which more misapprehension might be supposed to exist in the minds, at any rate of the Protestant population, than in regard to anything else connected with the whole scheme of confederation.

It must be clear that a measure would not be favourably entertained by the majority of Lower Canada which would place the education of their children and the provision for their schools, wholly in the hands of a majority of a different faith. It was clear that in confiding the general subject to the local legislatures it was absolutely necessary it should be accompanied with such restrictions as would prevent injustice in any respect from being done to the minority.

Now, this applied to Lower Canada, but it also applied, and with equal force, to Upper Canada and the other provinces ; for in Lower Canada there was a Protestant minority, and in the other provinces a Roman Catholic minority. The same privileges belong to the one of right here, as belonged to the other of right elsewhere. There could be no greater injustice to a population than to compel them to have their children educated in a manner contrary to their own religious belief.

It had been stipulated that the question was to be made subject to the rights and privileges which the minorities might have as to their separate and denominational schools. There had been grave difficulties surrounding the separate school question in Upper Canada, but they were all settled now, and with regard to the separate school system of Lower Canada, it was the determination of the government to bring down a measure for the amendment of the school laws before the confederation was allowed to go into force. He made this statement, because as the clause was worded in the printed resolution, it would appear that the school law, as it at present existed, was to be continued.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Galt undertook that the school law would be amended in the following session. In the following session, that was the session of 1865, the resolutions of the Quebec conference were discussed in the legislature of Canada but no school Bill was introduced to amend the law of Lower Canada. Complaint was made to the House by Mr. Holton and others and a measure was promised the following year. In the following year, that was the year before confederation, a school Bill was introduced giving to the Protestant minority much more power than they had then and giving to them the powers which they have now and which have been given them since by the legislature of the province of Quebec. Amongst the dispositions of that measure were the following :

The superior education will comprise the universities and the classical and industrial colleges or seminaries, and the provincial aid thereto, as well as that for academies, shall be annually divided between the Roman Catholic and Protestant institutions in proportion to the respective Roman Catholic and Protestant population according to the then last census.

Another section reads :

Whenever four of the Protestant members of the Council of Public Instruction for Lower Canada shall be of opinion that the management of the Protestant schools should be distinct and separate from that of the Catholic schools, they may make known that opinion under their respective signatures to the government through the Provincial Secretary.

But a strange thing happened in the legislature of Canada. It was at the time when we had a representation from Lower Canada and a representation from Upper Canada. A similar Bill was introduced immediately for the province of Upper Canada. This was strongly resisted and so strongly was it resisted that the two Bills were withdrawn. Thereupon Mr. Galt resigned his position as a member of the government of the day because he had not been able to improve the situation of the minority to which he belonged by legislation before the Act of confederation came into operation. Then what took place ? Of course, there was a great deal of commotion at that time and the Protestant minority of Quebec felt disinclined to enter confederation unless their rights were secured as they thought they ought to be secured. Mr. Galt was appointed to go to England with Sir John Macdonald, Sir Geo. Cartier and others in order to frame the Act which was to be the Act of Confederation. At that time the 'Montreal Gazette' was the principal as to-day it is the most important organ of the Conservative party. It spoke for Mr. Galt and on the 24th October, 1866, the 'Montreal Gazette' contained the following article :

We have much pleasure in announcing that during the recent protracted sittings of the cabinet at Ottawa, the subject of the position of the Lower Canada education question was very fully considered. The ministry were, we understand, desirous that Mr. Galt should be appointed as a delegate to represent the interests of the British population, but that gentleman felt that he could not accept unless he was assured as to the views of the government on the points that so seriously concern his countrymen and co-religionists, and which so deeply roused their feelings. We are informed that the ministry entirely satisfied Mr. Galt of their determination to give practical effect to the pledges given in parliament, and the gentleman has in consequence accepted the appointment of delegate for the express purpose of watching over these important interests, as well as of lending his aid to the consummation of the measure of confederation.

We feel that our Protestant friends may rest assured that the man who resigned the honours and emoluments of office on this question will not, as a delegate, be found wanting to his trust as their representative. And we hail with great satisfaction the approaching settlement of a question which might have been fraught with so much danger to the kindly and cordial relations which have of late so happily subsisted between the people of different races and creeds in Canada.

Mr. Galt went to England as a delegate. We know as a matter of history that he contributed to the drafting of section 93 of the British North America Act, and those of us who have read Mr. Pope's book upon the debates preliminary to confederation know that as a matter of history the 3rd and 4th subsections of section 93, the subsections which give the right of appeal, are

even in his own handwriting. Therefore it is to him that we have section 93 in its present form. As to that let me call the attention of the House to another extract from the 'Montreal Gazette' of March 2nd, 1867. Either that day or the day before the 'Montreal Gazette' had published the whole text of the Bill which afterwards bcame the Confederation Act and it accompanied this with the following comment :

Few questions have excited a more lively interest in this country than the education of children in public schools, or, perhaps, it would be more accurate to say, the appropriation of taxation for that purpose. We need not repeat the particulars of the agitation on the subject, which commenced with the promulgation of the resolutions of the conference of Quebec, and resulted in Mr. Galt resigning his seat in the cabinet. The short of the story is, all this led to an agreement on the part of the Canadian government to advise Her Majesty's ministers to insert in the Union Bill the provisions with which the public are, undoubtedly, already aware. That was the agreement to which we referred, in October last, as having been satisfactory to Mr. Galt, and on the strength of which he consented to become a delegate to London. The public may find in these provisions in the Bill the proof of the statement made by us, which some of our contemporaries, without any evidence, undertook to call in question.

Before the question of confederation was mooted, the constant cry on the part of a portion of Lower Canada Protestant minority, was: give us the same privileges as those enjoyed by the Upper Canada minority. Well, the Bill as it stands, in terms, provides that the minority in Lower Canada shall have precisely the same privileges as the minority in Upper Canada.

And further, that the minorities in all the provinces shall have the right of appeal to the general parliament.

The Bill, in this form, undoubtedly, in our opinion, will become the fundamental law of the country, forming a part of its political constitution ; and that, as such, it must be accepted. It affords essential guarantees as well in immediate practice as in ultimate resort.

Well Sir, Mr. Galt was too great a man not to stipulate for other minorities that which he was stipulating for the minority to which he belonged. Mr. Galt was not satisfied to have these guarantees under the constitution simply for the minority of Quebec, but he put them in the terms which I read a moment ago so that they could apply to any minority in any province under any condition under which a system of separate schools exist. It is in obedience to that order of the constitution that we have inserted the clause which I read a moment ago.

Now, Sir, a word as to the changes we have made in that clause. I stated the other day that we proposed to make a change and we have given notice of an amendment which we intend to move to clause 16. What is the reason of this change ? It is a fair question to ask and a question to be answered.

Sir, we have taken the ground on more than one occasion, we again take this ground and it is the ground upon which we stand in dealing with the present case, that wherever a system of separate schools exists that system comes into force and is constitutionally entitled to the guarantees which are embodied in section 93 of the British North America Act. Be that system much, be it little, whatever it is, it is entitled to those guarantees. That is the position we take, and when we introduced section 16, as it is in the Bill, we had no other intention than to give to the minority the rights and privileges to which they are entitled under the law which they have to-day.

But, Sir, it has been objected to us that the language used in section 16 was too broad, too vague, and that if it were adopted, it would create trouble and confusion instead of certainty as to the rights of the minority. By the first paragraph of section 16 as it stands in the Bill, the Act of 1875 is reproduced in toto. But Sir, an event occurred some 14 or 15 years ago which has to some extent limited that Act. Some 14 years ago the legislature of the Territories passed a law which in the opinion of the minority abridged the rights conferred on them by the Act of 1875. They complained to the federal government at Ottawa. They made representations to the government of that day and asked the disallowance of that law as an infringement upon their privileges as secured to them by the law of 1875. Sir John Thompson, who was then Minister of Justice, examined the question and refused to disallow the Act. He admitted rather, that the Act was an infringement on the privileges conveyed to the minority, but he stated that as this was a consequence, only following a similar Act, or rather continuing a similar Act passed some three or four years before, as to which no complaint had been made, and which was therefore in force, he would not advise disallowance and he allowed the Act to go into force. Under such circumstances the law of the Territories has been in force now for 13 or 14 years. Section 16 thus restricted is now the law of the country which has been in force for 13 or 14 years and which has given general satisfaction. Under such circumstances if we were to re-enact section 93 of the Act, it was possible that we would create confusion and that there would be lawsuits to determine the exact condition of the law. We therefore thought it was preferable to have the law made absolutely certain and in order to do that we have incorporated the ordinances under which the law as it is to-day has been established. It may be disappointing to some, but we believe that on the whole it is preferable to have a clear understanding on this subject so that the minority shall have the privilege of exercising control over their schools as they have to-day, and so that the law shall be absolutely clear and pronounced as to what is intended by the parliament of Canada if it passes this legislation. That is the reason why we have done this. The law of the Territories on this question is established in three ordinances, chapter 29 of 1901, chapter 30 of 1901, and chapter 31 of 1901. Chapter 29 organized a system of schools and this organization retained to the minority the privileges which they have of separate schools. Chapter 30 regulates the power of assessments over the municipalities for contributions to education and chapter 31 regulates the aid and contributions to be made to the different schools conforming to the law. We have introduced into the amendment chapter 29 and chapter 30 ; we have not introduced chapter 31 which regulates the aid and grants to be given to schools because we have thought it preferable simply to lay down the principle, putting no burden upon the Territories, not saying how they are to dispose of their money, not telling them what they shall do but simply stating that when schools conform to the law, whether they are separate schools or public schools, all shall be treated equally and there shall be no discrimination between them. That is the reason of the legislation I have introduced.

Upon this occasion I have nothing more to say but in moving this Bill, as I now do, for the second reading, I want to impress on the House once more that we are acting strictly in accordance with the principles involved in the constitution of Canada. I want to impress once more the fact that the constitution of Canada has been and is a compromise between different elements in order to produce a great result. It is a compromise in order to unite different heterogeneous elements. There are differences of powers, there are exceptions, but all this diversity is intended to promote unity.

Let me say one last word. We have done pretty well so far in the development of our national institutions, but we have not yet reached the maximum ; we have not yet reached the end. We may have a great deal still to do and I hold that we ought always to be ready for the task, and I am sure that it will not be too much to say that it will not injure any one, that it will not do any harm but on the contrary will do much good if, whenever we are called upon to apply the principles of the constitution, we apply them, not in any carping sense, but in a broad and generous spirit.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Mr. Speaker, the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has spoken with his usual eloquence upon the second reading of this Bill. If I were inclined to use his own words under certain circumstances in the

past, I might term him a scrapbook orator to-day. Whenever I have endeavoured to gather up certain pearls of thought which he has distributed in days gone by and to contrast them with the utterances made in the immediate present, the right hon gentleman has been good enough to apply that appellation to myself and I trust that he will not resent my returning it to him on this occasion. The right hon. gentleman has told us that the measure which the government has introduced, and especially the educational clauses contained in section 16 of the Bill, as well as the provisions which have been now substituted for that section, make for unity. Well, Mr. Speaker, they may make for unity in the country if the right hon. gentleman's own words are to be taken at their face value to-day, but certainly they have not made for unity in the cabinet nor among the right hon. gentleman's followers. The Prime Minister has been good enough a few days ago to charge me with having treated this question in this House lightly. I desire, in terms as strong as the usage of this parliament will permit, to repudiate to the utmost that assertion, and to say that if any man in this House has treated that question lightly it has been the right hon. gentleman himself. When I brought this question up two years ago, not he, nor any one of his colleagues in the cabinet dared to rise in his place and say one word about it. They put up the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) who was then the member for Alberta, to say on behalf of the government that they were not going into any 'blind pool,' and when the right hon. gentleman tendered to this country and to the members of the Northwest the blindest kind of pool in the letter which he wrote in the heat of a general election, then hon. gentlemen on the other side were all too eager to accept it without one moment's question. That was the first occasion when he treated this question lightly. The next was when in this House he asserted, crying 'hear, hear' to the words of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) who interpreted the remarks of the Prime Minister as meaning that provincial autonomy could not be granted to the Territories of the Northwest for many years to come. And, in the next place, Mr. Speaker, he treated this question lightly when he brought this Bill down to parliament, telling parliament as plainly as if he had said so in express terms that this measure embodied the collective wisdom of the cabinet, when afterwards it transpired although the Bill had not even been submitted to the ex-Minister of the Interior or to the Minister of Finance, the most important members of the government. And, in the next place, Sir, my right hon. friend treated this question lightly when more than once I asked him across the floor of this House why it was that he, the leader of the House ventured to mislead it with regard to the attitude of two of his ministers. I asked him that question not once or twice, but three times, and the only answer I ever received from the right hon. gentleman was evasion and badinage. It does not lie in his mouth to charge me with having treated this question lightly in view of the fact that he has dealt with it after the fashion I have described. Further than that, the right hon. gentleman approaches the consideration of this question now without a minister in the Department of the Interior, although in the right hon. gentleman's correspondence the absence of the Minister of the Interior on former occasions has been put forward as a ground for delay. So much for that. I will leave the right hon. gentleman himself to judge whether under these circumstances he or I can most justly be charged with having treated this question lightly and not in the serious way in which it should be treated.

I do not agree, Sir, with some remarks which the right hon. gentleman made in his speech on the 21st of February. He then said :

> A great deal has been done ; in fact more has been done than we have to do to-day. We have to take the last step, but it is easy and comparatively unimportant in view of and in comparison with what has already been accomplished.

I do not know whether my right hon. friend is quite of the same opinion to-day with regard to the easy nature of the step, but I venture to say in all seriousness that the step which we are taking is the most important and momentous step that has ever been taken by this parliament in regard to our northwestern country. We are doing to-day what this parliament cannot undo in the future, because the constitution which we now propose to give to the territories of the Northwest can only be altered by the imperial parliament.

I agree absolutely with the principle of this Bill so far as it is designed to give a provincial status to these territories. As leader of the Conservative party, I laid down that principle when in the northwest more than two years ago. I have stood for that principle in this House in the sessions of 1903 and 1904, and that principle I stand for to-day.

The mode in which the right hon. gentleman has brought down this measure has led to the expression of strong differences of opinion throughout this country. The educational clauses have been discussed almost exclusively in all parts of Canada. For the moment they overshadow other questions : they involve differences of race. When I addressed the House on the first reading of the Bill I said I did not desire to make this a political question. Perhaps the expression was not very happily chosen, because from whatever aspect considered, it must in the highest sense of

the term be a political question in the end. What I should have said was that I did not desire to make it a party political question, and I do not desire to make it a party political question to-day. I shall express my own opinion with regard to it; I shall express that opinion at the present time; I have not felt called upon to speak before. In some parts of the country I have been referred to as a fanatic; in other parts I have been referred to as a coward and entreated to speak out. The proper time for me to speak is to-day upon the second reading, and before I conclude I shall, I think, make my position absolutely clear. And I say, that in taking the position which I shall now take, I do not for one moment suggest that any hon. gentleman on this side of the House, following the dictates of his conscience and of his good judgment should feel himself in any way constrained by party ties to endeavour to agree with the views which I shall express.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. They do not seem to understand that principle over there.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The right hon. gentleman in his opening remarks adverted to five principal matters contained in the Bill: to the number of provinces, to the boundaries of the provinces, to the financial terms, to the control of public lands and to the provisions respecting education. It seems to me that so far as I desire to make any observations on the first three of these, I can better do that in committee. I will, therefore, in the remarks which I address to the House to-day deal solely with the questions which concern the control of public lands and the educational provisions of the Bill.

So far as the control of the lands is concerned, I adhere to the opinion I before expressed in this House: that the people of the northwest when they are granted provincial rights are fully capable of dealing with these lands; that they are entitled to the control of these lands just as much as the people of the eastern provinces of Canada are entitled to the control of their provincial domain. I see no distinction. One organ of the government published in the city of Montreal, an organ in which my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture is supposed to have a controlling interest, has given utterance to a delightful piece of information with regard to this matter. It declares that these lands should not be handed over to the control of the people of the northwest for fear of the danger which might be encountered from greedy land grabbers. Well, I am inclined to think—looking at the history of the past and looking forward a little to what may be expected in the future—that we are not likely to suffer any greater danger from land grabbers under the administration of the people of the Northwest Territories, than we have suffered in the past and are likely to suffer under the present administration. The right hon. gentleman argued that the control of these lands by the people of Alberta and Saskatchewan would probably interfere with the immigration policy of the government; he thought there might be interference with free homesteads and with the present low price of government lands. But, Mr. Speaker, may I not suggest with a great deal of force to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, that the people of the Northwest are more interested in attracting immigration to these splendid territories, which are their glorious heritage, than are the people of any other part of Canada.

Are they not the people chiefly interested? May we not rightly conclude that if these lands are handed over to them, they will so deal with them as to best conserve their own interests by forwarding and assisting a vigorous policy of immigration? May I not further suggest that even if there were any danger—and I do not think there is—it would be the task of good statesmanship to have inserted, if necessary, a provision in this Bill with regard to free homesteads and the prices of those lands, and obtain to it the consent of the people of the Northwest Territories. I see no possible constitutional difficulty because after all the question of the lands is not a question of legislative power until the lands are handed over to the people and become the public property of the provinces. There are hundreds of millions of acres of public lands in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Are we not endeavouring now to promote immigration to those provinces? And has the government of my right hon. friend found any difficulties interposed by any provincial administration which impede the carrying out of his immigration policy? Those lands are under the control of the provinces. The people of Ontario and Quebec go to their own provincial capitals and transact there all business relating to public lands. Why should not the people of the Northwest in the same way be entitled, when their own provincial capitals are established in the new provinces, to deal with their own public lands and exercise control over them in their own legislature? My right hon. friend has referred to the example of the United States. He found the example of that country very cogent in this instance; but when, a little later on, he came to deal with the question of education, he departed altogether from that example and presented it as one to be entirely avoided. But if the institutions of the two countries are so much alike that we may safely follow their example with regard to the lands, are not the characteristics and the religions of the two people so much of the same character that we might also grant to the people of the Northwest Territories exactly the same rights as are enjoyed by the states of the Union and by the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick?

My right hon. friend referred to his re-

cord in the past. He referred to his record with regard to the Manitoba school controversy. I do not desire to discuss this question from too controversial a standpoint, but does my right hon. friend really feel satisfied to-day with his record on that question, which so much disturbed public opinion ten years ago? If ever there was a question in this country calculated to arouse passion and prejudice, and if ever such a question was deliberately thrown into the political arena for the purpose of political gain, it was the Manitoba school question. That question was precipitated into the political arena by the right hon. gentleman and his friends then in opposition, and by his Liberal friends in the province of Manitoba. There can be no doubt about that. Let us look at the record for a moment or two, as the hon. gentleman himself has called attention to it. There were difficulties surrounding the Conservative administration of that day. What was the attitude of my right hon. friend with regard to those difficulties? When the Conservatives desired to investigate, he was impatient of delay. When they desired to conciliate, he accused them of weakness and cowardice. When they sought an interpretation of the constitution in the courts, he declared that they were exciting passion and discord. When they proposed the remedial order, he declared it was ineffective and insufficient. When they sought to enforce it by an Act of this parliament, he declared it was too strong and drastic in its terms. He denounced in violent language the late Mr. Dalton McCarthy in 1890, not only as an enemy of his creed, but of his race, and three years later he was content to accept Mr. McCarthy's aid on that question. On one side of him, he established a very able gentleman, who does not now occupy a seat in this House, but who then represented the constituency of L'Islet, in the province of Quebec—he used that gentleman to declare that the rights of the minority were being betrayed in Manitoba. And on the other side he accepted the aid of Mr. McCarthy, who denounced the action of the Conservative government as coercive and oppressive. He himself posed in the English speaking provinces as the champion of provincial rights, and in the province of Quebec as the heaven-constituted protector of the minority. The hon. gentleman thus addressed himself with great skill to both opposing elements, and eventually succeeded in utilizing that question as the means of putting himself and his party into power. And after they did attain office, I ask my right hon. friend, in all seriousness and earnestness, whether or not he carried out to the full, and according to the spirit, the promise he made his compatriots in the province of Quebec. Well, the election came on, and my right hon. friend secured support in the English speaking provinces as the upholder of provincial rights. He secured also even a greater measure of support in the province of Quebec, and now he is face to face with the very same question to-day. Years ago Brougham, in the English House of parliament, addressed a cogent indictment against the gentleman who was then leading the English administration. There, he said, he sits to-day doing penance for the disingenuousness of years. Does my right hon. friend regard those words as having to-day some application to himself.

The prime minister first declared that this question is not one of separate schools, and then he proceeded to give us a long argument with regard to the value and necessity of such schools. I shall not follow him along that path. It is not, in my opinion, a question of separate schools, but a question of provincial rights. It is not a question of separate schools, but of provincial self-government. It is not a question of separate schools but of constitutionl home rule. It is a question of those privileges and liberties of which the right hon. gentleman, up to the present at least, has claimed to be the champion and exponent. No one appreciates or respects more highly than I do the moral and ethical training which the Roman Catholic Church bestows upon the youth of Canada who were born within the pale of that church. I esteem at the highest the value of the moral training of the children of this country; and I am free further to confess that I appreciate more highly perhaps than some others the consistency and devotion of Roman Catholics, in this and other matters of their faith, wherein they give to the Protestants of this country an example from which the latter might well learn valuable lessons.

Perhaps in dealing with this question to-day I shall not make myself understood, as I would like to be understood, by many of my friends in the province of Quebec, whose esteem and friendship I value second to none of any of my fellow-citizens in Canada. I have met these gentlemen in friendly intercourse, both Conservatives and Liberals; I have found among them men of broad, generous spirit, men of culture, men of wide reading, men able to look beyond the confines of their province and of Canada, men inspired not only with patriotism and devotion to this country, but with a broad and generous spirit in their regard for those who happened to differ from them in political opinions or in matters of religion. And I would desire to make myself understood not only by those who are within the sound of my voice, but by all my friends in the province of Quebec, all of those whom I have known long and intimately and whose opinion I highly regard; I desire them to appreciate the fact that I, to-day, am standing on the rock of the constitution, as I understand that constitution; that I simply desire that the domination of this parliament shall not in any way destroy or undermine that foundation upon which the provincial rights of this country rest. And if there are any men in Canada

who should have a sacred regard for provincial rights, they are my friends from the province of Quebec, who of all men, have been in the past most jealous of the liberties of their province. It was in that school that my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) learned long ago the lesson which he seems to have somewhat forgotten to-day. In the province of Quebec, there is and there is rightly, a strong spirit in favour of provincial rights. And it is because I interpret the constitution in the light of that spirit that I take the stand upon this question which I take to-day. Let me illustrate my meaning by one further statement. If any hon. member of this House or any man in this country should seek to insert in this Bill a provision forbidding the establishment of separate schools in the Northwest, I would combat that proposal to the end, because I would consider it as absolutely in the conflict with the provincial rights which I desire to see maintained. I take this stand because I believe that not only in the light of the constitution, but in the light of the highest wisdom and statesmanship, education should be left absolutely to the control of the people of the new provinces.

Sir, in 1896—to refer again for one moment to the Manitoba school question—the constitution had been interpreted by the highest courts of the land. One decision had declared that Manitoba had absolute jurisdiction over education, except as controlled by section 22 of the Manitoba Act. (And, in referring to the Manitoba Act, let us remember that it has all the force of imperial legislation because it was found necessary, almost immediately to have it validated by imperial statute and it was validated by the British North America Act of 1871.) Another decision declared that parliament had power to enact remedial legislation. A remedial order was made by the Conservative government; and a remedial measure was introduced into this parliament by that government. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) fought against it. At his right hand he had Mr. Tarte, who then represented in this House the constituency of L'Islet, who I believe, expressed sincerely the strong views he entertained on this question. At his left, was Mr. Dalton McCarthy, to whom at least the same tribute is due. And between these was the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), willing to accept the support of both. Like the three Romans who went forth to hold the bridge, these gentlemen went forth to hold the breach. Mr. McCarthy had upon his shield the device, 'No coercion; provincial rights.' Mr. Tarte had upon his shield the device 'The rights of minorities; equal justice to all.' The right hon. gentleman had on one side of his shield the device of Mr. McCarthy, and on the other the device of Mr. Tarte,—I do not know which side he called the silvern and which side he called the golden; at all events the shield was thus exhibited. The general election came on, and, as I have said, the Conservative administration was defeated. In the maritime provinces a strong campaign was made, especially in the province of Nova Scotia, by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), with the war-cry 'provincial rights; no coercion of Manitoba.' In the west the same campaign was carried on by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). In Haldimand, in Winnipeg and in many other places throughout the west, 'No coercion of Manitoba' was the battle cry of that hon. gentleman, the ally and friend of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). And, Sir, what was all the storm about at that time? Had there been any attempt to violate the constitution? No; it was simply a question of policy. The highest court of the realm had declared the right of this government to make a remedial order and of this parliament to enact remedial legislation. Undoubtedly, remedial legislation was within the terms of the constitution. Well, by an overwhelming majority, the people of Canada rendered this verdict, a verdict which has been twice confirmed, if confirmation were needed—in 1900 and in 1904. That verdict declared that even within the terms of the constitution there should be no coercion of a province in respect of its control over educational matters.

Sir, the Conservative party was not unanimous on the question at that time. It was in the very nature of things that it would not be unanimous. Nor was there absolute unanimity among the Liberals of that day. The great majority of the Conservatives believed in the constitutional rights of the minority, and they stood by those rights at great risk and great cost to themselves. Men supported that Remedial Bill who knew that their action in so doing would debar them from future participation in the public life of Canada. The sacrifice was great, but it was not too great for many members who sincerely believed in the wisdom of enacting that legislation, who even went further and believed it to be the absolute duty of parliament to enact that legislation as proposed by the Conservative administration. And there were equally sincere men in the ranks of the Conservative party who combated that proposal, and, in the end, their position was sustained by the verdict of the country, brought about, in very great measure I believe, by the eloquent addresses of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in favour of provincial rights—addresses which were re-echoed in Ontario, in the maritime provinces and in the west by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) by the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock), by the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) and many other gentlemen on that side of the House.

Well, after the elections my right hon. friend stood forth as the champion of the

liberties of the people, as the defender par excellence of provincial rights, as the conciliator who had dispersed by sunny smiles the mists of passion and prejudice. If he was rightly estimated by the people of Canada at that time, there is grave question in the minds of many whether he has not now abandoned the principles which he then professed. Under what conditions did he present this measure? Without consulting his two ministers best qualified by their knowledge and experience, without really consulting the representatives of the people, the executive government of the Northwest, with regard to this particular clause, and moreover, if we may believe all that we now hear, without consulting the representatives in this House of the people of the Northwest. I have challenged him before to state to this House and to the people of this country the reasons which induced him to bring down that measure without exposing it to the ex-Minister of the Interior, then a member of his cabinet, or to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. I have thought this involved to some extent the self respect and even the honour of my right hon. friend. He has not so regarded it. He must be the guardian of his own honour, I admit that, and I do not press him further. But I venture to think that it was only due to parliament and to the country to declare to us why he saw fit to adopt that most extraordinary course.

Now I come to the arguments of my right hon. friend when introducing this measure. He put forward constitutional grounds, and he gave two reasons, which I must examine a little in detail, even if in doing so I trespass upon the indulgence of the House. The first reason he gave, so far as I was able to comprehend his argument, was this: That when parliament in 1875 enacted section 11 of the Northwest Territoires Act of that year, it imposed permanently upon those territories the provisions therein contained, so that they must necessarily become embodied in the constitution of such territories when created into provinces. To state that proposition seems to me to refute it. Parliament could at any time within the last thirty years have repealed section 11, or any other section of that Act; parliament could repeal that section to-day. Parliament on many occasions during the past thirty years has amended and modified the provisions contained in that Act. In 1890 Sir John Thompson introduced and this House carried an amendment, to a resolution moved by Mr. McCarthy. That resolution so amended conferred upon the people of the Northwest Territories power to deal with the question of dual languages after the next general election. A similar provision could then have been made with regard to education. So that provision contained in section 11 of the Act of 1875 must be regarded not as a permanent measure, but, as a temporary provision which could at any moment be repealed by parliament so soon as it saw that the legislature of the Northwest might safely be entrusted with larger powers. It was absolutely within the power of parliament at any time during the past thirty years to have given to the people of the Northwest the same authority over education as was given by the measure to which I referred with respect to the use of the dual language. It was absolutely within the power of parliament at any time within the last thirty years to have given to the people of the Northwest Territories exactly the same power over education as that which is enjoyed to-day by the people of Nova Scotia, of New Brunswick and of Prince Edward Island. Now I challenge my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, or any other gentleman on that side of the House to refute that statement, and to do so by any convincing or satisfactory argument.

My right hon. friend has referred to the opinion of the late George Brown. So far as matters of policy in this country are concerned, Mr. Brown's opinion would undoubtedly be of great weight, and should commend itself especially to hon. gentlemen on that side of the House who were brought up in that school of which Mr. Brown was the leader. Therefore when my right hon. friend, upon the first reading of this Bill, was obliged to quote the words of Mr. Brown condemning any attempt to create separate schools in the Northwest of Canada, he was giving to his followers a lesson read to them by the leader of that school in which they were brought up. But he was not content to deal with the opinion of Mr. George Brown upon a question of policy, he rather sought to use Mr. Brown as a constitutional authority. Well, we know that Mr. Brown was not dealing with the question from the standpoint of constitutional obligation; we know he was not well qualified to do so, because he had not the legal training and the constitutional knowledge which would cause him to be recognized as a great authority on a question of that kind. Now if my right hon. friend desired to quote Mr. Brown's views upon the constitution, he might well have read to the House these words from Mr. Brown as a constitutional authority:

> The constitution was framed with a view to leaving this question to the settlement of the various provinces, and it would be folly in parliament to violate that arrangement.

But if my right hon. friend really desired constitutional authorities, he might have come down a little later. I will give to the House the authority upon that question of men versed in the law, men whose every word upon the meaning of the constitution must carry weight. In the first place, let

me cite the views of the late Sir John Thompson, a great lawyer, a great constitutional lawyer, which were uttered in this House in the year 1894 :

What the constitution of the future provinces shall be, in view of the pledges which have been referred to, or in view of any other set of circumstances, will be for parliament to decide when it decides to create those provinces.

There was another gentleman, a lawyer who devoted himself, almost all his great ability, to the consideration of the constitution of Canada, a gentleman who, after being a colleague of my right hon. friend in his cabinet, was elevated to the Supreme Court of Canada, and whose loss by death a few years ago we all deplore. I refer to the Hon. David Mills, who, speaking also in this House, in 1894, used this language :

When the people of the Territories or any portion of the Territories are sufficiently numerous to constitute a province, when, in fact, they attain their majority in regard to local matters, and when they propose to set up for themselves, this parliament has no right to exercise control over them, no right to exercise any authority ; it can give good advice, but it has no right to give commands. But we are not dealing with the future. When the Territories have a sufficient population to entile them to become a province they must decide for themselves whether they will have separate schools or not.

Another gentleman, at one time a prominent member of this House, now elevated to the bench of the Supreme Court of Canada, recently dealt with the permanency of institutions in the Northwest Territories. I refer to a very distinguished judge, to Mr. Justice Girouard. In a case lately decided in the Supreme Court in which he pronounced judgment upon the claim of certain municipalities in the Northwest Territories to impose taxation on Canadian Pacific Railway lands, Mr. Justice Girouard said this:

I cannot conceive that until provincial autonomy be granted under the imperial statutes to the Territories, or any part thereof, that the Parliament of Canada cannot amend, alter, or even repeal in whole or in part any provision passed for its government.

Could any language be stronger ? Continuing the learned judge says :

The express orders of parliament were to be the supreme law as long as the Territories remain part of the public domains of Canada, without provincial autonomy, which has not been granted to this day.

A former colleague of the right hon. gentleman, a man of great experience in this House, a man who was a constitutional authority, a man whose abilities as a lawyer were so eminent that my right hon. friend parted with him as a colleague in order that he might give his services to this country as a jurist upon the Supreme Court —I refer to Sir Louis Davies—also dealt with this question. He said this :

The vast territory west of Manitoba through which the railway was to run was practically at the time uninhabited by white men. The provisions made for its future government were temporary, tentative and entirely subject to the control and guidance and supervision of the Dominion parliament and authorities.

Further on :

Most of the powers of the Territorial government were to be given in the discretion of the Governor General in Council from time to time and withdrawn when and as he thought fit.

And again :

The powers of legislation possessed by the Territorial council were delegated and not plenary powers. * * * *

All ordinances which the council had power to pass were to be subject to and not inconsistent with Dominion legislation especially relating to the Territories.

Mr. Clement, an eminent constitutional writer, at page 370 of the 2nd edition of his book has also dealt with this subject. I desire to make this question plain inasmuch as my right hon. friend has based his constitutional argument upon the permanence of those institutions upon the theory that, forsooth, because a certain enactment was passed in 1875 when there were only 500 people west of Manitoba, that provision must be, by the decree of this parliament, permanently impressed upon those territories although they now contain a population of 500,000. Here are the words of Mr. Clement :

From that time——

Speaking of the early history of the Territories——

——to the present, the Dominion parliament has had the power to legislate for the Northwest Territories in reference to all matters within the ken of a colonial legislature ; and although large powers of local self-government have been conceded to the inhabitants of these territories they are held at the will of the parliament of Canada. To what extent that parliament will interpose in reference to matters over which legislative power has been conferred on the Northwest Assembly, depends on 'conventions' not capable of accurate definition. No doubt before very long a new province or provinces will be formed out of these territories. The position, therefore, is so evidently temporary that it is difficult to decide to what extent of detail one should go in discussing the present position of the Northwest Territories.

Now, are not these authorities sufficient for my right hon. friend, or indeed sufficient for any hon. member of this House, to induce him to come to the conclusion that these provisions were absolutely temporary and tentative in their nature and that there exists nothing in the constitution which for one moment obliges us to impose this

provision for ever upon these Territories by an Act which we cannot repeal ? If the authority to which I have referred is not sufficient let me cite one which occasionally irritates my right hon. friend when it is quoted, one which is often inconsistent with his views, but nevertheless, one which, if it does not command his respect, will at least, I am sure, attract his attention. My right hon. friend himself said in this House:

It is impossible to admit for instance that the institutions of the Northwest are permanent. On the contrary they are exceptionally temporary ; they deal with a state of things which is exceptional in itself ; they were devised at a time when there was no population and they must be modified from time to time as the necessities of the case require. But at this moment to say they are permanent is a thing in which I cannot agree except so far as they must be permanent in every particular, so long as we are not ready to give these people a more extended form of local authority.

Mr. Speaker, you do not observe in this opinion of my right hon. friend any especial reference to the permanence of this provision which he now seeks to impress for ever upon the people of the Northwest Territories. But, let me not forget one other authority which I should refer to, that is the authority of Sir John Thompson, whom I have already mentioned. These words were uttered in the year 1894. Mr. McCarthy, in the course of his speech on that occasion, used this language and Sir John Thompson gave the following answer :—

As I understood the First Minister in his answer to the hon. member for West Assiniboia—perhaps I was wrong, but I would like to be corrected if I was wrong—rather insisted upon the view I am putting which is that if separate schools are continued until the Northwest Territories are given provincial autonomy they will have the right of insisting upon that being continued when provincial autonomy is conferred upon them.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I did not say that.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then I fail to understand the views which the First Minister holds. He seems to be on both sides of the question.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not at all. If I spoke ambiguously before, I was not at all conscious of it ; but I cannot be said to be ambiguous after the explanation I made to the hon. member for Assiniboia. I appealed to the House to continue the present system while the territorial system continued, and I declared that in my opinion the whole subject would be open and free to parliament as to what constitution we would give to the provinces when provinces were created.

Now, my right hon. friend took one other ground. He says that within the four corners of the British North America Act, 1867 to 1886, he has found justification for imposing upon the people of the Northwest this restriction. I take issue with him upon this ground as strongly as upon the other. Neither in the negotiations and resolutions which led up to the British North America Act, 1867, nor within the four corners of that Act, and of the Acts in amendment thereto, can any provision be found which obliges, or in my humble opinion even justifies parliament in imposing separate schools upon the new provinces. No doubt in this I may be in conflict with some hon. gentleman in this House, apparently with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) for otherwise this provision would not be brought down. If anything would cause me to hesitate in my own opinion it would be that I differ from the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) whose legal ability I very highly esteem. I do not claim to be infallible, but I have given to this question a good deal of consideration and it is my duty to state the conclusion I have arrived at, and which I have just stated, that there is not any provision within the four corners of the Act which obliges or in my humble opinion even justifies parliament in imposing this restriction upon the legislative power of the proposed provinces.

Let us examine in the first place the negotiations upon which the British North America Act was passed. Do not forget that in the very outset the intention was to include in the confederation the very territories that are now being constituted into provinces. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has referred to the Quebec resolutions. Let me also refer to them. He has referred to the 43rd article and to the 6th sub-article. I shall read that because it is important to consider it in order to judge whether, outside the strict letter of the law and within the spirit of the constitution, within the lines of the negotiations which resulted in its formation, anything is to be found which justifies the present action of the government. The 43rd article enumerates subjects within the exclusive power of the provincial legislatures and the 6th subarticle is as follows :—

Education, saving the rights and privileges which the Protestant or Catholic minority in both the Canadas may possess as to their denominational schools, at the time when the union goes into operation.

Not a word about Nova Scotia, not a word about New Brunswick, not a word about Prince Edward Island. Is there anything about the Northwest Territories in that resolution ? Not one word, not one syllable.

But in construing that article do not forget to read in connection with it article 10 of the same resolution, which is this :

The Northwest Territories, British Columbia and Vancouver, shall be admitted into the union on such terms and conditions as the parliament of the federated provinces shall deem equitable, and as shall receive the assent of Her Majesty ; and in the case of the provinces of British Columbia or Vancouver as shall be agreed to by the legislature of such province.

What do I argue from that ? There were resolutions passed with regard to the union of certain provinces, the 10th article of those resolutions contemplated the bringing into the confederation of the very territories with which we are dealing to-day, and when the question of education was dealt with under article 43, sub-article 6 of the resolutions no restriction was placed upon the powers of provinces which might be created in the future in the Northwest. Certainly, this is very significant. My right hon. friend in his speech upon the first reading of this Bill very frankly admitted this. He said :

I shall be told that that exception applies to Ontario and Quebec alone, and not to the other provinces. Sir, that is true. Amongst the four provinces then united, Ontario and Quebec alone had a system of separate schools.

Let us trace the history of this a little further. The British North America Act was passed and went into force on the first of July, 1867. Section 146 provided for the admission of other provinces upon a joint address of their legislatures and of the parliament of Canada. I shall read it.

It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's most honourable Privy Council, on addresses from the Houses of the parliament of Canada and from the Houses of the respective legislatures of the colonies or provinces of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia to admit those colonies or provinces, or any of them into the union, and on address from the Houses of parliament of Canada to admit Rupert's Land and the northwestern territory, or either of them into the union on such terms and conditions in each case as are in the addresses expressed, and as the Queen thinks fit to approve, subject to the provisions of this Act ; and the provisions of any Order in Council in that behalf shall have effect as if they had been enacted by the parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

I lay special stress upon the words 'subject to the provisions of this Act.' Under this provision the Territories became part of Canada on July 15, 1870, under an order of Her Majesty in council passed upon two addresses from the parliament of Canada. These addresses, did not, nor did the Order in Council founded upon them, nor did the Rupert's Land Act,1868, contain any provision which authorized, it seems to me, or justified, in my humble opinion, the imposition upon the people of the Northwest of the educational provisions contained in the present measure. Manitoba was included in the territory which became part of Canada under that Order in Council. The position of Manitoba was a little peculiar. An Act was passed by this parliament in anticipation of the Order in Council to which we have just referred. That Act was passed on May 12, 1870, a little more than two months before these territories became part of Canada, and therefore Manitoba was created into a province at the very moment that it became part of the Dominion of Canada. That is a circumstance which should never be lost sight of in dealing with any question relating to Manitoba, and I have already pointed out that so doubtful was parliament, so doubtful was the administration of the day of the validity of the Act creating Manitoba into a province. that recourse was almost immediately had to the parliament of Great Britain and the provisions of the Manitoba Act were validated by the parliament of Great Britain in 1871. Therefore, any question which might otherwise have arisen whether or not this parliament was justified in inserting certain provisions in the Manitoba Act became immaterial and never could arise after the passing of the British North America Act, 1871. Under these circumstances it seems to me that no constitutional obligation, and, in my humble opinion, with all deference to the views of those who think differently, no constitutional authority is found for the educational clauses. I am of that opinion because these educational clauses depart in terms from the provisions of the British North America Act which they purport to embody. If my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is correct in his contention that he is observing not only the letter but the spirit of the constitution, why is it that he has inserted in section 16 both as originally drafted and as amended provisions which purport to incorporate but which do more than that, which amend and change the terms of the British North America Act ?

The Prime Minister in his argument to-day declared that these Territories became entitled to the provisions of the British North America Act when they became part of this confederation. So they did, but 1875 is subsequent in date to 1870, and he is not seeking to-day to preserve any rights which existed at the time of the union in 1870. He attempts by this measure to perpetuate privileges which did not then exist, but which were created by this parliament in 1775. Is my right hon. friend willing to base his case upon the rights which existed in the Northwest Territories at the time of the union? What does my right hon. friend regard as the time of the union? I gathered from him to-day that the time of the union, is the time when these provinces became part of the Canadian confederation. If that is the meaning of the constitution let the constitution be so construed and acted upon without any attempt by this parliament to override or change its provisions. My right hon. friend says that under subsection one of section 93 of the British North America Act, laws imposed by this parliament upon the Territories in 1875, when those Territories had only 500 people must continue for ever to be the laws of these Territories, although they contain 500,000 people now and inside of twenty years they may con-

tain 2,000,000 of people. That is my right hon. friend's argument when reduced to its essential terms. He quotes from section 93 of the British North America Act; let us look at that section:

In and for each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions:—

1. Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the union.

Was it not decided in the Barrett case in 1892, that the inhabitants of the Northwest Territories comprised within the limits of the province of Manitoba had no right to separate schools either by law or practice at the time Manitoba became part of confederation. Was not that decided, and is not the date on which the Territories became part of confederation exactly the same date on which Manitoba became part of confederation and became a province of Canada?

Subsection 2 of section 93 is not very material because it relates solely to Ontario and Quebec. Subsection 3 of 93 reads:

Where, in any province, a system of separate or dissenting schools exists by-law at the union or is thereafter established by the legislature of the province, an appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any act or decision of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

And section 4 provides:

In case any such provincial law as from time to time seems to the Governor General in Council requisite for the due execution of the provisions of this section is not made, or in case any decision of the Governor General in Council on any appeal under this section is not duly executed by the proper provincial authority in that behalf, then and in every such case, and as far only as the circumstances of each case require, the parliament of Canada may make remedial laws for the due execution of the provisions of this section, and of any decision of the Governor General in Council under this section.

It will be specially observed that in subsection 3 the word, 'prejudicially' is not found. It says:

——an appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any Act or decision of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

In the letter to which the Prime Minister has called attention, Mr. Haultain has quoted certain words of Mr. Blake, which are very cogent in considering this question. Mr. Blake in 1869 said:

It is perfectly clear on great and obvious principles that the basis of union settled by the British North America Act is not capable of alteration by parliament.

To the same effect is the opinion of the well known and very able writer Mr. Clement in the second edition of his work on 'The Canadian Constitution,' page 352, where he says:

Can a new province be established with a smaller sphere of authority than that occupied by the provinces named in the British North America Act, 1867? By the British North America Act, 1886, the three Acts are to be read together and may be cited as the British North America Acts 1867 to 1886. And by section 6 of the British North America Act 1871, a Dominion Act establishing a province becomes, in effect, an Imperial Act—at all events an Act which cannot be altered by anything short of imperial legislation. It is submitted, therefore, that any new province created under this section must be given full provincial autonomy and powers as defined in the original British North America Act, 1867.

Analyze the British North America Act so far as analysis is necessary for the purpose of considering this question and what do you find? In the first place you find the establishment of a federal parliament and a federal executive; in the next place you find the establishment of provincial legislatures and provincial executives; in the next place you find the distribution of executive power between the federal executive, and the provincial executive, and lastly you find the distribution of legislative power between the Dominion parliament and the provincial legislatures. This analysis is not exhaustive, but it covers all that is necessary for the present purpose. I submit, Sir, that the basis established by this distribution of legislative and executive power cannot be altered either under section 146 of the British North America Act or under section 2 of the British North America Act, 1871. In establishing a new province can this parliament wholly or partially alter the basis of confederation; can it change the distribution of legislative power? That, I submit can only be done by the imperial parliament. Surely it cannot be contended that in giving to a new province the constitutional rights conferred by the British North America Act we can reverse the scheme framed by the fathers of confederation and embodied in an imperial statute. Yet, that is what the right hon. gentleman seeks to do to-day by the provisions contained both in the original and amended section 16 of the Bill. In creating a new province under the British North America Act can this parliament so amend section 92 as to transfer to federal jurisdiction nine-tenths of the powers which by the express terms of that section are to be exercised exclusively by the provinces? Can this parliament transfer to such a province any of the powers which under the provisions of section 91 come within the exclusive juris-

diction of the federal parliament? If we can transfer any why not all and thus completely transpose and reverse the entire scheme and compact of confederation. I submit that we have no duty, nay, we have no right or power to shatter the foundations then laid, or to rewrite the compact into which we then entered.

But it may be said that the second section of the British North America Act, 1871, has the effect of enabling this parliament to alter the terms of the constitution created in 1867. I do not so read it. I have already quoted section 146 of the British North America Act, and attention must be especially called to the words in that section:

Subject to the provision of this Act.

Take in connection with that the words of the third section of the British North America Act, 1886. In the passage which I quoted from Mr. Clement he drew attention to these words, but I desire to emphasize them, and I shall read the third section of the British North America Act, 1886:

This Act may be cited as the British North America Act 1886. This Act and the British North America Act 1867 and the British North America Act 1871, shall be construed together and may be cited together as the British North America Acts 1867 to 1886.

Well, with that light let us go to the British North America Act of 1871 and observe its terms. The British North America Act of 1871 in its preamble recites as follows:

Whereas doubts have been entertained respecting the powers of the parliament of Canada to establish provinces in territories admitted, or which may hereafter be admitted into the Dominion of Canada, and to provide for the representation of such provinces in the said parliament, and it is expedient to remove such doubts and vest such powers in the said parliament——

And after that preamble we have the words of section 2 of the Act, which are as follows:

The parliament of Canada may from time to time establish new provinces in any territories forming for the time being part of the Dominion of Canada, but not included in any province thereof, and may at the time of such establishment, make provision for the constitution and administration of any such province, and for the passing of laws for the peace, order and good government of such province and for its representation in the said parliament.

In the first place, you must read into that the words of the Act of 1886, to which I have already referred, which declare that these three Acts must be construed together. In the next place, you must read into the Act of 1871 the words contained in section 146, 'subject to the provisions of this Act.' When you examine section 2 of the British North America Act of 1871 in the light of these provisions, I venture to submit that the imperial parliament did not intend by the Act of 1871 to authorize the parliament of Canada to alter the distribution of legislative power which is provided in the British North America Act of 1867.

Let us examine then the basis of union with regard to education, because that still remains to be considered, and it is upon that point my hon. friend has rested a considerable portion of his argument. Would it not be well before doing so to observe how this question has been regarded by great constitutional lawyers in days gone by? There was no man in parliament for whose opinion in constitutional matters my right hon. friend had greater regard than the late Hon. David Mills. Speaking in this parliament in 1894, Mr. Mills said:

When you look at the subject of education prior to the union you will find not that any system was expressly imposed upon the province, not that the principle of separate schools was virtually established, but the rule was established that where separate schools were established and had been established before the union, they should remain, and where they were not established, the province should retain control over the subject to introduce them or prevent their introduction as seemed proper to the people. We have a practical illustration of this fact in the position of things in the maritime provinces and the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. So far as the Territories were concerned—I do not at all admit that the introduction of separate schools there stands upon the same footing as the introduction of separate schools in the province of Ontario, or of dissentient schools in the province of Quebec. In these provinces they are protected under the constitution; they cannot be interfered with by the local legislature. But in the Northwest Territories, as the hon. minister has said, it has been a matter not of right, not of guarantee to any particular class of the population, but a matter of policy. They were introduced with the view of preventing conflict in this House upon the subject of separate schools and for the reason that they were introduced there they should be maintained as long as these Territories are under the control of this parliament. When this parliament has discharged its duties and the people of the Territories have received the population to entitle them to enter the union they must assume the responsibility for deciding for themselves under the British North America Act how far they should maintain the principle of separate schools or maintain the non-denominational system. Any attempt on our part, whatever our inclinations or feelings may be, to anticipate what ought to be done in that particular, by the province after its autonomy is established, instead of being a source of security to its institutions would be a source of great danger.

Mr. McCarthy, who was inclined to differ at one time a little from Mr. Mills in that regard, said in the same debate, speaking a little later on:

It may be that the view of the hon. gentleman from Bothwell is right in that respect and that clause two of the Act of 1871 does not give to this parliament the power, in creating a

province to confer any constitutional rights other and different from those mentioned in the British North America Act.

And to the same effect, if I desired to heap up authorities, is the opinion of a gentleman who was elevated to the Supreme Court in Canada by my right hon. friend—elevated to a court where these constitutional questions continually are presented. He was elevated no doubt for the reason that he was a student of constitutional law and a high authority on that subject. I refer again to Sir Louis Davies. That gentleman said, in 1891, in this parliament :

My opinion is now and has been for years that when that time comes you cannot withhold from the provinces so erected the right to determine for themselves the question of education in one way or the other. I would be the last to favour this parliament imposing upon the people there any system of education, either free or separate. I only claim that when a Bill is introduced to erect those Territories into provinces that Bill should contain a provision enabling the people of the different provinces so created to decide what system of education they shall have. I do not discuss that question now. I only express this view lest I might be supposed by my silence to give assent to some extreme doctrines which hon. gentlemen have propounded. In view of the remarks which have been made, I thought it necessary to disclaim that, in assenting to the passing of this Bill, I bound myself for all time on this question of education. I do not. Although we are giving powers almost equal to those conferred upon local legislatures, we are not erecting the Territories into separate provinces. When that is done I suppose it will be done by the Queen in Council under the 146th section of the British North America Act, and I simply claim the right when that time comes to determine for myself. In accordance with the view I have always held and hold now, I have no hesitation in expressing, respectfully, that the people of those new provinces should have the right to determine what system of education they shall have.

Is there anything in the terms of section 93, read in connection with section 2 of the Act of 1871, which authorizes or indeed justifies the imposing of restrictions on the legislative rights of the new provinces ? Let me once more read it, omitting what is immaterial in this regard :

The parliament of Canada may establish new provinces and may make provision for the constitution and administration of any such province and for the passing of laws for the peace, order and good government of such province and for its representation in parliament.

It is urged that when you read that in connection with section 93, you are to conclude for some reason that the schools which were established in 1875, or the law which was passed in 1875 and the ordinances which were enacted in pursuance of that law, are to be imposed and must indeed constitutionally be imposed upon the new provinces. What is the basis with regard to education ? The basis is that in and for each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to certain provisions.

These provisions I have already adverted to ; and the question arises whether or not they have any relation to the creation of provinces from territories which became part of Canada in 1870—whether or not laws which were not in force in those territories at the time when they became part of Canada are or can be imposed upon the territories under the constitution by virtue of the provisions of section 93 coupled with the Act of 1871. With all deference to the opinion of those who differ from me in this regard, I submit that such is not the result. And it is perfectly clear that in their hearts the government believe that these provisions have no such effect. Otherwise they would not have attempted to change those provisions by the Bill now before the House. If the constitution is the rock upon which the right hon. Prime Minister stands, why does he not let that rock stand and why does he not build the superstructure of his legislation upon it ? Why does he seek first to undermine it as he is attempting to do ?

I submit that the first subsection of section 93 which affords the key to all the subsections, is only applicable to provinces already formed, already existing as separate sovereignties. The words of the section are : 'In the province at the union'—contemplating, it seems to me, laws which had come into existence by the sovereign will of the people before they entered this confederation, and not laws imposed upon 500 people in the Northwest of Canada in 1875, at a time when their voice could not indeed be heard in this parliament because they had then no representative here. These territories do not come into the union as a province. The words of the section I have just read are not apt, nor were they intended to convey any such meaning as the right hon. Prime Minister has attempted to read into them. In making his argument in favour of withholding the lands from the province, the Prime Minister inadvertently made a very strong argument against these educational provisions ; and I will tell him what it was. He said :

When the provinces which I have named came into confederation, they were already sovereignties. I use that term, because barring their dependence as colonies they were sovereignties in the sense of having the management of their affairs.

And a little further on :

But the case of these new provinces is not at all similar.

This is the right hon. gentleman's argument when he withholds from them control of their lands ; but when he wishes to withhold from them control in matters of education they are to be regarded as sovereign and exactly in the same light as the four provinces that originally entered confederation. Sir, I contend that that sec-

tion was only designed to preserve rights created by the people themselves in their independent legislatures before the union. It was a matter of compact. Legislative sovereignty had already established certain rights. These were not to be prejudiced after union had taken place.

In the case of the Northwest, however, the people had never acted. A system imposed upon them in 1875, which has continued from that time to the present, is now sought to be made perpetual. The people did not freely establish separate schools in the Northwest, but these were established under the terms of a statute in framing which the people had no voice, but to which as good loyal subjects they have been absolutely obedient so long as they were in a territorial position. The territories have never had any complete legislative powers such as were originally enjoyed by the provinces of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and British Columbia. Parliament, as I have pointed out over and over again could have revoked the power conferred first upon the territorial council and afterwards upon the territorial legislature. The right hon. Prime Minister sought to overcome this by a misuse of words—I say that in no offensive sense. He said :

> So, Sir, now whenever a province comes here knocking at this door asking to be admitted into confederation, if in that province there exists a system of separate schools, the British North America Act has provided that the same guarantee we give to the minority in Quebec and Ontario shall also be given to the minority in that province.

In this case no province comes here knocking at the door asking for admission into confederation. The government is proposing a measure to parliament under which provinces are created ; but these will not be provinces until after this Act is passed and has gone into effect. It is of no use to attempt to dispose of high constitutional rights by any such juggling with words as that. The Prime Minister deals with the question as if the people themselves had established their own system of separate schools by their own independent, sovereign action. They have not done anything of the kind. They established separate schools in the Northwest because the Act passed in 1875, when there were not more than five hundred people in the Northwest, imposed upon them the duty of establishing separate schools if they should establish any schools at all. Again the Prime Minister says :

> If we were in the year 1867, and not in the year 1905, and if we had to introduce into this Dominion the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan——

Mark the language : 'The provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan'—treating them as if they were already sovereign entities. Why did he resort to what I, without desire to offend call a misuse of words ? I will answer for him : It is because he was obliged to do so to give even a semblance of support to the measure which he introduced to the House on the 21st of February. Let me read again what I just now began to read :

> If we were in the year 1867, and not in the year 1905, and if we had to introduce into this Dominion the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, would my hon. friend tell me that these provinces would not have the same rights and privileges in regard to separate schools as were granted to Ontario and Quebec ?

Did any one ever hear a more absolutely unfounded premise and a more absolutely false conclusion ? And it was cheered lustily by some of these hon. gentlemen who since have been going about in sackcloth and ashes because of their difficulties upon this question.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 82) to incorporate the Dominion Annuity Company.—Mr. Bole.

Bill (No. 105) to incorporate the Ontario Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Boyce.

THE OTTAWA ELECTRIC COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 12) respecting the Ottawa Electric Company.

On the preamble,

Mr. ROBERT STEWART (Ottawa). Up to the present moment we have heard nothing from the promoter of the Bill as to the reasons why he asks this House to pass it. As one of the representatives of the city of Ottawa I would like to hear from him why he asks for this legislation, which, to my mind, is an invasion of the rights of the municipality. In such an important matter as this I really think that the promoter of the Bill ought to give us some reasons why he thinks we should pass it. I may say that since this Bill was in committee before a very numerously signed petition has been sent in protesting against the passing of the Bill, a petition signed by over 2,000 ratepayers of the city of Ottawa. I mention this as showing the very strong feeling that exists in the city against this Bill; and yet in face of this fact, and in face of the fact that this Bill seems to call for the abolition of the competition which exists to-day, we are still without any reasons given by the promoter of the Bill why it should pass.

Mr. GALLIHER. I stated the last time this Bill was before the committee that I was prepared to discuss it in all its aspects when we came to the clause that is particularly objected to. If you pass the preamble now, I will promise to satisfy the desire of my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Stewart) to the fullest extent. Until then I do not think it is necessary to discuss the Bill on the preamble.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The last time this Bill was up I raised some objection to it in the interest of the municipalities of this country. We have heard a good deal in this House about vested rights. Now if anybody has vested rights in a matter of this kind it is the people of Ottawa. By the existing legislation they are protected from a combination of electric companies and are thereby protected from an advance of rates. The object of this proposed legislation is to enable two companies that were prohibited by law from combining, to amalgamate. The same thing happened in the city of Toronto where I live. We have two electric light companies there which were expressly prohibited in their contract with the city from combining, and the way they got over it was to employ the ablest lawyer in this country who drew up an agreement between the two companies whereby they had the same president, the same directors and the same officials, and these gentlemen regulated the rates. They kept the skeleton of the two companies, the skeleton is still there; but to all intents and purposes they are one company, and they have thereby been enabled to do away with the very thing the city tried to get. Now the people in Ottawa have a vested right in these two companies being kept separate. The legislation proposed here is to enable them to amalgamate, and I cannot see for a moment why the government should assist this amalgamation. The Finance Minister of this country is treasurer for the people of Canada; the people of Canada through the government are paying to-day enormous rates to this Ottawa Electric Company for supplying light to the public buildings. The government are the custodians of the purse of the people of Canada, and if they consent to this amalgamation it means in the near future an advance in rates charged for electricity in the city of Ottawa. Now why should the government of Canada, as custodians of the people of this country, allow this thing to go through and thereby increase the charges to the people of this country, as will be the case when the rates for electricity are advanced in Ottawa. All the ministers of this government, I take it, are householders, or most of them are, in the city of Ottawa, but for some reason or other they are willing that this legislation, which raids the rights of the people of Ottawa, should go through. Furthermore, there are hundreds, if not thousand, of civil servants in the city of Ottawa, some of them with very small salaries to live on, who are all customers of this great electrical combine, and they are to be subjected to an advance in rates for electric light. I think it is the duty of this government as custodians of the purse of the people to do something for the civil service, and if they cannot increase their salaries, at least to protect them in their rights as citizens and stop this Bill from going through. But there is something behind all this, hon. gentlemen opposite have a political debt that must be paid, and they are doing it at the expense of the citizens of Ottawa. The men who own this company and who are promoting this Bill are known to be strong friends of the government, and are asking for a change in the law, and for some reason or other the government seem disposed to allow them to raid the rights of the people of Ottawa whose interests are to be sacrificed. I think the Liberal party should not be a party to such a transaction as this. The citizens of Ottawa have elected two supporters of the government, and these gentlemen who represent the people of Ottawa have come to this House and stated that this Bill is against the interests of the citizens and wipes out their rights; and yet the citizens of Ottawa who have given this government two supporters, are to be turned over to this electrical combine.

The country as represented by the government is to be turned over to this combine and they are to be allowed to charge the country increased rate for the electricity they supply. Even the ministers themselves, in so far as they are citizens, appear to be willing for some reason or other that this measure should go through. All the experience we have had goes to show that after these companies get franchises from cities they immediately begin to conspire with each other in order that they may avoid the performance of the obligaions which they have undertaken. What they are seeking to do is to avoid the obligations which they have assumed so that they may increase the charges which they impose upon the people. We have had all the municipalities in Canada joining with the city of Ottawa in its opposition to this Bill. The Municipal Union has entered its protest. In my own city of Toronto the council, headed by Mayor Urquhart, has passed a strong resolution against this legislation and has asked that municipalities shall have the benefit of whatever protection they have under the present law. Surely it is only fair that they should be protected in what they have. This company in asking for this legislation made an agreement with the city of Ottawa. It was willing to be bound by that agreement. Why should it attempt to escape from its undertaking? That being the case I say the government should not be a party to it, this House should not be a party to it and the people of Canada in every sense should not be a

party to it. Let me read to hon. gentlemen opposite what one of their own journals says on this very question of raiding municipal rights. In the 'Montreal Witness' of February 6th there is an editorial on the situation in Montreal but it is illuminative of the situation all around in regard to raiding municipal rights. The 'Witness,' discussing the crisis at Quebec, says :

There are, however, things that we know. We know that when Mr. Rainville, the well-understood legislative advocate of the grabbing financial corporations, appeared for election in the St. Louis division of Montreal, with evidently much money behind him, the better element of the party put up another candidate and fought the election through on the clear issue that the constituency wanted to have a representative of the people and not a representative of the trusts. We know that when Mr. Langlois was put forward, Mr. Parent, the premier, stepped in and declared that Mr. Rainville was the government candidate, and that whoever opposed him opposed the government.

In the city of Montreal when the Liberal party showed that its candidate was a friend of the trusts which were raiding the city of its rights the people rose up and defeated him. The same thing has happened all through. The 'Montreal Witness' on February 17 said :

Mr. Gouin has established in the legislature a record as an anti-trust champion. He made a gallant fight against the granting of the odious privileges to the Light, Heat and Power Company, while that combination always had Mr. Archambault as an advocate of its demands. The latter's servility to that combination is the principal blemish on the present government.

Mr. Parent, who supported all these raiding corporations, is to-day disappearing from public life and Mr Gouin, the champion of the rights of the people in the province of Quebec, is to-day the premier of that province. All this comes from the fact that he, as compared with Mr. Parent, was the friend of the municipalities and the champion of the rights of the cities of the province. The same thing is going on in our own province of Ontario. If you ask me why Geo. W. Ross disappeared as he did from the public life of the province of Ontario within the last month I will tell you that it was because he was the friend of these raiding corporations in the legislature of Ontario. He did not enforce the law against them. He did not stand up for the rights of the people in connection with the Consumers' Gas Company and other corporations there. You can see that same thing going on all through the country, and it is a shame to see the friends of these corporations in Quebec, in Toronto and in Ottawa raiding the rights of the people. The people of Ottawa have a vested right in these companies being prevented from entering a combination. The government proposes to give them legislation that will permit that to take place. The government is giving them legislation that will enable them to put up their rates not only on the government but on the civil service of this country, and there are hundreds of members of the civil service who are working on poor salaries in Ottawa. The salaries of some of them are so small that they cannot pay their bills, yet, they are being turned over by this government to the mercy of this electric light company. What is the reason ? There is no reason that I can see other than that the government is paying the political debt of some of its political friends by putting the people of Ottawa at the mercy of the Ottawa Electric Light Company. Under these circumstances I say that the House would be fully justified in dismissing this Bill. It has been dismissed twice already. Last session they could not make out a case that would justify the House in adopting this measure and I hope the House will again reject the Bill.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to rob my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) of such political capital as he would desire to make for himself at the expense of the reputation of hon. gentlemen who may perhaps some day aspire to be almost as honourabe and praisworthy as himself, but at the same time I may perhaps call his attention to the fact that there is not the slightest foundation for his insinuations or his statements. He says the government is putting through this Bill. Does he not remember that when the Bill came before the House last session, the government, as a government, took no part in reference to it, that each minister voted as he felt inclined, that hon. members of this House voted as they chose and that this Bill was defeated with the assistance of hon. members supporting the government ? By what process of reasoning, suspicion, or otherwise the hon. gentleman makes these foul insinuations I cannot better imagine than by reading his daily paper which dishes up equally foundationless charges every day. He is the only honest man in this House.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. According to his own opinion.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It is a good thing to have one.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. He is the only man that the people dare trust. Last session I exercised my right as an independent member of this House and a member of this government as well to deal with this measure as I thought best, and if the hon. gentleman will turn up the Votes and Proceedings he will find my vote there recorded against it. He will find the votes of many of our friends in this House recorded against it and I think if, instead of indulg-

ing in such reckless charges, he would confine himself to the discussion of the merits of the measure and wait until members on this side of the House have voted he would have some evidence to go upon. But the hon. gentleman appears to be altogether indifferent as to what he says so long as he can fire off something and put it in his journal to-morrow morning. To-morrow morning we will see in the 'Toronto World' an elaborate speech by the hon. gentleman with the statement that he is standing up in defence of the rights of the citizens of Ottawa. He will take precious good care to magnify his own part in this discussion and we will see to-morrow in the 'World' 'W. F. Maclean defends the rights of the citizens of Ottawa.' He says nothing about other hon. members who may be equally sincere, effective and honest but who do not happen to possess an organ such as the hon. gentleman has. Perhaps it would be well to discuss the merits of the Bill, to come down to details, to take the votes of hon. members and then the hon. gentleman will be able to know more definitely how we stand on this measure. I do not think it has been the practice of the government to exercise its influence in regard to private Bills. Private Bill legislation has always been regarded in this House, as far as I know, as being free from party considerations. Every hon. member is free to vote as he likes. That has been the practice, that is the practice to-day, and every hon. member who ordinarily gives his support and confidence to this government is free to vote as he likes.

My hon. friend would perhaps direct his particular attention to those on his own side, because, if I remember rightly, a sub-committee of this House was appointed. I do not think that that sub-committee was composed wholly of members on this side of the House. That sub-committee has made a report. That report, I am told, was unanimous, so that his observations as to the influences and the methods, the dishonesty of men who are engaged in pushing this measure through, may be extended to those on his own side. Will my hon. friend tell me if he extends these observations, suspicions, insinuations and charges against those gentlemen on his own side of the House, who have recommended to this House the passage of this Bill? Where is the hon. member from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk)? I believe he was a member of that committee. I believe the hon. member for St. Antoine division of Montreal was a member.

Mr. AMES. And I dissented.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman dissented. I was not a member of the committee myself, and I do not know what course he took. I accept his statement. I do not know whether the yeas or nays were taken. What was the attitude of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk)?

An hon. MEMBER. He was chairman.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. member for South Lanark, the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) was a member of the committee. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean) include him in his insinuations of dishonesty? Perhaps he would go on and elaborate and tell us who of those who sit around him are equally deserving of the censure that he, as chief censor of parliament, now takes the liberty of distrbuting gratuitously throughout the House. I shall watch with deep interest to-morrow night for the arrival of the Toronto 'World,' and I hope to see in it, in fine magnificent display, a reference to the valuable services being rendered to Canada in the cause of good government by the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean).

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. We have had a fine lecture from the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) on everything but the issue before us. That issue is whether the citizens of Ottawa are to be turned over to a grasping corporation against the existing law of the land. That law to-day confirms the citizens of Ottawa in certain rights. If the law is changed as here proposed, the citizens of Ottawa are to be turned over to this grasping corporation, and the Postmaster General does not like to hear the facts as I stated them to-night. He does not like to have it go forth, and, although the opportunity was given him, he has not a word to say in contradiction of the statement that Hon. George W. Ross has disappeared from the political horizon of Ontario because of his alliance with these corporations, and that Hon. Mr. Parent to-day is leaving the government of Quebec because, as the Montreal 'Witness' says, his government has been besmirched by alliances with these grasping corporations. There is other evidence in this country every day that in some way the corporations can get everything they want; when the people want anything they have to come here and fight for it. They have had to organize a municipal union in this country to maintain the control of the streets which they thought they had under the municipal laws of Ontario. But in some way the Dominion government, this federal power which once was the champion of provincial rights—and we heard something about that to-day—has been a party to an attack on provincial rights by these corporations. If the Postmaster General had dealt with the question, if he had stated the reasons why he intends to vote against this measure—and I take it that he intends to vote against it—if he had given some of those reasons which will induce him to vote against it, we would have made some headway; but he does not like the idea that I threw out, that this government, as a government, should oppose this Bill, because the government is to-day the greatest customer of the Consumers' Gas Company.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We feel quite satisfied that with the help of the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean) we will be able to defeat the measure.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Now we are making some headway. At last we have got the minister on the penitent bench. It has been difficult to get him there, you have to put a rope around his neck and drag him up there, but we have him there now, and if the hon. gentleman is speaking for the government, and desires us now to cease discussion, simply to vote on the Bill and finish it, I have not a word more to say, and I will put the hon. gentleman's picture in the newspaper to which he refers as the champion of municipal rights. If there is any picture that the people of North York would like to see in to-morrow's paper, it is the picture of the Postmaster General of Canada as the champion of provincial and municipal rights—and he can have the whole page.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Thanks.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. He can have the whole page, as he looks on Sunday and on every day through the week, as the champion of muncipal rights of the people of this country.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The offer of my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) is a somewhat doubtful compliment. Up to the present I have enjoyed the proud position of having had always, without exception, the undying hostility of the Toronto 'World'; I have enjoyed that advantage, and I would hope for the rest of my political career that nothing would deprive me of it. As to the adorning of the pages of that paper with my portrait for the delectation of the electors of North York, I have no objection, but I would ask on their behalf that they might not have in the same paper the portrait of the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean).

Mr. BELCOURT. It does not appear to me to be very pertinent to the subject to discuss the causes which led to the retirement of the Hon. Mr. Parent from the premiership of Quebec and the choice of his successor. I propose to say a word or two about the Bill. Before we discuss the clause of which my colleague gave notice the other day, I must join with him in a request that the promoters should give some explanation. The Bill has two objects. The first object, which is dealt with in section 1, is to increase the capital. The citizens of Ottawa are under the impression that the increase of capital is sought for the purpose of acquiring the shares of another company. I have not so far heard from the promoter of the Bill the reasons which prompts the Ottawa Electric Company to ask for an increased capital other than the reason for which, as I have stated, it is supposed to be sought. If there is any such reason, if there is any reason why the Ottawa Electric Company desire an increase of capital other than for the purpose of acquiring the shares of other companies, I would like to have that explanation. It may be that this committee would be fully justified and might be unanimous in granting the Ottawa company an increase of capital if it is made plain that that increase is not sought for the purpose of amalgamation with the Consumers' Electric Company. I should like very much, for my part, to know if there is any other object than that one, and I think the proper party to enlighten us is the promoter of the Bill. Unless some reason is shown for an increase of capital other than the reason I have shown, I shall feel constrained to vote, not only for the amendment, but against the Bill itself.

Mr. GALLIHER. There seems to be a strong desire, on the part of members from Ottawa at all events, that I should speak on this question. As I stated before, I would have preferred to have made my argument when we reached the clause of the Bill that has been objected to. I think that is the more usual course. However, I am prepared, and have always been prepared, to discuss this Bill upon its merits, calmly, reasonably, not going to the extreme either in favour of the Bill or against it. As the introducer of this Bill, I may say that comment has been made in the press as to why a member representing a constituency so far from Ottawa should be placed in charge of this Bill. I trust the press, or those who instigated that expression, do not think that I do not feel myself as much bound by any action I take upon a Bill affecting Ottawa as I would upon a Bill affecting a constituency bounding on my own.

Further, one of the papers has seen fit to style me a company's man, and another has styled me: the man from the electric lobby. In reply to the first, I have only to say that any hon. member or any journalist who looks through the records of this House and sees what my attitude has been on the question of provincial rights will be satisfied that the statement in the newspaper is not correct. As to the latter charge, I have never been a lobbyist in this House or out of the House ; I have not done any lobbying in respect to this Bill and I do not propose to do any. It is the privilege of a member of this House to take charge of a private Bill when asked to do so, whether it be in his own constituency or in any other constituency in the Dominion, and I have simply exercised that privilege. But let me discuss this Bill. In the first place a Bill similar to this was introduced last session of parliament; it passed the Private Bills Committee and was reported to the House. An amendment was moved by Mr. Birkett, the then member for Ottawa, and the Bill was referred back to the committee to consider the advisability of inserting this amendment. The Bill was then withdrawn by its promoters and it ended there. This session the Bill was introduced in the same

shape as last session and in the Private Bills Committee, Mr. Belcourt, senior member for Ottawa, moved an amendment which he stated was satisfactory to the mayor as representing the city of Ottawa. That amendment was exactly in the words of the amendment proposed by Mr. Birkett last session, as an amendment satisfactory to the city authorities and to him as representing the city. The company proposed that a rider should be added stating that if compelled to place their wires underground they should not be confined to the maximum charge fixed in the franchise agreement. One member of the committee remarked at the time that he thought the rider would kill the horse, and it seemed as if the whole objection on the part of the city and on the part of those opposing the Bill lay against this rider. I have never been able to see, and I cannot see to-night, where that rider would have altered the position one iota, but be that as it may, that rider has been disposed of. When the Bill came to the House from the Private Bills Committee the right hon. the leader of the House moved, that in view of the opposition, of the different parties to be heard, and of the interest taken in the matter, it might be well to refer the Bill to a special committee which was then named. I had nothing to do with that; I did not even suggest the name of a member on that special committee; but I do not think that any one will object to its personnel. That sub-committee consisting of nine members amended the Bill so as to provide that in case the Ottawa Electric Company should purchase a majority of stock in the Consumers Company or the Metropolitan Company, the contracts entered into between the city and these two companies should be held sacred and should not in any way be prejudiced. This left the city in exactly the same position with regard to that matter as it occupies to-day. One member of the committee, Mr. Ames, reserved to himself the right to object to the general principle of the Bill when it came to the House, but otherwise the report of the committee was unanimous.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I beg to say that I was on that special committee and I also reserved the right to act as I thought fit when the Bill came before the House.

Mr. GALLIHER. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement; I did not hear him but I did hear Mr. Ames. The objects of this Bill are threefold. First, the company asks permission to increase the capital stock. My hon. friend the senior member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) wants to know if that is to enable them to amalgamate with the Consumers Company and the Metropolitan Company and. I may say in reply that they cannot amalgamate with either of these companies because under the franchise granted to these companies they are not empowered to amalgamate with any other company. The second section explains itself, and it is that the Ottawa Electric Company wish to get power to purchase for cash the stock in any other company having similar objects. That is a privilege which has been granted by this parliament time and again and which is granted practically every day. It was done in the case of the Cedar Rapids Company, the St. Louis Company, the E. B. Eddy Company and others. The third object sought by the Bill is to enable the Ottawa Company to increase its borrowing powers. There is nothing inconsistent with the Acts that have been passed through parliament in favour of similar companies, in the legislation that is sought for by the Ottawa Company. It has been asserted by almost every speaker who has opposed this Bill, that the Bill invaded a municipal or civic right. As a matter of fact there is no interfering with a civic or municipal right. The competition is merely a condition created in the present instance by the city of Ottawa granting franchises to other companies than the Ottawa Electric Company. It is not a civic right nor is it a municipal right as municipal rights and civic rights inherent in themselves are viewed; it is merely the creation of a conditon of affairs by the act of the city itself. I have dealt with the question of amalgamation and I say that they cannot amalgamate if this legislation goes through, but they can buy a majority of stock in either of these companies. It has been said that this legislation will enable the other companies to break their contracts with the city, but the real truth is that this amendment will preserve to the city of Ottawa all the rights they contracted for when they granted franchises to the Consumers Company and the Metropolitan Company.

One word on the question of rates. The argument of hon. gentlemen opposed to this Bill is that it will entail 50 per cent extra cost on the people for their electric lights. Well, that may read very well in the newspapers or sound very well coming from hon. gentlemen who may be opposing the Bill, but I ask them if they for one moment really believe that if this Bill be passed the price of lights will be increased 50 per cent. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that that is not a commercial proposition. No company would be so foolish as to charge such an increase. If they did, they would be only cutting their own throats. But should the company be foolish enough to attempt any such course, the city of Ottawa has in its own hands the remedy. I am rather astonished that the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) who, day in and day out in this House for the past four or five years, has so strongly advocated municipal ownership, has not to-night advocated the taking over

by the city of Ottawa of the ownership and operation of the electric light plant. I do not go so far as the hon. gentleman on the question of municipal ownership, but I believe in municipal ownership of the electric plant and waterworks of a city. We have that in my own town, and the city of Ottawa has the power to-day, if it chooses, to acquire the ownership of this electric plant. It has two remedies against an increase in the cost of lighting. It may buy out the Consumers Company and operate that company under its charter, or it can enter, under its own special charter, into the manufacture of electric lights itself. Let me read the first section of the statute respecting the city of Ottawa which gives this power to the city :

> The municipal council of the corporation of the city of Ottawa shall, in addition to the powers conferred by the Municipal Light and Heat Act, which is hereby incorporated with this Act, have power to produce, manufacture and use, and supply to others to be used, electricity for motive power and for any other purpose to which the same can be applied, and also to fix rates and charges therefor, and collect the same, and to acquire and hold lands, water-powers, machinery and all other property, easements and privileges necessary therefor, and shall for and with respect to such powers and purposes or any of them, have all and every, the powers which are by the said Act conferred on municipal corporations with respect to light and heat.

Thus the city has in its own hands the remedy, and may own and operate its own electric light plant.

Reference has been made to a petition. Well, with all due deference to petitions, it does seem to me that if the cause of the opponents of this Bill be just and right, it is safe in the hands of the 213 members of this House. Besides I have no doubt you could get as many people to sign a petition to the opposite effect and an equal number to sign a petition to have their lights supplied for nothing.

Mr. STEWART. I do not propose to take up much of the time of the committee, but there are one or two points dealt with by the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill which I think should be explained. He says that if competition be taken away, there is still a remedy in the hands of the city of Ottawa, and he read an extract from the statute which purports to give power to that city to do its own lighting. He however forgot to tell the House that only last year a notice was served on the city by that same company, which is now applying for this legislation, to the effect that the city had no legal right to go into the business of electric lighting. My hon. friend's opinion therefore is contradicted by that of the Ottawa Electric Company, whose case he is pleading, and that company knew of the existence of the statute which the hon. gentleman cited when they served that notice on the corporation. In my opinion, it would not be safe to leave the city in the hands of the Ottawa Electric Company, especially when considering the claim made by that company that we have no legal right to do our own lighting. It seems to me that this effectively disposes of the argument regarding the remedy which the city has in its own hands, should an amalgamation of the two companies interested take place. But my hon. friend says an amalgamation cannot take place. Perhaps I ought to remind the House that when the Consumers Electric charter was granted, that charter expressly stipulated that the company should not sell out to any other company. A difficulty consequently lies in the way of amalgamation to-day which this Bill will remove because by it the Ottawa Electric Company will be given the power to purchase stock in the Consumers Electric Company, and in that way avoid the agreement made between the latter and the city. As one of the representatives of the city of Ottawa I ask this House not to pass legislation which will tie the hands of the city and place it at the mercy of one company. It may possibly not be good business for the company to increase its rates 50 per cent. I do not say that it will ; but if this Bill should pass, the power will be given the Ottawa Electric Company to increase its rates 25 per cent or 49 per cent. An advance of 25 per cent would be a considerable tax on the consumers of electric light in the city, and we ask parliament to refuse to give the company the power to increase its rates by 25 or 49 per cent. The company has the right to-day to increase its rates. Why therefore should it ask for this legislation ? There is nothing to hinder these two companies, if their rates are not profitable, from agreeing to charge adequate rates. The ratepayers of the city of Ottawa do not want electric light for less than it costs to produce it. But these companies can get together at any time and agree to establish an adequate rate. One hon. gentleman—I think it was the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) in charge of the Bill—said, when this matter was last under discussion that the rates were fixed at .52 cents per ampere hour, as if that was a reasonable rate——

Mr. GALLIHER. I did not say that.

Mr. STEWART. Some hon. gentleman said it as if this was not an unreasonable rate. But, if the Ottawa Electric Company and the Consumer's Electric are even holding their own without making dividends for their shareholders—and I very much doubt the statement that they are not able to make dividends at present rates—they can advance the rates to make a reasonable profit. But, if they are making their expenses, I submit that an increase to .52 cents per ampere hour would be too much. It would be an advance of 49 per cent—practically 50 per cent—which is entirely too much.

Regarding the amendment proposed by Mr. Birkett, then member for Ottawa, let me draw attention to the fact that the Bill went through committee in Mr. Birkett's absence. I am not making any charge or finding fault with him, but merely stating that he was not present when the Bill went through committee. When it came before the House and he saw that the Bill was likely to carry, the amendment he proposed was conceded by the city only because they thought they could not get better. But the point of the present Bill and the subject now really before the House, is whether this House shall pass a Bill to enable the Ottawa Electric Company to abolish competition. So far as the mayor's statement in the committee is concerned, it is well known that immediately after the meeting of that committee, the city council was called togther, and, by a vote of nineteen to five, decided to oppose the adoption of the maximum rate of the Consumers' Electric Company. So, we have to-day before us not the question whether this was acceptable to the mayor, or whether it was acceptable to the corporation of a previous year, but we have the statement of the corporation of Ottawa that they are opposed to the abolishing of competition, which is the principle underlying this Bill. And I think that the promoter of the Bill, if he would tell us all he knows about it, would say that the idea of increasing the capital is that the company may be able to absorb the Consumers' Electric Company and thereby destroy competition.

Mr. KEMP. Might I inquire from the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) why it is necessary for this company to come here for legislation ? If they wish to override the city of Ottawa why do they not go to the provincial legislature of Ontario?

Mr. BELCOURT. The charter which it is proposed to amend is a Dominion charter. So, they must come here.

Preamble agreed to, yeas 82, nays 59.

The hour for private Bills having expired, the Speaker took the chair.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST.

House resumed consideration of the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 69) to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) I have pointed out that it is not a question of introducing into the Dominion in this year, 1905, provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, but of creating out of the Northwest Territoiries of Canada these provinces under the Bills which have been introduced. And the right hon. gentleman continues as follows :

Mr. STEWART.

Would he tell me that when you would say to Ontario and Quebec : You shall have your separate schools, Alberta and Saskatchewan would be denied that privilege ? The thing is preposterous. Let us rise above such considerations.

Well, I ask him why he conveniently leaves out of sight in that illustration, the cases of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island ? He himself, has pointed out in an earlier passage of his speech—indeed to-day he has gone into the historical aspect of that matter—that these clauses, so far as Ontario and Quebec are concerned, were introduced into the British North American Act by virtue of a compact, and that no such compact existed in respect to the three maritime provinces. Well, if my right hon. friend will show me that the case of these proposed provinces—because they are not yet provinces—comes nearer to the case of Ontario and Quebec than it does to the case of the maritime provinces, if he is able to show me that there is in respect to these proposed provinces any such compact as that which was made before confederation between Ontario and Quebec, I will then readily and gladly accept his illustration ; but until he does so I contend that his illustration is of not the slightest value.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to section 16, because it is opposed to the spirit and the letter of the constitution. I am opposed to the substituted section because it is not different in principle from that for which it is substituted ; and indeed it is difficult to understand why there have been three weeks of delay, why there have been three weeks of negotiation, why there have been three weeks of turmoil, why this measure has been postponed from the 21st of February up to the present time, simply for the purpose of bringing down to parliament as a substitute that which is to all intents and purposes, in principle and for the most part in detail, exactly the same as the original section. Is this the result of the efforts of the ex-Minister of the Interior? Is it for this that he resigned office ? Is it to accomplish this that he laid down the seals of office and placed himself before the people of this country as the champion of provincial liberties ? Is this the result of the unceasing and untiring efforts of the seven hon. gentlemen from the Northwest Territories who sit on the other side of the House ? Sir, the mountains have been in labour, and a ridiculous mouse has been brought forth. What does section 16 as proposed to be amended accomplish ? It sterotypes for ever the ordinances and laws of the Northwest Territories in a portion of the country where extraordinary progress and development must be expected. I venture to think that an Act of this kind will be productive of more harm in that portion of the country than anywhere else in

Canada, because it is into the Northwest that our immigration will largely flow, and it is there that we must expect development and progress to a very unusual degree in the immediate future.

Why, the very form of section 16 and of the substituted section show that the government are not serious in the contention which the right hon. gentleman has made. What had they inserted in this Bill before we came to section 16? They had inserted section 2, which I will read to the House:

2. The provisions of the British North America Acts 1867 to 1886, shall apply to the province of Alberta in the same way and to the like extent as they apply to the provinces heretofore comprised in the Dominion, as if the said province of Alberta had been one of the provinces originally united, except in so far as varied by this Act and except such provisions as are in terms made, or by reasonable intendment may be held to be, specially applicable to or only to affect one or more and not the whole of the said provinces.

Has not the right hon. gentleman over and over again in this House, both upon the first reading of this Bill and in the speech which he made this afternoon, told us that it is his intention solely and absolutely to apply to the Northwest Territories of Canada the provisions of that constitution under which all Canadians live. Now I ask him, and I ask every hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who proposes to deal with this question, why section 2 is not sufficient to apply to the Northwest Territories of Canada, every provision of the constitutional statutes which it enumerates? If my right hon. friend proposes to stand on the rock of the constitution, what portion of the rock of the constitution is omitted from section 2? It goes further, I believe, in the direction in which the right hon. gentleman desires to persevere, than it should go having regard to the fact that this is not a province already constituted coming into the Dominion, but is a province to be created by the very Bill we are now discussing. I will have something more to say about that when this Bill is in committee. But putting aside for the moment that question, is or is not my right hon. friend sincere, are or are not his colleagues sincere, when they tell this House that they desire the control of education in the Northwest Territories to be regulated solely by the provisions of the constitution? If they are sincere, then I say that they have everything in section 2 that can possibly be given —if they stand as the right hon. gentleman says he does stand, on the rock of the constitution. Why, the matter is not arguable. For what reason do they insert these words?

Except in so far as varied by this Act.

If you are to stand on the rock of the constitution, if my right hon. friend and his colleagues are prepared to stand or fall by the provisions of the constitution, how is it that they desire to vary in one jot, tittle, or iota the provisions of the constitution? My right hon. friend has accused the press of this country of fomenting discord, of arousing passion, and strife and prejudice.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I want to tell my right hon. friend, and I want to tell the hon. gentleman who is venturesome enough to say, 'hear, hear,' that what has agitated the people of this country is not so much what has been said by the press as the knowledge that the right hon. gentleman, in this Bill, has in express terms departed from the provisions of the constitution. The British North America Act, 1867 to 1886, is to apply to these two provinces, to apply absolutely and in their whole terms. Are they? Let the right hon. gentleman answer in the terms of his own measure: No, they are only to apply 'except in so far as varied by this Act.' And yet with that provision staring him in the face, not only in section 2 but in section 16 of the Bill, he ventures, on his authority as a public man of long experience, on his responsibility as Prime Minister of Canada, on his honour as leader of this House, to stand here and tell us that he abides by the constitution, that he stands upon the rock upon which it is founded. Why, surely, the matter is not arguable. If the right hon. gentleman is sincere, let him strike out these words 'in so far as varied by this Act,' let him abolish section 16, and then you will have in truth and in their entirety those very provisions which are established upon the rock of the constitution. Let us look at the substituted section. It is worse, it seems to me—certainly it is no better than the original section:

Sir Wilfrid Laurier—In Committee of the Whole—On Bill No. 69—Will move that the following section be substituted for section 16 of the said Bill:

Section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, shall apply to the said province.

So far very good.

Shall apply to the said province.

How apply? Absolutely, in its entirety, unamended, without variation? No, Sir. Here again is the answer of my right hon. friend in the very words which he put upon the order paper of this House only the night before last:

Section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, shall apply to the said province, with the substitution for subsection 1 of said section 93, of the following subsection:

We are amending in this parliament section 93 of the British North America Act, which the right hon. gentleman says is applicable to the new territories. First, he lays it down in as distinct a way as ever I heard anything laid down in this parliament,

that the people of these Territories became entitled to the provisions of section 93 of the British North America Act and every subsection contained in it. Then, when he comes to constitute these Territories into provinces, he takes away what he has already said is the birthright of the people of these Territories. Well, that may be argument and that may be logic, but I am bound to confess that it is argument and logic absolutely beyond my comprehension. What is the subsection which we are going to interpolate into the British North America Act passed by the imperial parliament in respect to these provinces? What is it that we are going to substitute for the constitutional birthright of these people?

> Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to separate schools which any class of persons have at the date of the passing of this Act, under the terms of chapters 29 and 30 of the Ordinances of the Northwest Territories, passed in the year 1901.

We are amending the British North America Act of 1867 by inserting in it certain ordinances passed by the legislature of the Northwest Territories in 1901 under a delegated authority from this parliament. That is the position in which the right hon. gentleman places this matter before the House. Further, in the second subsection, it is declared that:

> In the appropriation by the legislature or distribution by the government of the province of any moneys for the support of schools organized and carried on in accordance with said chapter 29 or any Act passed in amendment thereof, or in substitution therefor, there shall be no discrimination against schools of any class described in the said chapter 29.

And in the third:

> Where the expression 'by law' is employed in subsection 3 of the said section 93, it shall be held to mean the law as set out in said chapters 29 and 30, and where the expression 'at the union' is employed, in said subsection 3, it shall be held to mean the date at which this Act comes into force.

And that, if you please, Mr. Speaker, is a strict adherence to the constitution, which is the birthright of the people of the Northwest Territories. I say, in all sincerity, and without the slightest desire to be offensive: Could absurdity go farther? You have applied the provisions of the British North America Act in section 2, and now, in section 16 of this Bill, you propose to abolish subsection 1 of section 93 of the British North America Act and to amend the third subsection by putting upon the terms of that section an interpretation which, I think, it could not otherwise bear. If the expression 'at the union' really means the date when the new provinces are tstablished, it requires no amendment for the Prime Minister's purpose. If it does not bear that meaning why and by what authority shall we amend it? If my hon. friends on the other side of the House differ from me there is one test to which we can both put our opinions. Strike out these words of interpretation, because, according to their view, they are absolutely necessary. Then we will stand by the constitution exactly as it was passed in 1867, and exactly as it should govern the people of Canada, including the people of the Northwest Territories, to-day.

I was under the impression that a great deal of the agitation and dissatisfaction said to prevail in certain quarters on the other side of the House, was occasioned by the provision contained in subsection 3 of section 16 of the Bill as originally drafted. That subsection reads as follows:

> In the appropriation of public moneys by the legislature in aid of education, and in the distribution of any moneys paid to the government of the said province arising from the school fund established by the Dominion Lands Act, there shall be no discrimination between the public schools and the separate schools, and such moneys shall be applied to the support of public and separate schools in equitable shares or proportion.

It was murmured—I know not with what truth—that one of the special reasons advanced by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) for his disagreement with his colleagues was the circumstance that this amendment had been made, and that thereby the moneys set apart for a certain purpose under the provisions of the Dominion Lands Act were supposed to be diverted from the purpose for which they were originally intended. Has that been changed? Let us read the provision which is now proposed to be substituted for it, and I will venture to say that there is a great deal less difference between the amended section and the original section proposed by the government than there is between either one or other of these sections and section 93 of the British North America Act. The amendment does not differ so much from the section as originally drafted as either one or the other of those sections departs from the terms of the British North America Act. Here is the amended section in regard to public moneys:

> In the appropriation by the legislature or distribution by the government of the province of any moneys for the support of schools organized and carried on in accordance with said chapter 29 or any Act passed in amendment thereof, or in substitution therefor, there shall be no discrimination against schools of any class described in the said chapter 29.

Almost ipsissimis verbis and certainly not in the slightest degree different in substance.

What, after all, is the position in which we find ourselves to-day under the proposal of the government? Parliament undertakes to interpret some provisions and to amend others of a constitution which it has not power to alter. If the constitution is to be followed, and if parliament

is to keep within its terms, the proper course is simply to provide that the general provisions of the British North America Act shall apply, in so far as they are applicable to the new provinces. It is the only course to pursue, and I stated a moment ago, what I now repeat that if the government of this country, instead of embarking on their present course had simply confined themselves to a proposal of that kind, protecting the rights of all parties under the constitution, as it was originally framed, there would have been no arousing of passion, or prejudice, or strife, and this difficult and delicate question could, I think, have been settled without any such discord as that which we have unfortunately known in this country during the past few weeks. If the constitution imposes on the new provinces the restrictions which have been spoken of, why is it necessary to distort, to amend, to alter its language or to interpret the Acts referred to ? Sir, it is not wise to follow a course which arouses passion, discord and discontent. Let the rights of all be governed according to the constitution, and no injustice will be done ; and, more than that, no injustice will be felt. The right hon. gentleman and his colleagues have been advocates of provincial rights, champions of conciliation, in the past, and after all conciliation is better than coercion. The Prime Minister has laid that principle down many times, and I am sorry he has been so forgetful of it on the present occasion. Let us listen to what he said in 1890 :

What I understand by provincial rights—and I suppose what my hon. friend must understand —is that the people of the Territories should decide for themselves whether or not they are to have the privilege or the onus of having two official languages.

And if he was willing then that the people of the Territories should have the right to determine what should be their language, whether they should have one official language or two, why should he be afraid now to entrust to the same people the rights of any man in those Territories in respect to education. Why should there be any fear ? Is not the question of language something to my friends in the province of Quebec ? I am led to believe and I do believe that next to the faith to which they are attached and of which they are proud, they take a legitimate pride in their own language. And why should they not ? I am English speaking and Protestant, I am not ashamed of the race from which I have sprung or of the faith to which I hold and it is for that very reason that I honour the French Canadians, because they are firmly attached to that faith which they learned at their mothers' knees, because they revere that language which they learned from their mothers' lips and because they are proud of the traditions of that splendid race to which they belong—and every one of us should honour them for that reason. Any man who has not some feeling of pride in his ancestry, who does not honour the traditions of the race from which he sprang, cannot be a good Canadian and it is well for the future of this country, it is well for the future of our people as a whole, that there should be in the two great races which dominate this country, a feeling on either side of attachment to language and of pride of race. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was willing in days gone by to entrust that great question to the fair play and justice of the people of the Northwest. May I not ask in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, why it is that there should be any fear now ? But let me continue the quotation to which I just now referred.

If you remove that law, you take away from them the privilege which they now have of using two languages. I do not believe that is in the direction of provincial rights or provincial autonomy. The amendment of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice tends to uphold provincial rights and local autonomy, and I am happy to extent my congratulations to the Prime Minister and to his government that more and more and day by day the force of circumstances brings them over to this principle.

You will observe that the right hon. gentleman in view of his attachment to provincial institutions, and provincial autonomy was then actually congratulating the leader of the Conservative government of the day because he was disposed to leave, and did leave after the next general election the question of language entirely to the justice and fair play of the people of the Northwest Territories. Yet he takes an entirely opposite stand to-day and insists that restrictions not to be found in the British North America Act shall be imposed on the people of the Northwest Territories. Then he went on :

If the hon. member for Simcoe instead of placing as a basis of his Bill that there should be a community of language, and that this community of language should extend everywhere in the Dominion where French is spoken, had simply left it to the will and desire of the people of the Territories, we would not have one half or one-tenth part of the trouble we have over this question.

And I will tell my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that (to use his own words), if he had simply left this question of education to the will and desire of the people of the Territories, constituted as they are about to be into provinces, we would not have one-tenth or one-hundredth part of the trouble that we are having in Canada to-day over this question.

The right hon. gentleman in 1896, when he stood as the champion of the liberties of the people, as the vindicator of provincial rights said :

Experience has taught us that this remedy of interference with local legislation has never been applied and probably never can be ap-

plied without friction, disturbance and discontent ; that you cannot apply that remedy without causing as much dissatisfaction as satisfaction. It must be evident that while you redress the grievance of the minority by such act of interference you run great risk of creating a grievance on the part of the majority.

I commend that language of the right hon. gentleman in 1896 to his attention now and I ask him, whether or not he is pursuing a wise course in departing from that principle ? And a trusted and valued colleague of his to whom I have already referred (Sir Louis Davies) speaking on a similar question at a little earlier date said this :

I desire to follow on the lines of the Liberal party laid down here years and years ago ; in all local matters to refer the question to the people more immediately interested. I have never found that solution of the difficulty to fail ; it has always proved equal to the occasion. Provinces have been driven almost to revolt ; there has been discontent in Ontario and in Quebec ; but when you apply the principle of provincial rights, when you allow the people to deal with their own local affairs as they please, the question is settled always in the way the people desire it to be settled. So it should be in the Northwest Territories. They have an equal right to speak with the people of the older provinces, and I for one will not be a party to taking away that right which if my own province were interested I would expect to have given to it.

These were regarded as wise utterances in days gone by and do they not meet with the approval of all reasonable and fair minded people and is there reason, is there justification, is there cause for departing to-day from that which was thought wise and right before ?

Why Mr. Speaker, in the very speech which the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) delivered on the first reading of this Bill, it seems to me that he uttered his own condemnation, and I shall leave it to the judgment of the House whether I shall not make good that observation. He was dealing with the boundary question in the early part of his speech and laid down the principle that it was absolutely essential in Canada, so far as possible, to have the provinces of about equal size, and he attached a special importance to that principle, indeed, we can all see that it is more especially important to carry out that principle, in the Northwest of Canada. He was giving a reason why the boundaries of Manitoba should not be extended westerly, though Manitoba with 73,000 square miles of territory adjoins Alberta and Saskatchewan, each having an area of about 250,000 square miles. What was the reason that he gave ? Let me read his own words.

But is there a member of this House who would advise us that we should carve out of the Territories which for thirty years have been under the jurisdiction of their own legislature, which are to-day represented by ten members in this House, any portion of what belongs to them and hand it over to the province of Manitoba, against the consent of the people of those Territories ? If they agreed to it, well and good ; I would have nothing to say. But the legislature of the Territories has more than once declared that they would not under any circumstances consent to any portion of their territory westward of the province of Manitoba being taken from them.

Further on he continues in the same strain :

But even this I am not prepared for my part to grant at this moment, because members representing that section to-day sit on the floor of this House, and they and their people have the right to be heard on that question, and if they do not agree to it I do not think the parliament of Canada should make the grant against their wishes.

If the right hon. gentleman is not prepared to extend the boundaries of Manitoba because the people of the Territories are unwilling that any portion of their territory shall be attached to Manitoba, how is it that he is willing to impose these restrictions upon them in face of the strongest possible protest by their Prime Minister, and accredited representative, Mr. Haultain ? Is there one principle to be applied to the question, whether or not territory shall be added to Manitoba, and is another principle to be applied to a subject which the right hon. gentleman himself knows from long experience is liable to arouse feelings of discord and even of passion when the people think they are suffering any injustice? Why, any question as to the boundaries of the Northwest Territories would sink into insignificance, so far as sentiment goes, in comparison with that question which the right hon. gentleman has seen fit to fling abruptly into the poltical arena of Canada. There cannot be any doubt about that. What does the right hon. gentleman say, referring to the members from the Northwest Territories who sit on his side of the House. He says :

If they do not agree to it I do not think the parliament of Canada should make the grant against their wishes.

What does that mean ? If it means anything it means this : That the seven members from the Northwest Territories who sit on that side of the House, hold this situation within the palms of their hands, and that if they maintain a firm stand they can prevent these restrictions from being imposed on the Northwest Territories. That is what it means if it means anything; and I assume that when the Prime Minister from his place of responsibility on the floor of this parliament gives utterance to these words as a solemn reason why a principle which he declares good should not be carried out, we have a right to attach some importance to his words. May I read them again ?

If the members from the Northwest Territories do not agree to it, I do not think the

parliament of Canada should make the grant against their wishes.

And if the members from the Northwest Territories do not agree to this grant out of the liberties of the people of the new provinces, the Prime Minister will tell the parliament of Canada that they should not make that grant against the wishes of these members.

There is one other point upon which I shall dwell for a moment and which is, perhaps a little out of its place here. I refer to the argument which my right hon. friend made not only to-day, but also a month ago with regard to the tax exemption of the Canadian Pacific Railway. In triumphant tones on both occasions he likened this matter to an obligation upon parliament to observe the terms of a contract; he has said: in establishing these Territories you cannot rid the people of the Northwest from that exemption which was imposed by a statute passed in 1880. He told us that no one would suggest any such thing, and that no one had ever attempted to suggest it. Well, the right hon. gentleman's memory is not very good. I myself had the temerity to suggest that very thing in this parliament. I said two years ago that I thought the government should seriously take into consideration the question of removing that exemption—and parliament can do it—but I said that parliament must strictly observe the terms of its obligation and that in such case it would be absolutely necessary for parliament to institute an inquiry and to make good to the Canadian Pacific Railway everything to which they were entitled by reason of the removal of the exemption.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Hear, hear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Postmaster General says 'hear, hear,' and when he and the Prime Minister can show me any contract by virtue of which this restriction must be placed upon the people of the Northwest, I will support the measure they have brought down. Why, Sir, the only contract which exists is in the terms of the constitution, and I have said over and over again to-day, that in this matter I myself, and I believe every hon. gentleman on this side of the House, is absolutely prepared to stand or fall by the constitution. But before I depart from the question whether or not this restriction shall be imposed on the people of the Northwest Territories against their will, I have one inquiry to make from my right hon. friend. The Prime Minister of the Northwest Territories said that he was not consulted with regard to the provisions of section 16 as originally drafted. He has stated in a letter—and I have not heard it contradicted—that there was only a casual reference made to the education question—one of the most important questions of all, surely—that there was only a casual reference to it on the Friday before this Bill was introduced, and that at 12 o'clock on the very day on which the Prime Minister introduced the Bill a typewritten copy of this provision was handed to him across the table. Mr. Haultain has further stated, that the Prime Minister was not then present, that the Postmaster General was not present, that the Minister of Justice was present for a short time, but the only gentleman who remained present during the whole of that interview, the only gentleman whom the Prime Minister of the Northwest Territories had any opportunity of consulting, (and that only three hours before the introduction of the Bill) was the Secretary of State. What was the answer of the right hon. gentleman to that assertion? It was this, that Mr. Haultain—a gentleman, as he always is—had seen fit to express, in the conclusion of his letter, his appreciation of courtesy which had always been extended to his colleagues and himself. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman at this stage whether or not the provisions of that amended section were at any time submitted to Mr. Haultain before they were submitted to this parliament? Has Mr. Haultain been consulted with regard to this amended section?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He has not. My right hon. friend has certainly abandoned most clearly his former role of advocate of the liberties of the people. Once he was ready to consult them. Once he was ready to meet their will. Once he was ready to bow to their will when constitutionally expressed. But when the Prime Minister of these Territories, which, according to the right hon. gentleman possess now almost complete rights of self-government, when the Prime Minister of these Territories and his colleagues come to Ottawa to consult with this government, and when a great question is raised, when passion and prejudice are being appealed to, the right hon. gentleman deliberately refuses to take the premier of the Northwest Territories into his confidence or seek his advice and assistance with regard to this measure. There were sunny ways in days gone by. There seem to be different ways now. I do not know for what reason the First Minister of the Territories was ignored. He and his colleagues are the accredited representatives of the Northwest Territories. They were summoned to Ottawa, and are here, for the very purpose of being consulted and of advising with regard to this measure. But although the situation is so serious, as the right hon. gentleman has depicted it, he ventures, in the face of public opinion in this country, to bring down this measure in its amended form without having given the Prime Minister of the Northwest Terri-

tories the right even to see it or examine it before it was finally decided upon.

Sir, the conclusion of the whole matter seems plain. The very basis of confederation, contemplating the eventual inclusion of all British North America, provided for separate schools in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec only. This provision was the result of compact and agreement. But no restrictions on provincial powers were contemplated in the Northwest. None are mentioned in the Quebec resolutions. The terms of the constitution, if applied in their integrity to the new provinces, do not, in my humble opinion, restrict the powers of the provincial legislature. The people of the Northwest are, I believe, opposed to any such restrictions. We have passed resolutions in this parliament in favour of home rule for Ireland. Shall five and a half millions of people of Canada deprive half a million of people in the Territories of that home rule which is theirs under the terms of the constitution? Shall we, despite the terms of our national charter, impose upon a small minority of the people of Canada a restriction which they will always resent and against which they will always struggle? Are the people of the Northwest competent to receive the rights of self government? Why then should they not receive the same rights which were conferred upon the people of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, and which are now enjoyed by them? In the provinces of Ontario and Quebec there is, it is true, a compact which is embodied in our constitution and which has always been—and must always be—observed for that very reason. But at the same time let us not forget that, if I am correctly informed, the rights of the minority in Ontario to-day are greater than they were at the time of confederation in respect of separate schools. That does not look like any desire or intention to coerce. Is there any oppression of the minority in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island? I can speak best for my own province, and I do not know that such question very much agitates its people. There is a modus vivendi, an understanding, an arrangement arrived at. Let no man suppose that I do not respect the attitude of Catholics with regard to this matter. No one can for a moment fail to realize the position, so far as they are concerned. They say: It is a matter of our faith that our children should be under instructors of their own faith, that they should receive religious instruction at school; and so strongly do we adhere to that principle that we would rather pay the state tax and also support our own schools than submit to any other system. I find no fault with that view. I only desire that such matters should be left to the people of the respective provinces and not be placed in the wide area of Dominion politics. Is there any reason to mistrust the people of the Northwest Territories? Are they disposed to be less generous than the people of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island? What does my right hon. friend himself say on that question? I have already pointed out what he has said with regard to the use of the French language as an official language of the Northwest of Canada. He was ready to trust that to the good sense of the people to their instinct of justice and fair play, and I venture to think to-day that if this question had not been hurled into the political arena by the right hon. gentleman, there would never have been the slightest hesitation in the Northwest of Canada about continuing those privileges to the Catholics which they now enjoy. One of my hon. friends on the other side smiles at the idea. Well, he is at liberty to enjoy his own opinion; but I venture to say that there is no reason why we should suspect the honesty, good faith and fair play of these people. I have never heard very much complaint in my own province, and while I respect the people of that province as highly as those of any other in Canada—although they did not treat me very well at the last election—I am not disposed to admit that there would be in the Northwest less generosity, less fair play, less sense of what is right and due to the minority than there is in the province of Nova Scotia. What did my right hon. friend himself say on this question? May I not appeal from the Sir Wilfrid Laurier of to-day to the plain Wilfrid Laurier of years ago? He said in 1890:—

> I have no reason to suppose, and I do not for one moment suppose, that the people of the Northwest Territories would act unjustly or unfairly towards the French minority.

Well, my hon. friend may smile at my words, but he will surely admit that his leader is as well qualified to express an opinion on that subject as he is himself. And further on the Prime Minister says:

> The smallest measure of conciliation is far preferable to any measure of coercion.

And did he not in his speech the other day appeal to that Canadian spirit of tolerance and charity of which confederation is the essence? And he went on to say, on another occasion, referring to the treatment of the minority in his own fair province of Quebec by those who are his fellow countrymen:

> I am glad to say, and perhaps it would be permitted if in this matter, being myself a son of the province of Quebec, I indulged in what may not be an altogether unpardonable pride when I say that I am not aware that the Protestant minority ever had any cause of complaint of the treatment they had received at the hands of the majority.

Sir, we are always ready and willing to acknowledge the sense of justice, the sense of what is right, which exists in the bosoms of the French-speaking citizens of Canada. But may I not, on behalf of my fellow countrymen in the Northwest of Canada, claim that they are animated by as just a spirit of what is right and fair ? If the record is good in one case, it seems to me that some consideration at least should be given it in the other. I can appeal to the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock), because I have in my hand an expression of similar sentiments uttered by him.

> I shall cast my vote to have this matter settled by the people's representatives in the Northwest who are best able to settle it, or by such other tribunal as may be suggested after they shall have the fullest opportunity of inquiring into all the conditions of the country, believing, as I do, that neither the Northwest Council nor any other tribunal to which it might be relegated by this House will betray the trust reposed in it, but will act justly towards all the people without fear, favour or affection.

May I not ask my hon. friend the Postmaster General to believe that if this troublesome question is kept out of the arena of Dominion politics and is relegated by this House to the people of the Northwest Territories, the people of those Territories, through their representatives in parliament will not betray the trust reposed in them, 'but will act justly towards all the people, without fear, favour or affection.'

Mr. Speaker, education was assigned to the provinces. Let any necessary agitation in respect to education, in respect to the rights and powers of legislatures with regard to education, be confined to provincial limits. That is the true solution of the question. Let the Dominion interfere and the agitation will be widespread. My proposition is to let the people settle the question for themselves, and the agitation if any—and I do not believe there will be any considerable agitation—will be confined within narrow limits, and, in the end, will be settled by some reasonable compromise, because, after all, we can always safely trust to the good sense of the people in this regard. As I said before, I firmly believe that if this question had been left to the people of the new provinces, they would have dealt, and they will deal, fairly with the minority. But we must not oppress or coerce any part of the people to provide safeguards that have not a warrant in the constitution. The constitution of Canada does not always protect minorities by any definite safeguards. There are nearly 50,000 Nova Scotian electors who, at the last general election, voted for Conservative or independent candidates, and about 55,000 or 56,000 who voted for candidates supporting the government. There are to-day in parliament 18 men representing the 55,000 or 56,000 electors, and the 50,000 men who voted for other candidates have not one single representative in parliament. What about the rights of that minority ? Have these rights been safeguarded ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Have they been safeguarded in the sense which hon. gentlement intend by this Bill ? It is true that in one sense the eighteen men who have been elected represent the whole people of Nova Scotia ; but in another sense these 50,000 electors to whom I refer have no representative in this parliament.

One further word I would like to say and it is this : That restrictions of this character imposed upon the majority for the benefit of the minority do not always work out in the way intended. For example subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act provides :

> Where in any province a system of separate or dissentient schools exists by law at the union, or is thereafter established by the legislature of the province an appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any Act or decision of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subject in relation to education.

If the people of Nova Scotia, or New Brunswick, or Prince Edward Island, tomorrow were to establish separate schools by law, they would at once bring themselves within the purview of Dominion interference. Because, it is not only from any act or decision prejudicially affecting these rights established before confederation that the appeal would lie, but from any act or decision of a provincial authority in any wise affecting such rights or privileges that the appeal will lie. And the very fact that there is a restriction of that kind may possibly act as a deterrent in these three provinces to which I have called attention.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I apologize for having so long detained the House ; I had hoped to conclude in a very much shorter time. I trust that I shall not be misunderstood by any of my fellow-countrymen with regard to the position I have taken in this matter. I base my case and my contention upon the terms of the constitution. I do not argue against separate schools ; I do not argue for separate schools. It is not for me to determine that question for the people of the Northwest ; it is for the people of the Northwest, under the terms of the constitution, to determine that matter for themselves. I shall always endeavour to respect the opinions of my fellow-countrymen, of whatever race and of whatever creed. But I do not think it is wise to attempt to step outside of the limits of the constitution to provide remedies which have no warrant within the terms of our national charter. The battle cry of hon. gentlemen opposite in 1896 was 'Hands off

Manitoba.' 'There will be no coercion Act under Laurier.' The slogan of that day raised against the exercise of coercion under a perfectly constitutional power, should ring to-day in thunder tones in the ears of those from whose lips it then resounded. Let there be no domination of provincial liberties by the federal power, let no violent hands be laid upon the charter in which those liberties are enshrined.

Mr. Speaker, it remains for me to state to the House what action I shall take at the present time, holding the views and convictions which I have expressed. Upon the second reading of any public Bill the question of principle is discussed. So far as this Bill grants provincial autonomy, I am heartily in suport of it; in so far as this Bill withholds from the new provinces any rights to which I think they are justly entitled under the terms of the constitution, I am not in favour of it. I shall, therefore, adapt a course which has in the past been adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite on more than one occasion, a course for which there is ample precedent, both in the parliament of Great Britain and in the parliament of this country; I shall adopt the course of moving that:

All the words after the word 'that' to the end of the question be left out and the following substituted therefor:—

Upon the establishment of a province in the Northwest Territories of Canada as proposed by Bill (No. 69), the legislature of such province, subject to and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Acts 1867 to 1886, is entitled to and should enjoy full powers of provincial self government including power to exclusively make laws in relation to education.

The effect of this amendment is not to defeat the Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My right hon. friend says 'hear, hear.' I do not want the Bill defeated; I want the Bill amended so that it shall give to the people of the Northwest Territories the full measure of self-government to which they are entitled under the terms of the constitution. It is for that reason that I have made my motion in amendment, in order that I may embody therein the principle which I think should be applied to this Bill. If carried, it will not defeat the Bill; if carried, the result will simply be that the Bill is placed on the order paper on a subsequent day, and it will go to committee with the opinion of this House in favour of the principle which I have advocated. That is the position which I think I ought to assume under the circumstances; at all events, that is the position which I do assume, and by which I am prepared to stand.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, I do not quite understand the procedure under which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has proposed this amendment and, so far as I do understand it, I do not agree with him as to the effect which it may have upon the measure that is now before the House. The motion now before the House is that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. 'Be now read.'

Mr. FIELDING. That is the motion which has been placed in your hands. The motion is that this Bill be read a second time. My hon. friend moves to strike out all the words after 'that,' and express a pious opinion on one portion of the Bill. It seems to me that after you have struck out all the words of the motion that the Bill be now read a second time, there is no Bill left. It is certainly not the usual method whereby anybody moves an amendment. If an hon. member regards the main purpose of a Bill—whatever he may be pleased to consider its main purpose—with favour and disapproves of some minor part of it, his obvious duty is to support the second reading of that Bill, and when in committee we reach the clause to which he objects, then is the proper moment to move that that clause be struck out and something else be substituted. I think the method of my hon. friend is a mistaken one; however, I do not attach much importance to that, and I prefer to proceed with the discussion.

I need hardly say, Sir, that I do not rise for the purpose of following my hon. friend in the very lengthy argument he has addressed to this House on what he is pleased to regard as the constitutional questions involved in the consideration of this measure. If I felt, as he appears to feel, that the constitutional questions involved are the overshadowing questions, I need hardly say that I would not presume to address the House at this moment, but I would leave the question to be dealt with by hon. members of the legal profession, who are supposed to understand such matters better than those of us who are laymen. But it is because I do not agree with my hon. friend that the constitutional question is the overshadowing question that I venture to discuss the matter at the present stage. I do not believe that the people of Canada will consent that any one of us shall shelter himself behind the fence of an alleged constitutional question. This school question is a vexed question, a troublesome question. We can all say with the fullest sincerity that it is a misfortune that we have to deal with it. But once we have it here, my belief is that our constituents, the people of Canada, will expect us not to evade it, but to meet it fairly, boldly, to discuss it openly, discuss it in a generous spirit, and endeavour to find some solution of the difficult problem. I do not agree with my hon. friend that we are not called upon to discuss the question of separate schools or common schools. I believe that the people of the Dominion to-day are not occupying their minds with an elaborate analysis of constitutional questions

which nine out of ten of them will never read, and which the whole ten will fail to understand. I believe that the people of Canada, since this unpleasant question is brought before us, will expect us to meet it plainly and openly, and discuss it with the hope of finding a happy solution. So I put aside the constitutional question, not for a moment undervaluing it——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The right hon. Prime Minister did not put it aside.

Mr. FIELDING. The Prime Minister did not discuss it in the sense that was attributed to him by the hon. gentleman.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not propose to go into that constitutional question, not because I say it should not receive any consideration, but because I say it is not the great question involved, and I prefer to go on and deal with the practical questions which are before us. If it is a constitutional question above all others, then, perhaps the best thing we can do will be to request the legal members of this House to adjourn to the Railway Committee room and thresh it out, while we who have not the good fortune to belong to that learned profession will stay down here and discuss the practical questions involved, or proceed with the ordinary business of the House. But, if it is the case that there are questions other than the constitutional question and greater than the constitutional question involved, these are the matters that I may venture to proceed to discuss before this House. Now, the first question to be considered, only for a moment, because, happily, there is no division of opinion upon it, is whether or not the time has come when we shall give a provincial constitution to these new Territories in the west. Happily, I say, there is no difference of opinion on that. It is now thirty-five years since these lands were acquired and brought under the control of the Canadian authorities. From the beginning, governments and legislatures have gone on preparing the people for the work of self-government. At an early stage the province of Manitoba was carved out and set up in housekeeping. At a later stage the Northwest Territories were given another form of organization. That form was developed from time to time and at this moment they have in the Northwest Territories a very considerable measure of self-government, but inasmuch as it falls short of the ordinary powers, privileges and authority of a province, we all agree that the time has come when we shall give a provincial constitution to the people who inhabit those lands.

Then, we come to the question whether these Territories shall come under the operation of one government, as at present, or whether they shall be divided into two or more provinces. There is not much dispute on that point, happily. I think my hon. friend the leader of the opposition had previously entertained the view that one province was sufficient.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I never expressed any opinion on the subject.

Mr. FIELDING. I think some opinions have come from the other side of the House on that point. However, I am not saying that for the purpose of arguing it but I am only mentioning it incidentally. When we consider the question of the population of the Northwest Territories to-day we can readily agree that the population of the Territories is not too much for one province. The population in the Territories to-day is about the same as the population of one of our smaller provinces, or of the greatest of the maritime provinces. But, we are well aware of the fact that the population of the Territories will increase very rapidly, and inasmuch as there is a vast area of land to be occupied it has been deemed wise to divide the Territories into two portions and establish a separate government for each. There may be some difference of opinion on that point, but it is not a very serious difference and we may say that we are happily agreed that there shall be two provinces.

The next question to which we come is the question as to what shall be done with the Dominion lands. My hon. friend, (Mr. R. L. Borden) in the small portion of his speech in which he did not deal with the constitutional question, devoted himself to the question of Dominion lands. We have provided in this Bill that the Dominion lands shall be retained by the Dominion. My hon. friend takes very strong ground in favour of these lands being given over to the provinces. He argues that inasmuch as by the British North America Act the lands were left to the possession of the original provinces we should apply the same principle and leave these lands to the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. That argument is by no means conclusive. We know that there are strong reasons why these lands should be retained within the control of the Dominion. We have not the slightest doubt that during the development of the Northwest Territories it is a wise provision that the Dominion and not the provinces should retain the management and control of the public lands. My hon. friend can see no reason why a distinction should be made between our dealing with the land question in the case of the Northwest Territories and dealing with the land question in the case of the older provinces. Let me say to my hon. friend that we think there are strong reasons. The question of immigration is one which is properly assigned to the Dominion government. The question of immi-

gration and the question of the settlement of the public lands are closely associated. In most of the older provinces the amount of available land is not very great; at all events the land which is likely to attract settlers immediately is not very great—not so great as it is in the far west. Then, if we expect population to flow rapidly into the west, if we are to control the immigration policy, if we are to be able to carry out that vigorous policy which during the past few years has been converting that land into busy hives of industry in many sections, if, I say, we are to be able to carry on that vigorous policy which has built up the Northwest Territories in the last eight years, it is necessary that there shall be a retention of those lands in the hands of the Dominion government. But, if we make a mistake at this point we, at all events, have the comfort of knowing that we err in good company, in company which my hon. friends opposite will be bound to consider very good company. My hon. friend did not note the fact that when the province of Manitoba was created, just as we are to-day creating these two provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, the land question was considered and that for the very reasons which I have ventured to advance to-night the government of Sir John Macdonald decided that it would not be wise to give the province of Manitoba control of its own lands. If for good and sufficient reasons, the same reasons as those which have been advanced by this government, it was deemed well that in the case of the province of Manitoba, the lands should remain under the control of the Dominion, why is it not an equally sound argument to-day to say that the lands in the case of these new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan shall remain in the hands of the Dominion? But, that did not settle the question. After the lapse of some years the province of Manitoba revived the question. The province of Manitoba advanced the very reasons which my hon. friend has advanced in favour of having control of these lands. They were not content to rest under the constitution which had been given to them. They came to Ottawa and they asked the government, on more than one occasion if I am not mistaken, to change that provision of the constitution and to give the province of Manitoba control of the lands. I have in my hand the decision of the government of Sir John Macdonald in the usual form of a certified copy of a report of a committee of the honourable the Privy Council approved by His Excellency the Governor General in Council on the 22nd May, 1884. The memorandum says:

The Committee of the Privy Council have named a sub-committee to confer with Hon. Messsr. Murray, Norquay and Miller, duly accredited delegates from the legislature of Manitoba, upon the subjects embraced in the memorandum of instructions given by the said legislature of Manitoba to the delegates, as well as many other matters affecting the province.

The report deals with a number of matters. It is quite lengthy and I shall only be justified in detaining the House with the part of it which comes immediately in connection with the land question. After hearing these delegates, after hearing the very strongest arguments that could possibly be advanced, no doubt the very same arguments that my hon. friend has advanced today, why these lands should be placed under the control of the province, the government of Sir John Macdonald came to the following conclusion:

The lands of Manitoba hold a very different position in relation to the Dominion government from the lands of the other provinces. Shortly after the union of the old provinces, the governent formed from that union purchased at a large price in cash, all the rights, title and interest of the Hudson Bay Company, in and to the territory out of which the province of Manitoba has been formed.

It incurred further a very large expenditure to obtain and hold this territory in peaceable possession, and at a still further cost which is continuous and perpetual is extinguishing Indian titles and maintaining the Indians so that the Dominion government has a very large pecuniary interest in the soil, which does not exist in respect to any other of the confederated provinces.

The purpose expressed in the memorandum of instructions——

That is in the memorandum of the Manitoba government——

——for which lands are sought, is that they may be applied to the public uses of Manitoba.

This purpose seems to be most fully met by the federal government already, viz.: in providing railway communication to and through Manitoba, in aiding the settlement of vacant lands, and in public works of utility to the province.

Further on the same report says:

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

provinces holding the lands should conduct their own immigration operations at their own expense.

And so against the contention of my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) to-day that it is a wise policy to surrender these lands to the local authorities we have the deliberate conclusion of the Dominion government of earlier days, the government of that distinguished statesman, whose name is always so warmly honoured by hon. gentlemen on the other side, we have the decision of Sir John Macdonald at the time of the creation of the province of Manitoba and afterwards when the question was revived by the provincial government, we have the decision of that eminent statesman that in the true interests of this Dominion the lands of Manitoba and the Northwest should remain under the control of the Dominion government.

Next, Sir, we may come briefly to the question of the financial arrangements. At the time of confederation it was agreed that the various provinces which form the union should surrender their customs and excise duties to the common treasury at Ottawa. But they required as a condition of confederation that some portion of these moneys should be returned to the provinces to assist in the maintenance of the provincial government, and thus there was established the system of provincial subsidies. The principles governing the distribution of money to the provinces are pretty well laid down. As the first step we give a certain fixed sum, having due regard to the responsibilities of the various provinces, in the way of allowance for government. Then there is a sum of 80 cents per head on the population, and finally there is an adjustment of the debt account whereby in some cases an allowance is made to the province in the form of interest on a public debt which that province might owe but which in the particular case does not happen to exist. So far the principles under which these subsidies and aids to provinces may be granted are pretty well understood, and they are applied in this case to the new provinces to be created, taking an estimated population which is probably a fair and liberal one upon which they shall receive the sums set down in the Bill.

One other financial question remains and it is one which arises out of the retention of the lands by the Dominion government. Since we have allowed the other provinces to retain the lands, and since they have them as a source of revenue, and since in the case of the Northwest Provinces we withhold the lands from them and they are deprived of that source of revenue, it follows that we must make some allowance to them, and it will be admitted that we should make a reasonable and generous allowance. I have seen comparisons made in criticism of this measure between the sums which will be received by these provinces in the west from the Dominion treasury and the sums which are received by some of the other provinces. I have seen a comparison made in the case of my own province particularly. Comparisons of that nature are very unfair and may easily be misleading. If I turn to the latest returns which I have at hand I find that in the case of Ontario the province receives about $1,500,000 a year of revenue from its lands. The Northwest Provinces will receive nothing to correspond with that and therefore we must make a liberal allowance to them. Quebec receives about $1,300,000 per annum, according to a recent report, in the way of revenue from lands, forests and minerals. My own province, Nova Scotia, received last year over $600,000 from its lands, mines and minerals. We deprive the new provinces in the west of these sources of revenue, and of course we should make up the sum to them by liberal allowances. I do not think that, on the whole, we can complain much of the financial terms. It may be that when we come to deal with the Bill in committee some questions may arise that may require further consideration, but speaking generally I think the most that can be said about the financial terms is that they are liberal—and I am sure that on both sides of the House we would desire to be liberal as respects these two provinces which will have a large territory and will begin with a comparatively sparse population. We all realize that a population scattered over a wide territory requires man for man more money for the expenses of government than a population which is closely settled together. I think therefore on the whole, reserving any discussion of details until we go into committee on the Bill, that the terms are liberal to these two provinces, they are generous, but not more generous than hon. gentlemen on both sides would desire we should make them.

But I know that all these questions, important though they may be, are overshadowed in the public mind by this great question of education. I believe that to-day most of the people of Canada are not thinking very much about the financial terms, the lands or anything of that sort, but they are very must disturbed in many quarters in consequence of reports that have gone abroad as to the nature and effect of the resolutions proposed in relation to the public schools. Now this belongs to a class of questions that at any time should be approached with all possible deliberation, especially in a country like Canada, with our diversity of race and creed. He would be a rash man who would plunge into a discussion of this question without a disposition to be considerate with regard not only to the opinions and convictions, but possibly even to the prejudices of his fellow men. It is in that spirit that we should approach the question.

We should be prepared to listen to all that may be said and to make an honest effort to meet the views of those who differ from us in opinion. We should aim as far as possible to have a system brought about which would come as nearly as possible to our own particular views: yet surely each of us must realize that if we are to carry on the government of the country we must not insist on our individual views, but must try to meet the views of those who may differ from us, must try to find common ground of action. For myself I do not like the principle of separate schools. I regret that such a large number of my fellow citizens in Canada are obliged to take the view, conscientiously as they say and as I believe, that they cannot support a system of free common schools. I think it would be a great thing for our country if in the growth that is now coming so rapidly upon us, our children of all races and sections and creeds could meet from day to day and mingle together in work and in play, in the school room and on the play-ground, and if we could happily agree upon such a policy it would do much for the grander upbuilding of the country of which we are so proud. I say unhesitatingly that if I were to have my own way only, if one could afford to insist that his opinion must prevail regardless of the wishes of his brethren, I would like to see a school law which did not call for this word 'separate.' But we must take things as they are. We have to recognize the fact that forty one per cent of the people of this Dominion do not think as I think on that question; do not think as the majority of Protestants think. What then? Shall we say that they are in the minority and that therefore we shall have no regard for them? Shall we say that they are but forty-one per cent and we are fifty-nine per cent, and therefore, we will be indifferent to them? No, Mr. Speaker, you cannot govern Canada by any such rule as that. Let us remember that the Roman Catholics are not in a minority everywhere; there is one great province in which our Roman Catholic brethren are in the majority, overwhelmingly in the majority. Suppose we insisted upon this doctrine of provincial rights right down to the last point as was argued to-night, what would be the condition of our Protestant brethren in the province of Quebec? Suppose that under the sacred name of provincial rights an effort were made to do away with the separate school system and with the rights of the minority in the province of Quebec, what would we find? We would find the table of this House and the table of the greater parliament at Westminster—because the law would have to pass the imperial parliament—we would find the table of this parliament and the table of the imperial parliament loaded down with petitions, not of the character of so many that come to us now insisting upon the doctrine of provincial rights, but with petitions demanding that the name of provincial rights should not be used for such a purpose, demanding that the majority should not have the right to control, demanding that the rights of the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec should prevail instead of the wish of the majority. Let us not forget that, as my hon. friend the Prime Minister has shown, in preparing the constitution of confederation, the strongest advocates of separate schools were the representatives of the Protestant minority in Quebec. And, Sir, if it was necessary then to make an arrangement to protect the minority in that province, is it a dreadful thing that the minority elsewhere should ask to receive consideration? I venture to say that in the minds of the Protestants of Quebec that thought will sink deep to-day, and that they will be influenced by the Golden Rule: 'Do unto others as you would have others do unto you.'

There are three great lines of thought to-day on the question of public education. One, held by a great many people, is that the secular system of education is the only system which we should have in the public schools. There are many people, altogether Protestants I think, who claim that it is useless to introduce anything like religion into the schools, and that all we can do is to devote ourselves to secular education. The second line of thought is that which is held by a large number of the advocates of what may be called national schools. These people think that with secular education you may associate a certain degree of what may be properly called religious instruction; that you may say to the teacher: thou shalt not teach the 'isms' of any denomination, but you may and you should—in the words of the Nova Scotia school law—

> inculcate by precept and example a respect for religion and the principles of Christian morality and the highest regard for truth, justice, love of country, loyalty, humanity, benevolence, sobrity, industry, frugality, chastity, temperance and all other virtues.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if under a system of public schools the teacher by precept and example inculcates those virtues, I do not know whether all will call it religion, but in my view the pupils of those schools will receive a very considerable amount of the very best kind of religion. However that may be, many think that it is quite possible to associate with secular instruction a certain amount of instruction—you may call it moral instruction if you like or you may call it religious instruction—and an effort is made in some provinces of the Dominion to do that. The citation I have made is from the Nova Scotia school law and I think it will be found to be substantially

the same in the law and regulations of the other maritime provinces.

Then we come to the third line of thought. It is that which is held by our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, it is also held by many Protestants, and it is: that you cannot have education and religion separated. A great writer has expressed the thought in this sentence:

> So natural is the union between religion and education that you may justly assume neither is where both are not.

Our Roman Catholic brethren attach more importance than our Protestant friends as a rule do (though many Protestants agree with them) to this question of religious education. They say that with them it is a matter of conscience; they say they must have their children taught by persons of their own faith who can give instructions in their own creed, and they would be very much pleased if we could adopt their views. They say—and who shall contend that there is not much truth in their assertion—they say that you cannot rely upon children receiving proper religious instruction in the home. I fear there is something in that statement; a little more to-day than there was in the good old times. Who shall say that to-day religious instruction receives as much attention in the homes of Canada as it did in the days of our grandparents? We are living in a very rapid age, and I am afraid there is some room for the contention of our Roman Catholic brethren that religion will not be taught to the children of Canada unless the foundation of it is given to them in the schools. We who form the Protestant majority may not be able to agree with them on that point, but it is not because we object to religious instruction; most of us I think, would be pleased that our children should receive some measure of religious instruction in the schools; but the trouble is that you cannot unite the people of any community in an agreement as to what is religion. Religion to many is creed and dogma and there will be differences of creed and dogma, and inasmuch as it is not possible to bring the people of a community to a common line of thought and action on that subject, we who form the Protestant majority say that we see difficulty in teaching any special form of religion in the schools. But while we may not agree with our Roman Catholic brethren on that question, we, I think, can agree that their view of the matter—that is as to the need of religious instruction in the schools—is entitled to our profound respect, and that it is held to-day, not by Roman Catholics only, but to a very large extent also by Protestants.

It is argued by some persons that we cannot make any change in the conditions with respect to these Northwest Territories. I am not referring to anything particularly said in this House. My right hon. friend the First Minister has not declared that it is not within the power of this parliament to make a change. He has not declared that there is any legal or binding obligation resting on the parliament of Canada to re-enact the clauses of the Act of 1875.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the First Minister expressly claimed that it was binding.

Mr. FIELDING. The point of difference is this. The First Minister does not, as I understand it, deny the absolute right and freedom of every member of this parliament to vote on this question as his conscience and intelligence shall direct him. I, at all events, take that view, and that is what I understood to be the view of my right hon. friend; but what my right hon. friend does say is that if you read the whole history of the question, you will come to the conclusion that though, as a matter of law, there may be no binding obligation—though in that sense you may not be able to produce a written contract, signed, sealed and delivered, as my hon. friend the leader of the opposition demanded a few moments ago—there may arise out of the whole history of this matter an obligation which the parliament of Canada should consider, and which many men regard as a moral obligation which this House should fulfil.

Mr. SPROULE. The right hon. the First Minister went much further than to speak of it as a moral obligation, because he used the expression that the constitution provides that we must do it.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think he said that the constitution provides that we must do it. I do not think my right hon. colleague is aware of any method by which any member of this parliament can be compelled to vote in any other way than his intelligence and conscience dictates. But what I understood him to say is that the spirit of the constitution created an obligation, and there he will be supported by very many men on both sides of the House. For the purpose of record let me read the section in the Act of 1875—section 11, chapter 49, Act 1875:

> When and so soon as any system of taxation shall be adopted in any district or portion of the Northwest Territories, the lieutenant governor, by and with the consent of the council or assembly as the case may be, shall pass all necessary ordinances in respect to education; but it shall therein be always provided, that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the Northwest Territories, or any lesser portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name the same may be known, may establish such schools therein as they may think fit, and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor; and further, that the minority of the ratepayers therein, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein, and that, in such latter case, the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assessments of such rates as they may impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

That is the clause in the Act of 1875, and with the change of a few words, which in no way disturbs its substance, that is the clause we find to-day in the Northwest Territories Act. It is curious, in view of the wide discussion and agitation which are taking place to-day, that when this Act of 1875 was passed, there was practically no discussion of it in this House. There was certainly no adverse discussion. It is remarkable that the parliament of Canada passed that clause and put it upon the statute-book by a unanimous vote of the House of Commons. Again I say I do not for a moment contend, and I do not understand that my right hon. friend contended, that, as a matter of constitutional right fixed by the words of the statute, we are obliged to re-enact that clause. I go further. I do not hesitate to say that in my view, at any time since 1875, it was within the power —I do not say the moral right—but undoubtedly within the power of this parliament to repeal the Act of 1875. Therefore, I am not claiming that there is any binding legal obligation, but I do say that we are obliged to look carefully into the circumstances under which that Act was passed; and if we find that at the time it was regarded by its friends and supporters, and parliament generally, as an Act which was passed, not only for the present but the future, that creates a moral obligation which this House may well take into consideration. The Bill was introduced in 1875 and carried with practically no opposition. It is worth while remembering that the government of the late Mr. Mackenzie was then in power. The Bill, as first introduced, did not contain any provision respecting education. Attention was drawn to that omission, and a provision was made a little later. The chief speaker on that occasion was the Hon. Edward Blake—a very eminent member of this parliament, a very able constitutional lawyer, and a gentleman whose Protestantism, I believe, is beyond question. Mr. Blake, speaking on that Bill, said:

> The task which the ministry had set for itself was the most important it was possible to conceive. To found primary institutions under which we hope to see hundreds of thousands, and the more sanguine of us think, millions of men and families settled and flourishing, was one of the noblest undertakings that could be entered upon by any legislative body, and it was no small indication of the power and true position of this Dominion that parliament should be engaged to-day in that important task. He agreed with the hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) that the task was one that required time, consideration and deliberation, and they must take care that no false steps were made in such a work. He did not agree with that right hon. gentleman that the government ought to repeal his errors. The right hon. gentleman had tried the institutions for the Northwest Territories which he now asked the House to frame, and for the same reason as he had given to-day—that it would be better for the Dominion government to keep matters in their own hands and decide what was best for the future. He (Mr. Blake) believed that it was essential to our obtaining a large immigration to the Northwest that we should tell the people beforehand what those rights were to be in the country in which we invited them to settle. . . . . He regarded it as essential, under the circumstances of the country, and in view of the deliberation during the last few days, that a general principle should be laid down in the Bill with respect to public instruction. He did believe that we ought not to introduce into that territory the heartburnings and difficulties with which certain other portions of the Dominion and other countries had been afflicted. It seemed to him, having regard to the fact that, as far as we could expect at present, the general character of that population would be somewhat analogous to the population of Ontario, that there should be some provision in the constitution by which they should have conferred upon them the same rights and privileges in regard to religious instruction as those possessed by the people of the province of Ontario. The principles of local self-government and the settling of the question of public instruction seemed to him ought to be the cardinal principles of the measure.

Is it not evident that at that time, in advancing that view as to the necessity of settling the education question, Mr. Blake had the idea that it should be settled, not for that day only, not as a temporary matter, but settled then and for ever?

Other members spoke at that time. I find that, in this House, as I have stated, there was no objection—the Bill passed without any division. The Bill went to the Senate, and was discussed there by several gentlemen, among others by Hon. Mr. Scott, then as now Secretary of State, who was in charge of the Bill. Whatever he said might fairly be assumed to express the view of the government of the day, the view of Hon. Alexander Mackenzie and his colleagues. Mr. Scott in the course of the discussion said:—

> Any gentleman would have to admit that it was the greatest possible relief to the people of Ontario that this question was settled for them, and was not, as in some of the other provinces, a source of constant discord. He was one of those who maintained that parents had a right to educate their children as they pleased, and that they ought not to be taxed to maintain schools to which they could not conscientiously send their children. Our whole system of government was based upon that sound principle, and how long could we have happiness and peace in this country if we were to abolish that safeguard, which was now recognized in both the large provinces? Would not every gentleman in this chamber gladly see the New Brunswick trouble removed? Now was the proper time to establish in the new territory a principle that ought years ago to have been established in this Dominion.

We may not feel called upon to agree with Mr. Scott as to how widely that principle ought to have been established in former years, but surely we cannot read the remarks he made on behalf of the gov-

ernment of Mr. Mackenzie without reaching the conclusion that what they meant to do was to establish the system of separate schools, not for the moment, not for a short period, but as a part of the government of that country for all future time. Mr. Scott is a lawyer; but I do not present his views as part of a legal argument. I am not presenting a legal argument; I quote these words simply to show that Mr. Scott, representing the government of the day, judged by the language he used, must have contemplated that the clause which they then adopted was intended, even though we might have the power to repeal it, to continue in force for ever in the Northwest Territories. Then I find also that the distinguished leader of the Conservative opposition in the Senate at that time, Sir Alexander Campbell, also discussed the question. Sir Alexander Campbell was a lawyer, and for a time was Minister of Justice. He refers to an amendment which had been removed by Mr. Aikins, to strike out the separate school clause, and this is what he said :

> It would be much to be regretted if the amendment passed. The object of the Bill was to establish and perpetuate in the Northwest Territories the same system as prevailed in Ontario and Quebec, and which had worked so well in the interest of peace and harmony with the different populations of these provinces. He thought the fairer course, and the better one, for all races and creeds, was to adopt the suggestion of the government and enable the people to establish separate schools in the territory, and thus prevent the introduction of evils from which Ontario and Quebec had suffered, but had judiciously rid themselves.

Is it possible to attach to that language any other meaning than that Sir Alexander Campbell desired to settle this troublesome question by adopting the separate school clause then and for all future time? Is it conceivable that he meant : We will settle this question up to a certain day and then we will throw the door open to discord and strife? His language cannot be subject to such interpretation. What could be stronger than these words : 'To establish and perpetuate in the Northwest Territories the same system as prevailed in Ontario and Quebec ?' Not only to establish but to 'perpetuate.' Did that mean a temporary arrangement? Surely, if the English language means anything, Sir Alexander Campbell meant when he spoke that day that the Bill he was supporting, though leader of the opposition, was meant to establish and perpetuate in some way a system of separate schools in the Northwest Territories. Then the Hon. George Brown spoke. Reference has already been made to his part in this debate ; but the words he used may be quoted again. In the course of the discussion he supported the amendment that was moved by Mr. Aikins to strike out the separate school clause and he used these words :

> The moment this Act passed and the Northwest became part of the union, they came under the Union Act and under the provisions with regard to separate schools.

Mr. Brown was not a lawyer. I am not quoting his words as expressing an opinion which is worthy of any consideration as part of a constitutional argument : I am speaking entirely with a view to establishing the intention that existed in the minds of the men who passed the legislation—the government who proposed it and the men in the opposition who supported it. There is one sentence in the speech of Hon. Edward Blake in this House that I would like to repeat :

> He (Mr. Blake) believed that it was essential to our obtaining a large immigration to the Northwest Territories that we should tell the people beforehand what these rights were to be in the country to which they were invited.

I have no doubt, from information that has reached me, that many immigrants have come into the Northwest Territories upon representations that the schools there would be conducted in accordance with their religious views. I believe this to be correct. I may mention a little incident bearing on that point. I had occasion recently to come into official contact with the representative of one of the continental nations. I was discussing with him the question of immigration—we wished to have immigrants come to Canada from his country. In the course of our conversation he said : If you are to get immigrants from our country, this school question that is coming up becomes one of very great importance to us. I have no doubt therefore that it can be shown that some of the immigrants who have come to the Northwest Territories have come—for we have many Roman Catholic settlers in that country—on the faith of representations that their schools were to be conducted in accordance with the views of the Roman Catholic minority.

I find that not only is there the evidence I have referred to, showing the intention at the time this Act was passed, but later on there were further discussions which may be cited in the same direction. I find that some years afterwards, in 1894, there was a discussion in this House with regard to some amendments of the Northwest Act that were proposed. I find that the late Mr. Dalton McCarthy, who desired that the separate school clause should be repealed, who was an opponent of separate schools as hon. gentlemen well remember, in a speech at that time laid down the principle that if you should continue to allow that separate school clause to remain on the statute-book, if you should go on year after year allowing the Northwest people to possess this system of separate schools up to the moment at which they would be brought in as a province, then they would be in a position to come to us and say : It is too late for you to change that

system ; you must now give us a continuation of it.

Mr. McCarthy, of course, was desirous that the system should be changed, but in the meantime he did not shrink from the responsibility of saying that if the parliament of Canada desired to change it, it must act quickly, and not wait until the time arrived for the creation of the provinces. I find the words of Mr. McCarthy in 'Hansard' of 1894, page 6085 :

Now we insist by the clause of the Act of 1875 which has been included in the various consolidations of the legislative powers of the Northwest Territories which have been made from time to time, that they shall have separate schools ; and if we continue insisting that that system shall prevail up to the time we create provinces in the Northwest, then the application of this clause of the first subsection of section 93 of the British North America Act to which I have referred, rivets for all time upon the new provinces the system of separate schools. Create a province there now, enact the usual clauses of the British North America Act, and the result will be that in the new province those who have enjoyed what is spoken of as a right or privilege with respect to denominational schools, would be able to say : The constitution given to this province by the Dominion parliament does not permit any interference with any right or privilege which we enjoyed prior to the time of the creation of this province. That I think is a most important consideration.

Mr. McCarthy, it will be observed, as an opponent of the system of separate schools, took the ground that if the parliament of Canada wished to destroy that system it must not wait until it undertook to create a province. His argument is that if you leave these Northwest people in possession of the separate school system, if you go on year after year permitting it, encouraging it ; if you allow them to pass ordinances in accordance with it, if you have these ordinances sent to Ottawa year after year and you approve of them and allow them to go into operation, then you are confirming the system of separate schools to those provinces ; and when the moment shall arrive that these lands shall pass from the status of territories into the larger status of provinces, it will then be too late for you to come in and say ; we will deprive you of this system of separate schools. Mr. McCarthy and Sir John Thompson had some little discussion, and he (Mr. McCarthy) again emphasized his views on that subject.

I am very glad the right hon gentleman——

Referring to Sir John Thompson.

——has explained it in that way, and perhaps I was wrong in my understanding of his remarks. Of course it is an important declaration from the First Minister.

That was the declaration which Sir John Thompson made, and which was quoted by the leader of the opposition to-day, in which he said that the parliament of Canada would be free to give to the provinces of the Northwest such a constitution as it might see fit. Mr. McCarthy was answering that declaration, and he went on to add :

Now the House will have to use its own judgment on this question. What I say is this : That if this question of separate schools is to remain in its present position until we grant provincial autonomy to any portion of the Northwest, it will be practically impossible, unless there is an enormous change in public opinion, to deny them what every other province that has joined the confederation has been entitled to, what Manitoba was entitled to, and what I submit under the circumstances every province would be entitled to. Now, let me draw attention to the constitution conferred upon Manitoba in that regard. I have not got it under my hand, but it will be found on consulting it that when we conferred autonomy upon the province of Manitoba, we did it by reference to the British North America Act. What we declared was that where not otherwise provided for in the Act, all the provisions of the British North America Act should apply to the province of Manitoba, and I think the very same words were contained in the resolutions which were passed at the time British Columbia and the province of Prince Edward Island came into the union. So that we have got that precedent before us ; that was the promise upon which we admitted Manitoba, and looking at the character of the legislation, I do not think that there can be any doubt that the same rule must apply when we come to admit the provinces to be created out of the Northwest Territories.

My hon. friend, in quoting to-day from Sir John Thompson, almost gave me the impression—he will probably say that he certainly did not so intend—that Sir John Thompson had expressed no opinion favourable to the continuance of separate schools in the Northwest Territories. Sir John Thompson, in answer to Mr. McCarthy, did state that the parliament of Canada could give to the Northwest Territories such a constitution as it might see fit ; but in doing so Sir John Thompson used words which unmistakably show that in his mind that moral obligation would exist. Sir John Thompson said :

What the constitution of the future provinces shall be, in view of the pledges which have been referred to, or in view of any other set of circumstances, will be for parliament to decide when it decides to create those provinces.

Sir John Thompson recognized as a lawyer the power of the parliament of Canada to give to the new provinces such constitution as parliament might see fit, but in doing so he carefully inserted the words :

What the constitution of the future provinces shall be in view of the pledges which have been referred to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Could the hon. gentleman state what were the pledges he referred to ?

Mr. FIELDING. I take it he referred to the general legislation as to separate schools in the Northwest. That is what I take it to mean. Again I quote from Sir John Thompson in the same debate. I will quote a clause which my hon. friend read to-day, but I want to quote it in an enlarged form :

> We claim therefore that the constitutional system which was established with regard to schools and with regard to language in 1875 ought to be maintained for the same reasons as those which dictated its creation, and that this condition of affairs should last, at least, while the affairs of the Territories are under the control of this parliament.

That language seems to imply that the matter might be further considered when they ceased to be territories. Then he goes on to say what I read just previously :

> What the constitution of the future provinces shall be, in view of the pledges which have been referred to, or in view of any other set of circumstances, will be for parliament to decide when it decides to create those provinces. I hope therefore that the House will be careful to-day not to disturb the arrangement so wisely made in 1875, and which is as useful to the Territories now, as it was then.

Now can anybody point out wherein there will be a difference in the educational needs of the Northwest on the 1st day July, 1905, as compared with the conditions on the 30th June in the same year ? You will have passed from the status of a territory to the status of a province, but will that in the slightest degree alter the needs or conditions of the Northwest with respect to education ? If the schools which they have are working happily and satisfactorily on the 30th day of June in this year 1905, what reason will there be for making any change in the legislation on the 1st day of July following ? Aside from the constitutional question, surely we have to admit there is the practical question of the needs of the people of the Northwest Territories, and in that respect they will not be different on the morning of the 1st day of July from their needs on the morning or the 30th day of June. A clause of that kind, Sir John Thompson said, is as useful to the Territories to-day as it was in 1875, and surely the same words may be repeated and we may say that this clause and the conditions which the clause has created will be just as useful to the people of the Northwest Territories on the 1st day of July as they will be on the 30th day of June.

Now, I have not been discussing the constitutional question as my hon. friend will observe. I have been discussing entirely what I may call the practical side of the question, and I do that with the firm conviction that most of the people of this country will not bother themselves very much about this constitutional question but they will want to get at the actual facts of this very important subject. We are proposing by this legislation to confirm certain Acts of the Northwest Territories. We are proposing to continue certain legislation, to continue for a further time and for ever the school system which now exists. We are met with the statement that the position of the Liberal party in that respect is different to-day from the position which it held in the case of Manitoba. We have heard that from the hon. leader of the opposition to-day. I think it will have to be admitted, after a careful examination of the situation, that the conditions in respect to the Northwest Territories are widely and entirely different from the conditions that existed in connection with the proposed legislation for the province of Manitoba. It was proposed by the Remedial Bill of 1896 to override an Act of the legislature of Manitoba, passed by the voice of the people of that province, and, as subsequently was maintained, entirely within the legislative authority of that province. We do not propose to override any Act of any legislature. What we propose to-day is to confirm and continue for all future time a measure which the free voice of the Northwest legislature has placed upon the statute-book of the Territories. So that, on that point, there is a wide difference between the condition of affairs in respect to Manitoba and the condition of affairs in respect to the Northwest Territories. Then again it was said and with some justice that an effort was made to coerce the province of Manitoba, because it was proposed to pass an Act against which the government of Manitoba entered a solemn protest. There is no protest from the government of the Northwest Territories against this measure. I make that statement advisedly. The premier of the Northwest Territories, an estimable gentleman who has been taking part in this discussion, as properly he should, has written a letter to the Prime Minister of Canada, but I am informed and believe that that letter expresses his individual opinion and it is not authorized by the government of the Northwest Territories. So, in the case of Manitoba I repeat that the proposition was to do something against which the government of Manitoba protested. In this case we are doing something against which the government of the Northwest Territories have entered no protest whatever. Then, there is a further consideration. I suppose the people in the Northwest Territories have the best right to speak through their acknowledged representatives. I have no right to say what will be the views expressed by my hon. friends from the Northwest Territories on the other side of the House, but it is understood—I do not state it from direct communication with my hon. friends from the Northwest Territories—but it is understood and believed that this legislation is accepted and will be supported by seven out of ten members from the Northwest. Well, if there is no great matter of

principle involved, and I hope to be able to show in the few remarks with which I propose to detain the House before I close that there is no great matter of principle involved in this measure, and if seven out of ten representatives from the Northwest Territories are satisfied that this is a good law for the people, who shall dare to say that we are coercing the people of the Northwest Territories ? I would say, Sir, that any argument which is designed to prove that we are dealing in this matter in the way of coercion is entirely unjustifiable. What is this law which we are going to confirm and to continue in the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan ? We are told that this provides for a system of separate schools. Well, a system of separate schools may mean one thing in one quarter and another thing in another quarter. It is, in a measure, a system of separate schools. That expression in the minds of many people means a great deal. I do not think I am mistaken when I say that in the minds of a great many Protestant people in the country when you talk about separate schools they immediately understand that you are talking about schools that come under the control of some religious body, and particularly schools which come under the control of the Roman Catholic church. That is the common idea of separate schools in many quarters. Whatever may be said as respects other countries, or other provinces, it would be utterly mistaken to say that we are giving to the Northwest Provinces separate schools in that sense of the words. I submit to this House that the system of schools which we have to-day in the Northwest Territories is a national school system, and if it has all the elements of a national school system then I say there is no principle involved in this discussion which would justify us in having a quarrel over it. What is this system ? One would suppose from the frequent references that are made to it that it is some iniquitous system, something which if continued would prejudice the interests of the people in these Territories for all time to come. The system of schools which prevails to-day in the Northwest Territories exists by virtue of chapters 29, 30 and 31 of the ordinances of the Northwest Territories. So far as the principle of separate schools is concerned, of course, that principle was to be found in the Act of 1875 and the ordinances adapted themselves to it. But if you read these three ordinances of the Northwest Territories you will rise from the perusal of them with the conviction that in that country they have a system of national schools which may well challenge the admiration of the people in other portions of this country. What then are the essential elements of national schools ? I take it for granted that if you have a school which is established by the public authorities, if the management of the school derives all its authority and privileges from a regulation of the government of the state, if you have a system of schools under which the proper authorities of the state, or the province, or territory as the case may be, themselves specify the school books, establish the course of study, provide for the inspection of the schools and for the distribution of the money, if you have all those elements, then, I say you have a system of state-created, state-managed and state-supported public schools. Every one of these conditions exists to-day in the public school system of the Northwest Territories. A member of the government of the Territories becomes commissioner of education and the powers of the commissioner are set forth in detail. I shall only read the clause under the heading of 'Regulations of the Department.' These regulations are to be made by the commissioner himself, a member of the government, with the approval of the Governor in Council. Section 6 of chapter 29 says :

> The commissioner, with the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, shall have power :
>
> 1. To make regulations of the department—
>
> (a) For the classification, organization, government, examination and inspection of all schools hereinbefore mentioned ;
>
> (b) For the construction, furnishing and care of school buildings and the arrangement of school premises ;
>
> (c) For the examination, licensing and grading of teachers and for the examination of persons who may desire to enter professions or who may wish certificates of having completed courses of study in any school ;
>
> (d) For a teachers' reading course and teachers' institutes and conventions ;
>
> 2. To authorize text and reference books for the use of the pupils and teachers in all schools hereinbefore mentioned as well as such maps, globes, charts and other apparatus or equipment as may be required for giving proper instruction in such schools ;
>
> 3. To prepare a list of books suitable for school libraries and to make regulations for the management of such libraries.
>
> 4. To make due provision for the training of teachers.

What is there, Sir, in all this to which anybody can take exception ? These details constitute the essential elements of a national school system. That system prevails to-day in the Northwest Territories, and that system we propose to continue by the legislation which we have presented in this House. The difference between a minority school and a majority school in the Northwest Territories is so exceedingly small that he who would attempt to make a definition of it would find himself in difficulty. The difference is with respect to one half hour's instruction in religious matters at the close of the school. The school laws of the Northwest Territories provide for religious instruction, not as a matter of obligation ; they empower the trustees to authorize religious instruction within cer-

tain limits. That authority for religious instruction is not confined to separate schools; it applies to all schools in the Territories. It is provided that wherever the trustees so wish, wherever the local conditions permit, there shall be religious instruction in all schools in the Northwest Territories, not in the minority schools only. Then there is a further provision that all schools may be opened with the reciting of the Lord's Prayer. Does anybody object to that? I hope not; I trust that in any case where the trustees of a school authorized that, it is not objectionable. But then there is this half hour of religious education. From the hour at which these schools open in the morning up to half-past three in the afternoon they are absolutely alike; there is no difference; the teachers have the same duties, the same qualifications; the same examinations, the same course of study, the same books are prescribed by the government, the regulations are made by the government, the inspector is appointed by the government. I repeat that from the hour of opening in the morning up to half-past three in the afternoon there is no shade of difference in all these schools in the Northwest Territories. So it has come to this, that we have a shade of difference as respects the half hour of religious instruction, from 3.30 to 4 o'clock. I submit, Mr. Speaker, to this House that on a question like this that half hour of religious instruction is not and should not be a cause of conflict. Where the majority of the people and the trustees are of the Protestant faith, that half hour of religious instruction will, of course, take the form of the faith of the majority; it will be Protestant religious instruction. Where the majority of the people and the trustees are Roman Catholics, that half hour of religious instruction will follow the faith of the Roman Catholic majority. In each of these cases the minority, if they wish, may have a separate school. I am firmly persuaded that the difference is so slight that if we reach a wise decision now, if we refrain from fanning the flame of political passion—I withdraw that word political, I am not discussing this from a party standpoint, and I did not intend to use that word, and I withdraw it—if we refrain from doing or saying anything which can fan the flame of religious excitement in the Northwest Territories now, my honest conviction is that the separate schools will diminish, and the free common public schools will increase. I am persuaded that the difference is so small that the mass of the people in the Northwest Territories will hardly find it to their advantage to keep it up except in a few instances. I am reminded of one point: I had forgotten to state that even with respect to that half hour, it is not a matter of obligation, but if the parents of any child disapprove of that religious instruction for that half hour, the child may withdraw. There is, therefore, liberty of conscience in the highest degree. I do not hesitate to say, Protestant that I am, that I do not think that half hour of religious instruction given by a Roman Catholic teacher will hurt the children; I think that half hour of instruction given by a Catholic teacher to Catholic children—I think that we may reasonably feel that if there is enough of it to have any influence on the life of the child, it will make a boy a better citizen, a better Canadian. I want the House to consider seriously, I submit the proposition again, that if it be true as I say, and I believe I am correct beyond the power of contradiction, that from the moment that the school opens in the morning up to half-past three in the afternoon there is no difference between a separate school and a free national school, and if the only point of difference between them is that half hour of religious instruction, is there enough in it to quarrel about, and to have public meetings and agitation throughout the length and breadth of this land? I believe that the great mass of the people to-day who are joining in petitions and holding meetings have not had time to understand this question. I believe that they have an erroneous view as to what the condition in the Northwest Territories is and as to what is the condition which we propose to perpetuate. When they discover, as they will, in the light of the debate which will take place in this House now and in the next few days, when the people of Canada shall learn that we have in the west to-day a system which is practically a national school system, and that the only point of difference between us is with respect to that small matter of a half hour of religious instruction, I think the great mass of the Protestant people of Canada will say that they regret that there has been any agitation on the subject.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) referred to-day to the conditions of education in the province of Nova Scotia. We are proud to-day, Sir, of the national school system in that province. We rejoice that from time to time we hear our public men of all parties and all creeds cite the province of Nova Scotia as an example of toleration and good will. The happy conditions which exist in that province have many a time been referred to by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, who has held the people of Nova Scotia up as examples of moderation and toleration. We have a free common national system of education in the province of Nova Scotia. The principle of that system is, as I stated at an earlier stage of my speech: Thou shalt not teach any 'ism' but thou shalt teach by precept and example, the Christian virtues. This is the essential point, and happily we have got along very well. But do not make any mistake. Let no man imagine that that happy condition has been brought about without conciliation and compromise. We have no separate schools by law in Nova Scotia, but I say that we could not

have brought about that happy condition if we had not been disposed to meet our Roman Catholic brethren in a generous spirit, with due regard to their religious convictions. There is no separate school system by law in the province of Nova Scotia, but I tell this House to-night that the principle of separate schools is more emphatically recognized in the province of Nova Scotia than it is to-day in the Northwest Territories.

Come with me down to the fair city of Halifax and what will you find ? The Roman Catholic Archbishop builds the school and leases it to the school trustees. What would they say to that in the Northwest ? The Roman Catholic authorities receive consideration and this is one of the means whereby we bring about that happy condition which obtains down there. The sister of charity teaches in our schools wearing the garb of her order, and many of the sisters are among the best teachers in our province. There are schools in the city of Halifax which will be pointed out to you as Roman Catholic schools, and so they are. The Prime Minister once when in Halifax visited one of these schools and he alluded to it as a separate school, and one of the sisters interrupted him and said : no, Sir, it is a public school of the province of Nova Scotia. And so it was, but it was a school which was recognized as a Roman Catholic school and it was attended only by Roman Catholic pupils, and it was taught by the Roman Catholic sister of charity wearing the garb of her order and the cross upon her breast. We have made concessions to our Roman Catholic brethren in the province of Nova Scotia. Why, if a vacancy occurs in the teaching staff of one of the Catholic schools of Halifax, the Protestant commissioners have no vote in the selection of a successor ; the Catholic Commissioners only have the right to vote. Such is the system in the city of Halifax, and substantially the same system exists in many of the larger communities in the province, because it is only in a large community that this condition can be brought about. I am less familiar with the conditions in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, but I think I am right in saying that they are substantially the same.

Mr. EMMERSON. The same in New Brunswick.

Mr. FIELDING. While we have no separate schools established by law, we have in practice in all these provinces separate schools, and I hesitate not to make the statement that in my own province of Nova Scotia the principle of separate schools is recognized more emphatically than it is recognized in the Northwest Territories to-day. I would have this parliament bear in mind that if we have that happy condition of things in that fair province, if we can be quoted from time to time as models of good citizenship and toleration and moderation, it is not because we have allowed principles to be carried to dangerous extremes, but it is because we have recognized the rights and feelings and even the prejudices of our Roman Catholic brethren. What interest has suffered ? There was a little friction years ago, but there is none to-day. The sensible people of Nova Scotia have made up their minds that this is a matter in which we can please our Roman Catholic brethren without hurting ourselves, and when we can do that why should we not make an effort to do it? I repeat then, that the happy condition in the province of Nova Scotia which is so often referred to —which I myself have again and again spoken of with pride—has been brought about by paying due regard of the rights, and the feelings of the Roman Catholic minority.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the minister think that the people of the Northwest Territories would be less liberal or less generous than the people of Nova Scotia ?

Mr. FIELDING. Perhaps they would not, but if forty-one per cent of the people of Canada think that there is a danger, we might well see if some compromise, some arrangement could not be made. We have to-day before us perhaps the most important measures that have ever engaged the attention of the parliament of Canada. They are measures which are wide-reaching in their effect. Whether we have regard to the interest which is manfested by the people throughout the country to-day or whether we have regard to the future welfare of this Dominion which all, irrespective of party, are so anxious to advance, we may feel, I am sure, that these are great measures, and that we should approach them with the utmost care, with the utmost deliberation, with a desire to find a happy settlement of any differences that may arise. Let us not conceal from ourselves certain facts ; let us be frank with one another. Let us say that the gravity of this situation is even more serious than many think. If my right hon. friend the Prime Minister is to retire from office, as he would be obliged to do, if this Bill were defeated, what then ? Under ordinary circumstances the retirement of a minister or the retirement of a government means very little after all. The public adapt themselves to new conditions ; one government goes out and another comes in. Party interest may suffer. But that is not the situation to-day. There are interests involved in this question which far outweigh any mere party consideration. What matters it if one government should go out and another come in ? But think for a moment of what would happen under the present state of affairs. Some one will say : what matter if the Prime Minister goes out, somebody else will come in. Sir, no government could be formed under such circumstances

which would command the confidence of this parliament. I make that statement after due deliberation. But, somebody will say: What of that; if you Liberals cannot form a government we Conservatives will take charge. Will you? I doubt it. I have no right to speak for my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, but if I know him at all I venture to remark that he would shrink from the formation of a government in which he would be obliged to draw religious lines. As a high-minded man, with due regard for the future of his country, he would shrink from the formation of a government under which he would be obliged to exclude from office and vote and power forty-one per cent of the people of this Dominion. The leader of the opposition has acknowledged to-day that there is no union among his party on that question. He chaffed the Prime Minister for a moment; he said this question was not making for the unity of the goverment. May I venture to suggest that it is not making for the unity of the opposition? The leader of the opposition acknowledged to-day—it was right that he should acknowledge it—that he and some of the men with whom he sits were not able to see eye to eye. He warned us that he spoke to-day for himself only and that he did not presume to speak in the name of his party. What does that show us? Does it not prove that if my right hon. friend shall be obliged to retire from office on this question, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition would shrink from the formation of a government under such conditions? The matter is too grave to permit of its being treated lightly for a single moment, but I venture to say that it will be impossible to repress a smile on both sides of the House when I suggest the picture that would be presented of my hon. friends from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), and Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) sitting down to prepare a resolution with respect to separate schools.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We could not make a much worse mess of it than the government has up to the present.

Mr. FIELDING. I think my hon. friend is entirely wrong. He will find, when the vote is taken, that we have a united government and a united party, and he will find, according to his own confession, that he will not have a united party supporting him. My hon. friend made merry at our differences a few days ago, but I suspect he has been having a few bad quarters of an hour himself. Let us not, in our momentary good nature, fail to see the gravity of the situation presented to the House. I say deliberately—and every hon. gentleman who listens to me knows it—that if this Bill be not passed, if we should be unable to carry a measure on this subject, then my right hon. friend will be obliged to retire and no other government can be formed which will command the confidence of this parliament.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is that the reason why the Finance Minister is back into line?

Mr. FIELDING. The only way a government could be formed by hon. gentlemen opposite would be by the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) coming forward to sit cheek by jowl with the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) as an advocate for separate schools, and I do not think that my hon. friends would care for the combination. I am speaking in all seriousness. This is no matter for levity. I repeat that there is in a certain sense a crisis. There is no party crisis, but there is a crisis with regard to the administration of public business in Canada by any government and any party. If my right hon. friend should retire on an issue like this, then the only thing that could possibly happen, if my hon. friend the leader of the opposition should agree to form a government at such a time, would be that he must form a Protestant government and he must have a general election.

An hon. MEMBER. Shame.

Mr. FIELDING. Who says shame?

Mr. OSLER. This is the first time that the religious question has been introduced.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; sit down.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think that the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) has paid me the compliment of trying to understand what I was presenting to the House. Again I repeat—and I want to guard against any misapprehension, I want to give the hon. gentleman who said 'shame' an opportunity to say it again, because I want to state the situation as it actually exists. I say this is becoming a religious question. Who denies it? My hon. friend the leader of the opposition said as much to-day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I beg my hon. friend's pardon, I said nothing of the kind. If so understood, I desire to disclaim any such intention. I argued this question, as my right hon. friend the First Minister did in the first instance, on the constitutional ground because in his remarks to this House, both on the 21st February and again to-day, he put the question solely on that ground.

Mr. FIELDING. The point is not important. I understood my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, to have spoken, in the course of his speech to-day, of the religious differences which unhappily would arise in this matter. I think that will be found somewhere in 'Hansard'; but it is

not important, and if he says he made no allusion of the kind, I withdraw the remark. But I say that it is in the minds of a large portion of the people of Canada a religious question. I take the responsibility of saying—and every man opposite knows it—that this question to-day is largely shaping itself as a religious question. We have on the one side the Roman Catholic body, largely united, and on the other side a large portion of the Protestant body who are agitating against this Bill on what may be called religious lines. I am not discussing their motive or purpose, but the line of separation is religion, and no one can contest that. I say that inevitably if the right hon. the First Minister had to retire from office on this question and my hon. friend the leader of the opposition were called on to form a government to settle this school question in the Northwest, he could not unite the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). There is nothing wrong in saying that. We all know that these gentlemen have their differences on this question and could not agree. I say that the government then would have to be formed on religious lines, and that would be the greatest calamity that could occur to the Dominion of Canada. Surely in the presence of such a condition of things, we would all do well to see if it be not possible to find some solution of this great question. This is a time of great promise for our country. Canada united, happy and harmonious, will present a picture which will command the admiration and the confidence of the civilized world. Canada, in that happy condition, may hope to receive immigrants, may hope to move forward with even more rapid strides on that splendid march of progress and prosperity with which she has entered the twentieth century. We have had great progress in the Northwest, but after all it is but the beginning of better and greater things.

> We hear the tread of pioneers,
> Of nations yet to be;
> The first low wash of waves when soon
> Shall roll a human sea.

Let it be our happy privilege in this parliament to do all that we can to continue that picture of the condition of Canada. Let us be careful, lest by a mistaken step to-day, another picture may have to be presented, showing our people divided along religious lines, our country riven and distracted by religious strife. Canada then would no longer present that happy picture; the tide of immigration would be turned back, capital would take alarm, business men would lose confidence, we would no longer be able to enjoy the prosperity we are now enjoying, nor could we reasonably hope for that magnificent future which to-day opens to our vision. Let us realize the danger of religious strife in this matter. Let us try to avoid it. Let us have peace in Canada if possible—not an ignoble peace, not peace at any price, but peace with honour; peace on the terms of this honourable compromise which meets the religious prejudices, as some see fit to call them, which meets the religious convictions of two and a quarter millions of our people, and yet at the same time secures to the people of the Northwest Territories now and for ever every essential element of a system of national schools—peace on the terms of this modified Bill which we submit to the House with the sincere conviction that we offer a measure which high minded and patriotic men may honourably accept, regardless of party, race, class or creed.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, it is now within a few minutes of twelve o'clock, and we have put in a good faithful day's work. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Prime Minister will observe by referring to the remarks which I made on the first reading of this Bill, that certain information was asked for which, he was good enough to say, would be brought down at the earliest possible moment and put in such form as would make it available for the use of the members of the House in the discussion of this Bill on the second reading and in committee. Some portion of it I believe, has been brought down, but only a small portion. May I be permitted to direct the attention of the right hon. gentleman to the importance of having this request complied with at the earliest possible moment, for we are now in the midst of a discussion on the second reading, and, if the information is to be of any value, it must be available at the earliest possible moment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L Borden) tell me to what information he particularly refers?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the Prime Minister will refer to pages 1464 and 1465 of the revised 'Hansard'——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am familiar with that, and I gave orders that that information should be prepared.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then, it is in progress?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly because special instructions were given——

Mr. FOSTER. 'In progress' will not do us much good while we are right in the middle of the debate.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand from the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) that he has ordered everything available to be brought down. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) has in mind anything particular, and if he will tell me either to-night or to-morrow, I will try to have it ready.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will examine the papers that have been brought down and will communicate with the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON. I would remind the Prime Minister of a circular, a manuscript copy of which I have, but which I have not found among the papers. It is dated Regina, 30th of September, 1893, and is signed by Thomas Brown, Secretary of the Council of Public Instruction. I would like to know if it can be found printed among the ordinances or Orders in Councils of the Northwest Territories? I shall be glad to place this manuscript copy in the hands of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) that, if possible, a printed copy may be found and brought down.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12 o'clock, midnight.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 23, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

TRANSCONTINENTAL SURVEYS.

Mr. SLOAN asked:

1. Has the government any information that the Grand Trunk Pacific has completed the necessary surveys, or any portion thereof, for the building of the new Transcontinental line in British Columbia?

2. If so, is it the intention of the government to urge the early construction of this section of the Grand Trunk Pacific?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). In reply to the hon. gentleman's first question, there appears to be no information on the subject in the department.

As respects the second part of the question, it is the intention of the government to urge the early construction of this as well as of other sections of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

FRUITS MARKS ACT CONVICTIONS.

Mr. GUNN asked:

How many convictions have been made under the Fruit Marks Act to date?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER. (Minister of Agriculture). Ninety-six, upon information laid by the staff of the fruit division of the department.

In addition to these, there have been convictions upon information laid by others, but the department is not aware of the number, as the cases have not been reported. The department has heard of three such cases.

CIRCULATION OF AMERICAN CURRENCY.

Mr. BICKERDIKE asked:

1. Is the government aware that a very large amount of American currency is at present in circulation at par in Canada?

2. Is it within the knowledge of the government that in most cases Canadian currency is refused in the United States, and when accepted, only taken at a very heavy discount?

3. Is it the intention of the government to introduce a measure the present session for the purpose of preventing the circulation of United States coin in the Dominion?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance):

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. It is not the intention of the government to introduce any measure to prohibit the circulation of American coin, but we anticipate that we will be able to make such regulations as will largely displace that coin.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 69) to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta, and the amendment of Mr. R. L. Borden thereto.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, in continuing the discussion on this most important question, I do not propose to endeavour to enlighten the House upon any legal points involved in it, beyond a passing reference to some views of the British North America Act as they appear to me and their relation to the Bill now before us. Before commencing the discussion of the subject proper, I would like to refer to some remarks made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in closing the debate last evening. His speech sounded to me very much like a threat or a doleful foreboding, and it occurred to me that it was delivered for the purpose of holding his own followers together rather than of foreshadowing what might be the result in the event of this Bill being defeated. He used

the following language, and he referred to it twice :

I say deliberately—and every hon. gentleman who listens to me knows it—that if this Bill be not passed, if we should be unable to carry a measure on this subject, then my right hon. friend will be obliged to retire and no other government can be formed which will command the confidence of parliament.

All I can say is that he has a very poor opinion of the people of Canada, that he has not that confidence in the wisdom and sense, good judgment and forbearance, generosity and enlightenment of the Canadian people that, as a Canadian, he should have.

Mr. FIELDING. Will my hon. friend permit me to insert in the quotation the words 'this parliament'? I was alluding to what might be done with the present parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. 'This parliament.' Parliaments are usually the result of appealing to the country and the wisdom of the people, and I take it that the good sense, and the good judgment, and the wisdom of the people of Canada are quite equal to the task of electing another parliament. I would not so much discredit the intelligence and the right aims of either the Roman Catholics or the French of this country as to insinuate that they would not be equal to the task of assisting to elect a parliament. Parliaments come and parliaments go, and we have never yet been confronted with that situation in Canada, and I am quite sure we are not likely to in the near future. The hon. minister said :

This is a religious question.

Well I can tell him that he was the first one in this House who said so. We thought it was a provincial autonomy Bill, that had to do with the establishment of two provinces in the Northwest, out of property that belongs to us, that it was a Bill for the purpose of giving them power to govern themselves, to legislate with regard to their own ends, to do the work which every province in the confederation that has provincial autonomy is doing at the present time. But the right hon. gentleman says it has turned into a religious question. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that be the case, who is responsible ? Is it this side of the House ? Did we introduce the element which would arouse any feeling along religious or sectarian or national lines ? Not by any means. We were silent spectators at the introduction of that Bill, which contains the elements that have provoked the acrimonious feeling existing in some parts of the country to-day. It is, I submit, the right hon. gentleman himself who availed himself of the earliest opportunity—I was going to say the improper opportunity—of making, upon the introduction of this Bill, a very impassioned speech along those lines. His speech on that occasion was something very unusual, something very improper, something in my judgment quite uncalled for ; for while it is competent and proper for the member who introduces a Bill to explain its provisions, he is expected to confine himself to that object and explain them as briefly as possible. But instead of an explanation, we had an exordium on other lines. We had raked up the condition of things before confederation. The right hon. gentleman conjured up again recollections of the various fights on religious issues that formerly prevailed between Upper and Lower Canada, when these two provinces were united. All these bitter recollections were pressed into service for the purpose of impressing on this House the wisdom and the necessity of passing this Bill. If there be acrimonious feeling excited in the country to-day, who is responsible ? Certainly not the opposition but the government itself led by the right hon. gentleman, whose appeal in favour of the obnoxious features of the Bill was endorsed by the hon. the Finance Minister. These are the men who are responsible. It is they who have created the feeling of distrust which exists to-day. The right hon. gentleman declared that the press which supports the opposition has spared no effort to inflame the public mind on a very delicate subject. But if there were any such attempt, was it confined to the Conservative press ? If there were any efforts to inflame the public mind, is that to be traced to the Conservative press alone ? No, Sir, the criticisms of the press throughout the country were not confined to the newspapers supporting any political party. We had these criticisms from religious papers, independent papers, and political papers on both sides. And they all were agreed in the main that the government is doing an improper thing, something calculated to create a strong feeling of aversion throughout the country against the measure and the government itself. Is not that a fact, Mr. Speaker ? Need I point to the very logical, moderate and fair criticisms of the 'Globe'—the organ above all others which ought to voice the sentiments of the present government—and criticisms which, I humbly submit, would do credit to any newspaper in Canada. What is the press of the country doing to-day ? The organs of public opinion are, as a mirror, reflecting public sentiment, calling on the government to take warning, calling on parliament to take warning, and not do to-day what afterwards they may not be able to undo. Is the press to blame because it contains denunciations of the offensive features of this measure ? Is not the press in this respect exercising a public duty, and can it be charged with inflaming public passion and arousing sectarian strife because it calls attention to the dangers of this Bill ? Not at all. It is not the press of the country but the right hon. gentleman and his friends who must be held responsible for the present conditions.

The right hon. gentleman appealed to his record dealing with these troublesome questions, and pleaded that he had given sufficient evidence of his desire to conciliate and treat the various elements and creeds in this country upon lines that are broad, national and humane. He referred to his refusal to interfere in the New Brunswick agitation with regard to separate schools and gave that as an evidence of the spirit of fairness and toleration which actuates him. In the first speech he made on this measure he also referred to that matter, and drew attention to the fact that he had then advocated non-interference with the rights of the province. Well, it struck me at the time that if that be the record of the right hon. gentleman, it is a great pity he did not embody the spirit which then actuated him into the measure now before parliament, because, if I understand the English language, this measure is above all things an interference with provincial rights. The right hon. gentleman told us that he refused to interfere in the agitation over the Jesuits Estate Bill because it was the undoubted right of the province to pass that Bill. Let me say that the Jesuits Estate Bill was my first experience in parliamentary life with one of these vexed questions, and I agreed with the right hon. the First Minister that as it was dealing with lands belonging to the province, which in my judgment the province had a perfect right to sell and do what it liked with the proceeds, consequently we as a federal parliament had no right to interfere. I held that it was a Bill dealing with education, which under the British North America Act came within the exclusive right of the province ; and therefore if the province chooses to sell those lands and use the proceeds for educational purposes, or throw them into the sea, we had no right to interfere. Therefore although the question excited a great deal of feeling in my section of the country, I stood by that principle as firmly as I stand by it to-day, and I did it believing that the only guarantee for the successful working out of confederation lay in giving the provinces all the rights conferred on them by the constitution, and only exercising here those rights which belong to the federal parliament. Then we had the right hon. gentleman boasting that on the question of the Manitoba school education he had stood by provincial rights and endeavoured by conciliatory methods to adjust the differences between the two classes of people in that province and finally succeeded. Well, Mr. Speaker, I was with the First Minister on that question as well. I took the same grounds that I did on the Jesuits Estate question, namely, that it was undoubtedly the right of the province to deal with education, and I opposed any proposal to coerce or force Manitoba at that time. Was I right then ? I submit that I was consistent in the stand I took upon those two questions, which were at the very antipodes of each other, so far as popularity in my riding was concerned. Am I then to be blamed if I take the same ground to-day ? Am I to be blamed if I take my stand to-day on the question of provincial rights in the matter before the House as firmly as I did on the Jesuits Estate Bill and the Remedial Bill, which sought to compel the province of Manitoba to do what I thought she had a perfect right to refuse to do ? Then, I say, I am consistent with my record in every particular. But the First Minister is not consistent with his record. On other occasions he stood by provincial rights ; to-day he is abandoning the principle of provincial rights and forcing upon these unwilling provinces laws which compel them to do what the constitution never intended they should be compelled to do. The right hon. gentleman defends his conduct by saying : I am doing this in obedience to the constitution. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) said last night that he did not understand the Prime Minister to say that he was compelled by the constitution to take the course he does. But I have here the Prime Minister's very words :

> I stand again, as I believe, upon the rock of the constitution of Canada when I say that this parliament should, according to that constitution, give to the minority in the new provinces the same rights and privileges that are given to the minorities in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario.

This is as plain a declaration as could be made that he is obliged by the constitution to do what he is doing—that he must take the course he does or otherwise he will not be doing right. I leave the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance to settle this difference between themselves. But I take the declaration of the Prime Minister. I understand his reasoning to be that, as section 93 of the British North America Act provides that certain rights enjoyed before confederation must be continued after coming into the union, he feels compelled to take the course he does. He says, if I understand him correctly. The Northwest Territories have a form of government, and under that form they have established separate schools ; and, now that we are establishing the provinces by these Autonomy Bills, we must provide for the perpetuation of the separate school privilege.

Now section 93 provides :

> In and for each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education.

But the section further provides :

> Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the union.

So, the Prime Minister argues that, because they have denominational schools by law in the Northwest Territories at this

particular time, which he calls—improperly I think—the union, he is obliged under the constitution to provide in the Bills now before us for the continuation of the system of separate schools. Now, my understanding of the constitution is that subsections 2 and 3 of clause 93 of the British North America Act was intended to apply to provinces that had provincial autonomy before entering the union. Even at the time of confederation there were provinces, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, which did not then enter the union, but which have entered since. Had either of these had a system of separate schools before entering the union, these subsections of clause 93 would apply, as it applied also to Ontario and Quebec. But these subsections do not apply in the case before us at all. Because, these provinces are being carved out of territory that is already in the union, and never had provincial autonomy, but has had only such legislative authority as was delegated by this parliament under laws made in 1875 and later. The contention of the First Minister, as I have said, is that because they have separate schools we must perpetuate that system. But is that the contention of the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) as well ?

Mr. FIELDING. I thought I had dealt with that point in my remarks last night. I know of no method whereby the word 'must' can be applied to the action of any member of this parliament. But I said I thought that the trend of the constitution created conditions which amounted to a moral case of a very strong character in that direction.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the minister further to say that this is all based on a moral claim.

Mr. FIELDING. I have said again and again that my opinion was—if a layman may presume to have an opinion in these matters—that there is not and cannot be a legally binding obligation upon this parliament, but that every member of this parliament must vote according to the dictates of his judgment and his conscience.

Mr. SPROULE. I am speaking not with reference to the votes, but with reference to the provisions of the Bill. I would suggest that the Minister of Finance and the First Minister might hold a conference and agree, in order that they may do as they should do, speak on behalf of a united cabinet——

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will try to settle the differences among his own friends, I think he will have ample employment.

Mr. SPROULE. It is my duty to deal with a government measure and with the government behind that measure, and with the principles of constitutional government, one of which is that a cabinet shall not be divided in presenting a measure to the House. Yet these hon. gentlemen are divided to-day. I need not ask the Minister of Finance how long he has taken to analyze this Bill and reach the conclusion he has reached? We were told he did not see in the light in which he now sees it until a short time ago. He may claim to be excused on that ground for not having a very definite knowledge of the measure. But the father of the Bill says that the constitution compels him to do what he now proposes. Now, to satisfy myself I thought I would apply to an authority whose opinion would be respected in this House, one who I have heard the right hon. Prime Minister and other hon. members on the other side quote approvingly more than once. I say this because the contention was set up that on account of separate schools being there to-day, we were not free, in giving the provinces provincial autonomy, to ignore those schools and allow the provinces to legislate according to their own judgment. I submitted the question to Mr. Christopher Robinson, K.C., who is well known I think, as high a constitutional lawyer as can be found in this country. I submitted several questions which were embraced in the speech of the First Minister, and I wish to read his opinion, because it is in my judgment in accord with the opinion announced by the leader of the opposition yesterday, and buttressed by many citations of constitutional authorities. Mr. Robinson says :

> The right of the Dominion parliament to impose restrictions upon the provinces about to be formed in dealing with the subject of education and separate schools, is, I think, not beyond question.

They have the right to do it.

> This would require more consideration than I have been able yet to give to it, and must ultimately be settled by judicial decision.

Remember, it is not the question whether we have any power to interfere with the province at all, it is a question of whether this parliament must do it, not whether we have power to do it.

> I am asked, however, whether parliament is constitutionally bound——

The First Minister says : I am constitutionally bound.

> I am asked whether parliament is constitutionally bound to impose any such restriction, or whether it exists otherwise, and I am of opinion in the negative.

Now I am not directing this to the Minister of Finance, because he does not hold that opinion, but I am directing it to his premier who does hold it, with a view to getting the different members of the cabinet in accord.

It must be borne in mind that I am concerned only with the question of legal obligation. What the parliament ought to do or should do in the exercise of any power which they possess, is not within the province of counsel.

He does not pretend to give advice on that point.

Such a restriction, I apprehend, must exist or may be imposed, if at all, under the provisions of section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, and on the ground of their application to the provinces now to be formed. If that section applies——

He seems to be in doubt.

If that section applies, it would seem to require no enactment of our parliament to give it effect——

Now is that not the contention of the leader of the opposition ? If that power exists it does not require any enactment to give it effect.

——and if not, no such enactment, so far as I am aware, is otherwise made necessary. Upon the whole I am of opinion that section 93 does appear to me to be intended for, and confined to, the then province, and to the union formed in 1867.

Then if it does not apply, the responsibility rests with the right hon. gentleman and his friends forcing an educational system on the people out there that they think should not be forced upon them. If its provisions are confined to the then provinces and to the union formed in 1867, the authority given them in the Act of 1875, and under which by their ordinances they have established separate schools, could not apply at all, because that was not the date of the union. The date of the union was antecedent, in 1867, according to Mr. Robinson's judgment; therefore there was no power in the land to give separate schools, and they had no separate schools then.

There is not in any part of the Northwest Territories as a province any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools possessed by any class of persons, created by the province, or existing at such union ; and a right subsequently established by the Dominion in the part now about to be made a province, does not appear to me to come within the enactment.

Is that straight enough ? 'It does not come within the enactment. But the whole argument of the First Minister was : I am doing something because I am compelled to do it, if he had said : I am doing it because there is some kind of moral obligation resting upon me,—he might have been justified by his conscience. But he says : I am doing it because constitutionally I must do it, there is no other alternative, it is forced upon me to act along that line, and therefore I am justified in acting as I have done.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Before my hon. friend passes away from that point, will he be good enough to lay on the table the questions that he put to Mr. Robinson along with the answer ? Because we have had a running comment on the answer.

Mr. SPROULE. I have just read the answer. I may say that I had already foreseen this very reasonable request. I had the questions drawn out and submitted to Mr. Robinson, and I have been urging for a reply, and it was only to-day at two o'clock that I was able to get it. I have only the telegram that was sent to me without the question. Unfortunately I did not keep a copy of them, otherwise I would be able to hand them to the hon. gentleman. As soon as they are available, I will present them to the minister.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman read the telegram through without comment.

Mr. SPROULE (reading) :

The right of the Dominion parliament to impose restrictions upon the provinces about to be formed in dealing with the subject of education and separate schools, is, I think, not beyond question. This would require more consideration than I have been able to give to it, and must ultimately be settled by judicial decision. I am asked, however, whether parliament is constitutionally bound to impose any such restriction, or whether it exists otherwise, and I am of opinion in the negative. It must be borne in mind that I am concerned only with the question of legal obligation. What the parliament ought to do or should do in the exercise of any power which they may possess, is not within the province of counsel.

Such a restriction, I apprehend, must exist or may be imposed, if at all, under the provisions of section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, and on the ground of their application to the provinces now to be formed. If that section applies, it would seem to require no enactment of our parliament to give it effect, and if not, no such enactment, so far as I am aware, is otherwise made necessary. Upon the whole I am of opinion that section 93 does not apply to the provinces now about to be established. Its provisions would appear to me to be intended for, and confined to, the then province, and to the union formed in 1867. There is not in any part of the Northwest Territories as a province any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools possessed by any class of persons, created by the province, or existing at such union ; and a right subsequently established by the Dominion in the part now about to be made a province, does not appear to me to come within the enactment.

I may say that it is signed 'W. D. Macpherson' who is acting for Mr. Christopher Robinson.

Mr. FIELDING. Is that the opinion of Mr. Robinson or Mr. Macpherson ?

Mr. SPROULE. It is the opinion of Mr. Robinson, communicated by Mr. Macpherson.

Mr. FIELDING. It is so stated ?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, in a letter to me and which I have in my possession. I do not wish to take up the time of the House longer on this subject, but I want to refer to one or two quotations which may have been used before but which I now want to give for the benefit of my right hon. friend the leader of the government. The present Prime Minister, as will be found in 'Hansard' of March 3, 1896, said :

In a community with a free government, in a free country like this, upon any question involving different conceptions of what is right or wrong, different standards of what is just or unjust, it is the part of statesmanship not to force the views of any section, but to endeavour to bring them all to a uniform standard and a uniform conception of what is right.

Not to force the views of any section! I ask him if he is doing that to-day in connection with this Bill. Is he not forcing the views of one section of the community up there who do not think that it is right to compel them to accept what they do not believe to be suitable to the conditions there? Then, speaking on the same day of the different agitations which have from time to time arisen in Canada over provincial rights and defending himself for having stood up in support of provincial rights, he said :

Sir, if the hon. gentleman, while he was tracing the history of confederation, had recalled that page——

Referring to the various disputes that had taken place in Canada——

——it might, perhaps, have struck him and those around him that coercive methods never yet led any people to good and wise action.

Will he apply the coercive methods he is adopting to-day to these new provinces ? If he does to what wise action or good purpose will it lead ?

But I would recall the history to the hon. gentleman, not only of his own province, but of the Dominion of Canada at large.

Later on he said :

These frequent recurrences of agitations and commotion are a severe strain, and a very severe strain upon the tie which binds these provinces together ; and the danger is all the more to be apprehended, if, searching further on for the causes which have brought about this commotion, you find that on every occasion there was only one cause, always the same, and that was the feature of our constitution which abridges the independence, the sovereignty of the provincial legislatures. In one form or the other, such was the cause of these agitations.

What is the cause of the agitation to-day? Is it not exactly that very same thing, that you are endeavouring to interfere with and abridge the rights of these legislatures ? The right hon. gentleman is to-day doing what he then declared it unwise to do when he said that all these agitations were traceable to one source and to one cause, and when he advised parliament that it would be wise to avoid such a danger. It is wise therefore to avoid interference with provincial rights. Then, speaking of the right of the provinces to legislate in regard to education he said :

This division of legislative powers is absolutely essential to the federal form of government.

He was referring to the British North America Act where it divides the powers of the provincial legislatures from the powers of the federal parliament and he said that this division of legislative powers is absolutely essential to the federal form of government. We gave the power to legislate in regard to education to the provincial legislatures. Then, speaking as to the question: Who should rule?—he made a further statement. We heard it stated last night that the Roman Catholics numbered about 41 per cent of the population and the Protestants 60 per cent and the question was asked : Are we going to disregard the rights of this large minority ? I say no, we never intended to disregard them, nor infringe upon them, nor do any injustice to them, but I do hold that the principle which I have stated before that the majority must govern applies as much to the electors of a province as it does to the electors in Canada in an election to this parliament. Then, in reply to the question : Who should rule?— he said :

Indeed, it must be accepted, and accepted as a truism, that under popular government the majority must rule.

The majority of the people of Manitoba desired a certain thing and the Remedial Bill proposed to compel them to do something that they did not desire to do, and therefore the right hon. gentleman held that the majority must rule. It would be a doubly improper thing, I think, to adopt a measure which would not only interfere with provincial rights, but which would prevent the majority from ruling in a country in which the right hon. gentleman declared it to be a truism that the majority must rule. He continued :

I do not mean to say, Sir, that the majority will always be right. No, Sir, the majority may err, the majority may prevaricate. But I am not prepared to say that the majority will always do wrong, will always prevaricate and will always wantonly and wickedly do injustice to the minority.

I think you can safely trust to the intention of the majority to do what is right, and the rule of the majority is the only principle that we can apply to the government of the country. Then, he asks :

What is the remedy of the minority under these circumstances ?

There was a very troublesome question to be settled. There was a majority and there was a minority. The majority wanted one thing and the minority another. He declared that the principle must obtain that the majority must rule. Let him apply that to the new provinces he is creating as he applied it to the province of Manitoba in 1896 and if he does we will not have this provision in the Bill which is creating so much excitement and agitation in the country to-day.

What is the remedy of the minority under these circumstances ? The remedy of the minority under a free government is to agitate and endeavour to bring over the majority to their way of thinking.

That is proper, that is correct ; I agree with every word of it. Sir John Macdonald said the same thing in almost exactly the same words in reference to the New Brunswick case. The right hon. gentleman says that the majority must rule and he says that in case of difference the remedy of the minority is to agitate and endeavour to bring over the majority to their way of thinking. That is the rule under a free government and ours is a free government. Why does he depart from that safe and correct rule, that truism that he laid down in 1896 ? Has he received new light on the subject, have the scales fallen from his eyes that he has propounded another doctrine to-day which is diametrically opposed to the doctrine that he propounded then ? As to the power under the constitution, under section 93 of the British North America Act to supervise and control the legislation of the provinces he says :

The lesson we should deduce is that if it was a wise provision to establish this power in the constitution for the supervision of the local legislatures, perhaps it was not dictated by unmixed wisdom.

I agree with him that it was not dictated by unmixed wisdom. Our experience of the working out of our government since confederation has demonstrated over and over again that it is unfortunate that the provision is there.

For, Sir, experience has taught us that this remedy of interference with local legislation has never been applied and probably never can be applied without friction, disturbance and discontent ; that you cannot apply that remedy without causing as much dissatisfaction as satisfaction.

And yet he is endeavouring to do it to-day. He is applying it in the face of the fact that he himself admits that it never can be applied without friction, disturbance and discontent, and to-day he adversely criticises the press of the country because there is friction and discontent.

It must be evident that while you redress the grievance of the minority by such an act of interference, you run great risk of creating a grievance on the part of the majority.

Therefore, by a parity of reasoning it ought to be avoided. Why does he not follow that good advice to-day? Speaking with regard to the power of the government to grant remedial legislation, the right hon. gentleman said:

Sir, the power is there, and being there, the aid of the Dominion government will be sought by the minority. What is the rule that ought to be followed ? I shall be told by the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper), in fact, he has already told us, that the rule works mechanically, and that no judgment is to be exercised by this parliament in such matters. Sir, that cannot be the rule. It cannot be that this remedy is to apply mechanically. This remedy must be granted or denied according as the circumstances of each case require. And that, Sir, is the very language of the statute that the hon. gentleman cited a few moments ago. The remedy is to be sought and applied as the circumstances of the case require.

That was the contention in 1896—that the federal parliament was not compelled to legislate. He was advocating non-interference with provincial rights; he was questioning the wisdom of a Remedial Bill on the ground that it might create a grievance for the majority that was quite equal to the grievance under which the minority laboured.

Now, I want to say one word with regard to the British North America Act as a layman. I suppose it will have not much weight with the lawyers of this House, and it may not have much weight with the laymen; but I hope it will at least have some weight with the common sense intelligence of the people of this country. My understanding of the respective rights and duties of the federal parliament and the provincial parliament is something like the following: At confederation each was assigned its rights; each was given the class of subjects upon which it had an exclusive right to legislate. There were subjects on which each had an exclusive right; there were other subjects on which they had a joint right, and there were other subjects not included in either on which both might properly legislate. The British North America Act puts the rights belonging to the provinces in one schedule, and the rights belonging to the federal parliament in another. Everything concerning local government is given to the provincial parliament, and everything concerning trade and commerce and national undertakings is given to the federal parliament. But it was never intended that the federal parliament should infringe on any of the subjects which were assigned exclusively to the provincial parliament, and education was one of these subjects. I have before me a little work

which I have read sometimes with interest. It is entitled 'The Powers of Canadian Parliaments,' by S. J. Watson, of Toronto, who has evidently given a good deal of attention to the subject. He first states the reserved rights that were given to the federal parliament: regulation of trade and commerce, postal service, military and naval service and defence, navigation and shipping, currency and coinage, banking and the issue of paper money, insolvency. Then he deals with those rights reserved exclusively to the provincial legislatures: amendments from time to time in their constitutions, municipal institutions in the province, local works and undertakings other than such as are excepted in subsection 10, the incorporation of companies with provincial objects, property and civil rights, education. Education is, therefore, one of the exclusive rights of the provinces; it is only the province which has the right to legislate with regard to education. I hold that to be the correct principle, and whenever this parliament is legislating in regard to education it is infringing on the rights of the provinces.

But I am told there is a provision in section 93 of the British North America Act that gives us power to legislate. In what regard? In one regard and one regard only, that is, by remedial legislation. The Governor in Council, acting as a court, has appellate jurisdiction in cases of the infringement of the rights that belong to minorities. It may be appealed to by the minority for the restoration of those rights. Then the Privy Council becomes a court of appeal, not a legislative body, and if they think those rights have been taken away, and they fail to persuade the provincial authority to restore those rights, then, and not till then, their power as a court ceases, and the federal parliament steps in with its legislative right. That is the only time we can interfere as a federal parliament. We can then pass a Remedial Bill, but we can only do that, as the first minister said, if in our judgment it is good public policy to do it, or we can leave it alone. That is the only provision in the British North America Act, in my judgment, giving us any rights to legislate with regard to education.

With regard to this measure, I want to say that the government have at last undertaken to do what they should have done long ago, and they are confronted with a great many difficulties which they have brought upon themselves. These difficulties might have been very much minimized had they taken the advice of this side of the House, and erected the Territories into a province or provinces long ago. Had they given provincial autonomy to the Northwest Territories years ago, before vested rights grew up to the extent to which they exist to-day, and before the population had increased to the numbers it has reached to-day, they would have had much less difficulty then they have at the present time. Their difficulties have multiplied in proportion to the delay that has occurred. The disproportion in size between the province of Manitoba and the two provinces which they contemplate creating now is very great. The one is very small and the others are very large. What excuse can they give for being unable to extend the boundaries of Manitoba? The existence of vested rights in the Northwest Territories, the growth of settlement, and certain other things which did not exist years ago. There would have been very little difficulty in extending the boundaries of Manitoba if the government had undertaken this question at an earlier date.

Because settlement has gone on there since, and owing to that settlement, and owing to those vested rights, they find it difficult to act to-day. The principle upon which the financial arrangements are based is almost sure, in my judgment, to create dissatisfaction in the other provinces. I feel quite satisfied that that will be the case. When the other provinces come to know and analyze the arrangement which this Bill contains for financial assistance to these two provinces, they will recognize at once that it is much more liberal than the terms which they enjoy to-day, or which they have had in the past, and this will create discontent, and will bring them knocking at the doors of parliament for a rearrangement of provincial subsidies. It is very liberal, I admit; I am not complaining of that, so much as of the fact that it will give us trouble in the future, perhaps in the very near future. In undertaking to do our duty as a federal parliament and to create provinces in the Territories already in the union, we are told that we must treat those Territories as though they were provinces in existence, having provincial autonomy, having a legislative assembly of their own; to treat them as though they were provinces which are entering the union to-day. I need not refer to that again fully, because I have already done so. We may properly erect provinces, and in giving them provincial autonomy, we are bound to give them all the rights which the British North America Act says they should have, and one of these is the right to legislate upon education. Now, I say that, as a matter of policy, as a matter of duty, according to my understanding of the constitution, when we erect these Territories into provinces, we are bound to give them all the rights of legislation, all the provincial rights, that our constitution provides they should have and enjoy; and if we give less, we are likely to cause friction and trouble. If we go beyond that, we are encroaching upon provincial rights. I say we are now going beyond that, and therefore I object to that encroachment on provincial rights. Have we, as a federal parliament, the right to go beyond that? I have given my reasons for thinking that

we have not. It is for this House and for the country to determine according to their judgment whether these reasons are sound or not.

The British North America Act, in assigning the rights and power to the parliament of Canada and the provincial powers, distinctly provides how far we may go, but nowhere does it contain a provision that we may legislate with regard to what educational system a new province must have, and when we do that we are doing what, in my judgment, is improper. The right hon. the premier seems to assume that the federal parliament is a supreme body which is over and above the provincial parliaments, and which can, of its own will, exercise a patronizing or paternal control to the extent of compelling the provincial parliaments to do what they do not desire to do. Talk about being a supreme body! What does Watson say in regard to it? The federal parliament is not a supreme body at all, it has no over-towering powers, it has no powers that are so much above or beyond a provincial parliament that it can exercise them over that provincial parliament. He goes into the history of how we got our federal parliament, and says:

> It must be borne in mind as regards the internal and material interests of each of the provinces, their municipal self-government, their systems of education, their public lands and their development, and the administration of justice, the local legislatures are of much greater importance than the federal parliament.

Much greater importance.

> Over these vital and complex functions of a free commonwealth which are known as civil rights and which are the life and marrow of local self-government and constitutional citizenship, the provincial parliament rules supreme.

And the federal parliament cannot interfere. He says:

> It must be borne in mind that the federal parliament is the offspring of the provincial legislatures;——

Not the provincial parliament the offspring of the federal parliament.

> ——that it is not their progenitor; and that in confiding to it such of their powers as were necessary to establish it as a greater institution than themselves there were yet certain powers which they reserved for their own behoof.

He argued that we had a federal parliament, why? Because the provincial parliaments gave up part of their powers to make it, but that the provincial powers were supreme, and must always be so within their rights. We established the federal parliament and the provinces gave it certain powers, and the federal parliament can only exercise these powers; when it attempts to go beyond that and interfere with provincial rights, then it is doing what a higher authority than it, that is the provincial parliament, says it cannot do. The rights of the provincial parliament within its sphere are supreme and brook no interference. I believe that is as true as the truism given by the premier with regard to the rights of majorities. It was not the federal parliament, as I said, which condescended to give rights to provincial parliaments; the condescension was on the part of the provincial parliaments, and they established the federal parliament. The rights of the provincial parliaments were an inheritance belonging to them; they had inherited their rights and enjoyed their rights, and any rights or powers which the federal parliament has to-day are mere hereditary rights given to it by the provincial parliaments; therefore, the provincial parliaments ought to be supreme and are supreme within their own jurisdiction.

The educational clauses in this Bill are purely an interference, in my judgment, with provincial rights, and on this ground I am opposed to them. I do not mean that I am opposed to the whole Bill, but I am opposed to the educational clauses. The struggles which have taken place in the past with regard to provincial rights, and the contention of the Reform party that provincial rights must be maintained at all hazards, ought to be as strongly impressed upon the minds of the Liberals as it was in the past, and they ought to endeavour to carry out that principle. They should not neglect that principle. We have had many fights of this nature. We had the struggle over the Streams Bill, and very strong feelings were created; we had it over the Boundary Award; we had it over the Hotel Licenses Bill, which was known as the McCarthy Act; we had it over the timber and mineral rights of the provinces; we had it over the Manitoba Remedial Bill, the New Brunswick School Bill; and in every one of these cases the Reform party stood on the same ground, that is, in defence of provincial rights. Where are they to-day?

Some hon. MEMBERS. We are there. On the same spot.

Mr. SPROULE. The Reform party carried Ontario for the provincial government over and over again on provincial rights, and because they stood up in defence of provincial rights. Where are they to-day? I say they have drifted away from their moorings.

An hon. MEMBER. Where were you at that time?

Mr. SPROULE. Where was I? I was in this House at that time, and on many of these measures I agreed with the hon. gentlemen, because I thought they were right. I am opposed to them to-day, because I think they are wrong. I am where I was then, but they are not where they were then. They remind me very much of the story of the Indian who was hunt-

ing his wigwam and met a traveller in the forest. He asked the traveller if he could tell him where he was. 'Why,' the traveller said, 'you are an Indian. Are you lost?' 'No,' said he, 'but the wigwam is lost.' In like manner, while the principle remains, these hon. gentlemen opposite have drifted away from their wigwam. They have taken another track, and are advocating principles the very opposite of those they formerly contended for. I would ask the Reformers of Ontario how they will justify their conduct of to-day before the people of that province? I remember when a motion was made in this House calling on the British authorities to grant home rule to Ireland. Every Reformer, without a single exception, voted for it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. How did the hon. gentleman vote?

Mr. SPROULE. I can tell him very well if he would like to know.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I certainly would.

Mr. SPROULE. They contended that home rule for Ireland was the proper principle. They were advocating giving home rule to a territory over which they had no control, but when they have in their own country a territory to which they are giving provincial autonomy, they refuse to give it home rule. Where they have the power to give home rule they will not do it; but where they have no power they insist on its being given. They are something like Mark Twain who was willing to sacrifice all his wife's relations on the alter of his country. In like manner these hon. gentlemen are willing to sacrifice every one of their principles in order to keep office. They are evidently not in accord on the principle of home rule because if they were they would give the Territories the fullest measure of self government and political autonomy but in reality we are not. Can it be said that we are granting them full provincial autonomy, when we interfere with their rights to deal with education, although it is expressly laid down in the British North America Act that the provinces shall exclusively make laws on that subject. If we compel them to adopt an educational system which we prescribe, though it may be quite unsuited to their needs and conditions, are we giving them home rule? But we are told that the fathers of confederation accepted the principle of separate schools rather than jeopardize confederation. Sir, the great principle was not that of separate schools. The great difficulty the fathers of confederation had to confront was the deadlock between the different sides of the House. It was not the question of separate schools which was the disturbing element between upper and lower Canada. Not at all. But when the fathers of confederation were enacting the British North America Act, they had to provide for the conditions that existed in these two provinces and consequently had to provide for separate schools. They accepted the conditions existing in Ontario and Quebec and provided that should other provinces come in with similar rights in existence, these rights should continue. But there were four provinces entering confederation which had not these rights. If however the principle of separate schools was established at confederation, why do we not have it in these four provinces?

This clause which is objected to, said the right hon. gentleman, is the law to-day, it is in accordance with the constitution, and I commend it even to the biased judgment of my hon. friend from East Grey. He referred to the hon. member from East Grey in different lights that day, and I think in a manner quite uncalled for and which did not come with the best grace from one occupying the dignified position of Premier of this Dominion. It was a gratuitous assumption on his part that the member for East Grey has a biased mind and is not fair. No one, he said, is so blind as the one who will not see, and of course the hon. member for East Grey was in that category. Well, I think that the hon. member for East Grey ought to be credited with possessing the ordinary intelligence which the average member of parliament is usually credited with. If we were in 1867 instead of 1905 and if we had to introduce into the Dominion the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, would we not, asks the right hon. gentleman, have to give these provinces the same rights and privileges with regard to separate schools as we gave Ontario and Quebec? I say emphatically no, and I am confirmed in that conclusion by the advice of that high authority, Mr. Christopher Robinson, whose opinion I have cited. In my judgment the question we have to settle is this. Is it proper to interfere with the rights of these provinces in the matter of education? The Minister of Finance says there is a moral obligation resting on us to do it. But is that moral obligation sufficiently strong to justify our interfering with provincial rights and compelling the majority of the country to do what they say it is impossible to carry out successfully under their present conditions. Would that be sound policy? These are the questions that appeal to our judgment to-day. In the first place is it right, as a question of principle? In the second place is it sound as a question of policy? It might possibly be right in principle and still not be sound as a matter of policy. As a matter of policy is it wise to compel the people to provide for separate schools for all time whether suited to the conditions out there or not? I do not think it is and am therefore opposed to any interference with provincial rights. If we grant educational rights to one church, we must logically grant them to every church. These

are practically church schools though called separate schools. What kind of system have they in France ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. A very bad system. I stand for the British system.

Mr. SPROULE. They have a system of national schools. France is a great country and I admire it. How long is it since they have taken the schools out of the hands of the church ? Only a short time.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Do you approve of that?

Mr. SPROULE. Why did they do it.

An hon. MEMBER. The church got bad.

Mr. SPROULE. That is your statement not mine, and the hon. gentleman knows more about it than I do. But here is the question that appeals to my mind. If for centuries past the education of the French people has been under the wing of the church and the church has directed it and worked into it its religious tenets and dogma, and it has resulted in giving them an uneducated people. I was told by a Frenchman a short time ago that France is a nation of atheists to-day. I was told that by a Frenchman who ought to know. And, if that is what has been accomplished with full control of education in the hands of the church—if it means the turning out of a nation of illiterates and atheists, then surely, it is not amiss to place education wholly beyond the control of the church. Is not that one of the strongest arguments that could be found in favour of that course ? And that is the very reason that France is following that course to-day. President Loubet declares that it is proper and right, and that France must do it. And if we try to keep education free from the control of the same church, is it to be said that we are fanatics? I cannot recall all the names that are applied to us——

An hon. MEMBER. Narrow-minded.

Mr. SPROULE. That is one. And we are told that we are bigoted. But there is another word——

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Fanatical.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, we are told that we are fanatics and prejudiced against the church. But if we endeavour to do what France declares is imperative for the maintenance of her national life, are we to be accused of being fanatics ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) allow me to ask a question ?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Leaving aside the case of France, let us, as a British colony, deal with a case nearer home. Would the hon. gentleman say that he is against the system now in existence in Great Britain—which is a denominational system ?

Mr. SPROULE. There are many features of it to which I am strongly opposed.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am a Britisher.

Mr. SPROULE. I am glad to know it. I ask are we to be blamed for doing what France has done ? Are we to be blamed for doing what Belgium has done ? Are we to be blamed for doing what Italy has done,—the very home of the Pope ? In that country the schools have been taken out of the hands of the church. Are we to be blamed for advancing a similar course here to that which has been taken in Ireland, establishing and carrying on national schools ? Are we to be blamed for doing what has been done in the Australian colonies and in the United States ? Above all are we to be blamed for doing what five out of the seven provinces of the confederation are doing to-day, carrying out a national school system ? When we take such a course, can this be said to be proof of fanaticism on our part ? I do not think it is fanaticism. I do not wish to say a word that would be offensive to our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects. I admire their zeal, their piety and their attachment to their church. No one admires these things more than I do. No one is less disposed to deprive them of their rights than I am. But, because I believe that, forty years ago we discarded a bad system of education and adopted a better one ; and because I believe that we ought to carry out in the interests of the rising generation, keeping the system free from the control of any church, am I to be accused of fanaticism ? I have just said if you grant church schools at all, to be logical you cannot confine that privilege to the Roman Catholic church ; you must grant them to every other denomination as well.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. Why should not the Presbyterians have the same right ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. And why should not the Methodists have the same right ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. And the Baptists——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. And the Mormons ? Does the hon. gentleman say 'hear, hear' to that ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, not the Mormons.

Mr. SPROULE. Well I am glad to know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) draws the line somewhere. There are one hundred

and thirty religions represented in the Northwest Territories. Are we to have that many kinds of schools there? And, if not, is not the only logical course to take the control of education of the rising generation away from the church——

Mr. LEMIEUX. What church?

Mr. SPROULE. That is the question I asked. This Bill proposes to hand it over to one church. My contention is that no church should be allowed to control it. In my opinion it is as improper to give the control of education to the Methodist church or the Presbyterian or the Baptist or the Luthern or the Mormon as it would be to give it to the Catholic Church—they are all in the same category according to my judgment. The state should provide the means of education and should control education. We should have a state system of education as we have in some parts of the Dominion to-day.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) tell us what is the difference between the schools that are proposed to be established in the Northwest Territories and that he calls separate schools on the one hand, and the public schools on the other hand?

Mr. SPROULE. That is not relevant to the purposes of my argument. I am not saying anything about the quality of the schools as they are to-day, but I am talking about the interference with the powers of the provincial legislature, to give whatever system of schools they think best. Now we can find some countries where this particular school system does prevail. Where does it prevail?

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. In Quebec.

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all. You have there what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armand Lavergne) would call a national system, But the peculiar system to which I have referred is used in Newfoundland. Every denomination has its own schools and the public money devoted to education is divided amongst them. And I have a letter from a very intelligent gentleman there, who says: God forbid that you should drift into the educational methods that we have here.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. What is his name?

Mr. SPROULE. He is a Scotchman like the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. Johnston), but he does not come from South Cape Breton, and his name is not Johnston. He tells me that the public money devoted to education is divided amongst these denominations, and he adds: Our educational system is a disgrace to the civilization of the twentieth century. Are we desirous of going back to that condition in the Northwest Territories? Yet, it is the only logical thing we can do if we follow out the principles of this Bill. The separation of church and state is one of the principles that we fought for long ago. Are we desirous of throwing away to-day all that we have gained in this respect? I say that this Bill which is a violation of that principle, it is a re-union of the church and the state by which education will be handed over to church control.

Mr. BRODEUR. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) tell me how these separate schools of the Northwest will be under the control of the church and not under the control of the state?

Mr. SPROULE. The minister refers to a condition of things different from the ordinary separate schools. He has always been defending the system in Quebec and Ontario. I am speaking of the system in Quebec and Ontario where schools are under the control of the church. Does the hon. gentleman deny that in his own province?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am speaking of the system existing in the Northwest Territores.

Mr. SPROULE. I am speaking of the desire to perpetuate a system which will practically put the control of the schools under the church, where the money for the support of those schools must go to the church indirectly. Then this is a union of church and state.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend will admit that so far as the Northwest is concerned, there is no provision in the Bill now before the House by which the schools shall be under the control of the church.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not say that the church has any improper control over them in the Northwest. I am talking about the principle involved in taking away from the provinces the right of control, and compelling them to establish a system they do not want. Remember I am not condemning the educational system there to-day, nor am I fighting to do away with that system; I am fighting for the right of the provinces to establish whatever system they choose.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Did not my hon. friend say a moment ago that the system of separate schools was bad?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, the system that we have in Ontario and Quebec is bad.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The national system is better—that is the way to put it.

Mr. SPROULE. Now if the legislatures of those provinces, in the exercise of their undoubted right, see fit to establish separate schools to-morrow, I have not a word of objection to it. It is their own business, their own right. We are not fighting

against that, we are not proposing to give them advice with regard to what they shall do; we are only fighting for their right to establish such a system as suits their conditions. We are not condemning them for what they may or may not do in the future, we are not even advising them. Let them do as they like. If they wish to re-enact the present educational system, and re-enact the ordinances relating to the separate school system that they have there to-day, we have not a word of complaint against their doing so. But we say, Do not bind them with a chain that prevents them from doing what the constitution says they have a right to do and ought to be allowed to do.

Now the next question I shall consider is, Who are asking for educational rights for minorities in those provinces? Are the people in those provinces complaining, even the Roman Catholics, who, according to the census, number 30,000? So far as I know we have not had a single petition presented to this House from any of them asking that the provisions of this Bill be put through. Then why are we to be blamed if we say that these provisions are not needed there? The people there do not think they are needed, as otherwise I presume they would ask for them. So far as I know we have not yet received a single petition from that country asking that the new provinces be compelled to adopt that system; so far as I know not a single memorial of any description has come from that vast country asking us to adopt that system, though there are supposed to be 500,000 people in that country. Who is asking for it? Not the legislature of those Territories, because the Prime Minister of the Northwest legislature has declared that these school provisions are an improper interference with their rights, and he is opposed to them. He is speaking on behalf of that country, on behalf of all the people. Neither the majority nor the minority seems to be desirous of having this provision in the Bill. They have not asked their legislature for any change. Then I say, why should we force it upon them? Are we not coercing them? Then who are asking for it? It is not the other provinces of the confederation who have no separate schools. Five out of the seven provinces of the confederation have no separate schools; British Columbia has none, Manitoba has none, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia have none, nor has Prince Edward Island. They are not asking for this measure, because they won't have it at home. Then we may assume they do not want it. Is Ontario asking for it? Up to the present time I think but one petition has come from Ontario recommending that the provisions in the Bill be put through. Then who is asking for it? Not the provinces who do not enjoy that system to-day. The only parties who are clamouring for it are the clergy and the people of the province of Quebec.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT. It was the Jacques Cartier Club who started the movement.

Mr. SPROULE. That may be, that club is composed of a portion of the people of Quebec. But I am not denying them the right to do so, it is perfectly proper for them to do so. But I say this demand comes only from the clergy and the people of Quebec, who are asking us to force this system on an unwilling people. What is the situation to-day? Quebec is thousands of miles removed from that country. The great bulk of the people of Quebec know little about the conditions out there, and know little about the school system.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. The people of Quebec have many relatives in the Northwest.

Mr. SPROULE. They have, and those relatives have not even asked for it, they are satisfied. Then why should Quebec, that is thousands of miles away from that country, force this Bill on an unwilling people? Do they know anything about the conditions out there? Do they know anything about the possibility of keeping up such a system there? The people out there know better than any others the conditions prevailing in that country. It does not necessarily follow that because separate schools can be carried out successfully in the province of Quebec they can be carried out with equal success in the Northwest Territories. Why do I say so? Because the conditons are altogether different. How wide is the average farm in Quebec? Fifteen rods, I think.

An hon. MEMBER. More than that.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, it cannot be more than twenty rods, because I notice there are four of them in a width of eighty rods on the river with one settler on each in Quebec. The houses are principally on the river front, where there is a river, and there is a family every twenty rods. The houses are so thickly located along these rivers that for miles and miles they look almost like villages. There is therefore great community of interest among them, the population is numerous, and they can keep up schools without any difficulty, it is not a heavy burden for them to do so. Now I have made a little calculation on this point. In the province of Quebec how many families have you to the square mile?

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Two families and a lot of children.

Mr. SPROULE. According to the way their farms are laid out on the river front, you have at least twenty-one and a third families to the square mile, and every one of them has about a quarter of a hundred

children. They can fill the schools. I am glad of it and they are entitled to great credit for it ? How many families are there to the mile square in the Northwest Territories ? Taking the ordinary farm that is owned up there you would have but four families. How many miles square of that territory will it require to provide children enough to fill a school ? Do you not see if you divide the people up according to religious belief in one locality, part Protestant and part Roman Catholic, you reduce the number of available people to support a school there, and therefore it may be quite impossible to carry on such an educational system as would be quite suitable and easily carried on in the province of Quebec. What do we find in regard to the same inquiry in Manitoba and somewhat similar conditions exist up there ? How many children have they in their schools in the province of Manitoba ? I have the list for 1894 : Woodlands nine, Ossowo five, Oakland eight, White Haven six, Silver Creek nine, West Oakland seven, and I find that the average attendance is about four. There is not one school in fifty that has an average attendance of ten. What is that caused by ? By the sparseness of the population. The people have their farms in the west larger than they have their farms in Quebec and larger than they have their farms in Ontario, and therefore there are fewer settlers in the different school sections. Why is it that separate schools can never be worked out successfully in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories unless it be in the villages and towns ? It is due to the fact that you have only four families to the mile and when you divide them, there are only two Catholic and two Protestant families. They are thus separated and there is no support for the schools. The burden becomes too great. It is too onerous. If they get up schools at all they must hire inferior teachers because the salaries they pay must be very low and the result of this is a poor school and injustice to the children who get the only education they will ever get in such schools. I draw attention to this to show the conditions that exist in the Northwest Territories and I ask what justification there is for the people and the clergy of the province of Quebec, where the conditions are entirely different, where the conditions are such as would enable them to keep up separate schools, to insist that separate schools shall be enforced upon these people in the Northwest Territories ? In my judgment there is none. Are the people of Quebec capable of being the best judges ? They are far removed from the country, they know little about the conditions or otherwise I am sure very many of them would take a different view of the matter.

Mr. BRODEUR. Would my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question ? He says that the people of the province of Quebec are asking for this legislation. He has no evidence of that. Is he able to explain to us how it is that some years ago he voted in favour of forcing the government of the Northwest Territories to establish separate schools in those territories ?

Mr. SPROULE. When ?

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend must know it.

Mr. SPROULE. I never voted to my knowledge on that question. If the question had been raised I would have voted against it.

Mr. BRODEUR. A Bill was introduced some years ago when my hon. friend was in the House providing that separate schools should be provided in the Northwest Territories and he did not say anything against such a provision in the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. That was in 1875 before I was a member of this parliament. If it had been proposed when I was here I certainly would have opposed it. It is true that the Act has been amended once or twice since but the question of schools has never been raised.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. When he was in the House in 1880 the same provision was introduced in a Bill which was then placed before the House. But it was introduced by a Tory and he never said one word against it.

Mr. SPROULE. I was not aware of any such provision having been introduced, but if I had been I would have voted against it.

Mr. BRODEUR. In 1880 section 9 of the Bill which was then introduced provided that :

> The Lieutenant Governor in Council or the Lieutenant Governor, by and with the advice and consent of the legislative assembly, as the case may be, shall have such powers to make ordinances for the government of the Northwest Territories as the Governor in Council may from time to time confer upon him ; provided always that such powers shall not at any time be in excess of those conferred by the ninety-second and ninety-third sections of the British North America Act, 1867, upon the legislatures of the several provinces of the Dominion.

Section 10 provides that :

> When and so soon as any system of taxation shall be adopted in any district or portion of the Northwest Territories, the Lieutenant Governor, by and with the consent of the council or assembly, as the case may be, shall pass all necessary ordinances in respect to education——

Mr. SPROULE. That is a re-enactment of the old law.

Mr. BRODEUR—(reading).

> ——but it shall therein be always provided that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the Northwest Territories, or any lesser portion or subdivision thereof, by what-

ever name the same may be known, may establish such schools therein as they may think fit, and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor ; and, further, that the minority of the ratepayers therein, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein,——

And my hon. friend voted for that.

Mr. SPROULE. I can tell the hon. gentleman that he is astray. I never voted for that.

Mr. BRODEUR. That Bill was introduced in 1880.

Mr. SPROULE. It may have been introduced but it was not voted on to my knowledge. The school question had never been raised. The hon. gentleman has been reading a re-enactment of the old law passed in 1875. The question of separate schools was never discussed in this House nor voted upon during my time in it. I never heard a word regarding it because if I had you may be sure that I would have stood then just where I stand to-day.

Mr. BRODEUR. If my hon. friend will permit me ? I suppose he does not deny that this clause was enacted in 1875, but section 9 was not enacted in 1875. It was enacted in 1880. By that section, section 93 of the British North America Act was incorporated in the Bill and I am sure my hon. friend will not deny that he had not a word to say against it.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think I ever heard a word about it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was it a re-enactment or an alteration ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, it was an Act concerning the Northwest Territories.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is not the question I asked. Was it a re-enactment or was it in any substantial respect a new enactment ? That is a fair question.

Mr. BRODEUR. It was an Act presented to the House by Sir John Macdonald.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not asking that.

Mr. BRODEUR. It was an Act presented to the House by Sir John Macdonald concerning the Northwest Territories and amongst the different clauses of this Act were sections 9 and 10 which I have just read and which forced the government of the Northwest Territories always to maintain separate schools.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Surely the hon. gentleman understands if he has not some reason for not answering my question. I desire to know whether or not these provisions to which he has called attention were the re-enactments of provisions previously pased or whether they were substantially new enactments. Is that not a fair question ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I may say in regard to section 9 that I did not say that it was a re-enactment of any section contained in the Act of 1875. As to the principle embodied in section 10 it was a re-enactment of the clause which appeared in the Act of 1875 but as to the embodiment in the Northwest Territories Act of section 93 of the British North America Act, I think it was the first time it was incorporated in the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. That might be and I would pay no attention to it. I was not familiar until later years with the British North America Act. You might mention any clause of the British North America Act and I would not know what it did or did not apply to. But, as I understand it that was a simple re-enactment of the Act of 1875 and if I had known of it then I would have stood just where I stand to-day. It did not matter who was in power or which party introduced it.

It is contended that immigrants coming to settle in the Northwest Territories have been influenced in favour of this country by the knowledge that there were separate schools here, in connection with the church to which they belonged, and that if we do not perpetuate these schools, we shall do a great injustice to them and be likely to retard immigration. Now, I took the trouble to look up the immigration literature issued by the present government to ascertain if there was anything to justify that statement, and I could not find anything at all. Here is one of the important pamphlets distributed by the government, and what does it say with regard to schools ? It says :

Schools are non-sectarian and are national in character.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Might I ask the hon. gentleman if that is a government issue and, if so, under whose authority ?

Mr. SPROULE. This is a government issue, by authority of the Hon. Clifford Sifton, Minister of the Interior. It is entitled 'Farms and Farmers in Western Canada,' to be distributed in the United States, the old country or anywhere else. It also sets out that a certain proportion of land is set apart for the support of national schools, and that the state provides for their support and maintenance. This is not an evidence that immigrants come to that country because of the advantages offered to them in the shape of separate schools. I may draw attention to another fact, which may not be known to many. There have been presented to this House from all parts of Canada a large number of petitions against the educational clause of this Bill. Petitions have come from the Northwest Territories, with tens of thousands of

signatures, and among them are the names of many Roman Catholics, who are petitioning parliament to-day not to pass this clause of the Bill. I have letters in my possession drawing attention to the fact that the names of many Roman Catholics are on those petitions. I have letters stating that if petitions had been sent to the Doukhobors, translated into their language, seventy-five per cent of them would sign those petitions; so would the Galicians, and so would the Roman Catholics of this country. The Galicians say: We left one country because of the tyranny of the church, and we were told that we were coming to a free country, and we do not want it in Canada. They do not want separate schools; they want national schools; and the result is that none of them are asking for this provision in the Bill, while hundreds of them have deliberately petitioned against it. Roman Catholics in the province of Ontario have also petitioned against it, very many of them. I have had petitions sent to me in large numbers, and my attention has been drawn to the fact that Roman Catholic names were on those petitions. In some instances I have know them very well; I have known them for years; and I assume that they knew what they were seeking. So I say the Roman Catholics are not a unit on this question. Many of them are in favour of national schools, and we are not to blame because we desire to give them national schools. I have always understood that the sentiment of this Dominion was in favour of national schools and against interference with the rights of the provinces. I presented one petition from New Westminister, British Columbia with 300 names, another from Vancouver containing 2,097 names; another containing over 300 names; another containing 400 or 500. I have presented petitions in large numbers from the Northwest Territories from Manitoba, from Ontario, from Quebec, from Nova Scotia, from New Brunswick, and from Prince Edward Island. From all over the country have come petitions to the same effect, declaring that it is improper for this parliament to interfere with the rights of the province, and asking that there be no interference with the rights of provinces in regard to education. The church unions all over the country are passing resolutions against it. The Orange lodges all over the country are passing resolutions against it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. Properly so. There is no harm in that, any more than there is in the Jacques Cartier Club petitioning for it. It is the right of every British subject under the Crown to petition parliament so long as he does so courteously and in accordance with the provisions laid down. We have Conservatives petitioning for this Bill, and others against it; that is their right and no one complains. Petitions are coming in thousands in favour of non-interference with the rights of the provinces, and from only one province are petitions coming asking us to force the hands of the new provinces and curtail their rights, and that is the province of Quebec.

But we are told that we have separate schools in Ontario and Quebec, and that everybody is satisfied with them. Here is what the Prime Minister said in introducing this Bill:

> I am glad to say, and perhaps it would be permitted if, in this matter, being myself a son of the province of Quebec, I indulge in what may be not altogether unpardonable pride, when I say, that I am not aware that the Protestant minority of Quebec ever had any cause of complaint of the treatment they had received at the hands of the majority.

According to this, everybody is satisfied with the separate schools of Quebec, and everybody is satisfied wth the separate schools of Ontario. I know that is not a fact; I have heard it over and over again. I know where a separate school has been converted into a public school, within a few miles of where I live, and the reason the people gave for doing that was that with their strength divided, the task of keeping up separate schools was too onerous and heavy either for the Protestants or for the Roman Catholics. The Prime Minister says: I have never heard of any dissatisfaction in the province of Quebec. Now, I have here a quotation from the Huntingdon 'Gleaner,' and what does it say? It says:

> How does the premier reconcile this declaration of his with the fact that the English-speaking people outside the island of Montreal have largely disappeared and are continuing to disappear? Whole townships, settled by them and which prospered under them, are to-day French. Protestant churches are to be found in which no service is held, and the spot where Protestants were buried for three generations and more are now to be found in the corners of farms of French-Canadians. In only one of the counties that composed the eastern townships have the Protestants a majority, yet once they had absolute control. Do men throw up their farms and leave a province where they have no cause of complaint?
>
> Let Sir Wilfrid explain this—the extraordinary spectacle of a people abandoning the land of their birth, to which they are bound by every tie of affection and patriotism, to seek new homes in the United States, for the proportion has been trifling who have gone to our Northwest. What is it they find under an alien flag they could not in the province of Quebec?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We lost a great many from Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. National schools, I assume.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My hon. friend——

Mr. SPROULE. The Postmaster General should be the last man in this country to interrupt me. I do not complain of his doing so, because if time would permit I could tell him a great deal of the feeling in his own constituency that he may not be aware of.

We want no rhetorical generalities, no vaporing about justice and toleration. Here is a plain problem—Why are the Protestant farmers of the province of Quebec going away? Do men flee a province where they have no cause of complaint?

And still the hon. minister says there is no cause for complaint.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Does my hon. friend think that the Protestants would be more apt to stay in Quebec if there were no schools?

Mr. SPROULE. I am only telling him what the Huntingdon 'Gleaner' thinks has been the result of their divided education.

I am not going to enumerate all their causes of complaint: I select one and that the one on which Sir Wilfrid makes his boast—that of schools. Farmers have told the writer, when he remonstrated with them for selling out, that they had no choice, that when the ratepayers were all of one mind in their district they had only strength enough to keep up a school, but when the curé interfered and insisted on a separate school they could not maintain one.

They could not maintain two. When they divided their forces the Protestants were so few that they could not maintain one.

The alternative was before them to see their children grow up in ignorance or go to a country where there are no separate schools. They were doing well in the province of Quebec, they did not expect to get farms of better soil, it was a wrench to their feelings to break old associations and part with old neighbours, but for the sake of their children they felt they must make the sacrifice. It is a sad truth, and one I am ashamed to set down, that in localities in the townships where Protestant parents have not left under this motive, they have become so few that they have either no schools or are able to keep one open for so short a term each year that it is of nominal service. Their children can neither read nor write, and a race of illiterates are growing up who are a reproach to Protestantism. Analyze the reports of the inspectors of schools and there are revelations of ignorance among the scattered English-speaking communities in the eastern townships and adjoining counties which, if their wealthy compatriots in Montreal realized, or our churches comprehended, would stir them to action.

There is no more saddening aspect in the condition of our province than the groups of Protestant children to be found here and there all over it destitute of the means of acquiring the elements of education, and threatening us with a coming generation of Protestant farmers as ignorant as Russian moujiks. This is a fruit of separate schools. If we had national schools, instead of sectarian schools, no child in the province would be without opportunity to learn to read and write. Another consequence of these sectarian schools should never be lost sight of, and that is, where Protestant farmers are too few to have a school, they are taxed to support Catholic schools, which, sometimes, have as their teachers nuns or Christian Brothers. There are hundreds of Protestant farmers who are forced to support Catholic schools or sell out.

And that is no hardship to the Protestants of Quebec? Is it no cause of complaint?

Mr. O. E. TALBOT. Is the hon. gentleman aware of any instance in which an English Protestant in the province of Quebec has been forced on account of the condition of affairs to sell his farm at a sacrifice in order to permit a Roman Catholic to take his place?

Mr. SPROULE. At a sacrifice? I have never gone into that phase of the question or perhaps I could give the information.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT. He sells if he gets his price.

Mr. SPROULE. I can give the hon. gentleman some information in connection with this. I can refer him to the fact that I think in the second or third year I was in this parliament the people of Quebec came up here and petitioned the then government to give them sufficient money to take them to the maritime provinces or to the far west and what was the reason? That where there was a community of Protestants years ago, there was then only an odd one, and they had become so few and scattered that they were neither able to support separate schools nor churches, and their families must go—

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Would it be any better if they were obliged to go to a French system of national schools.

Mr. SPROULE. If it was of good standard quality I think they would be much better off.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Well, they can go.

Mr. SPROULE. And these petitioners brought a map along showing that where there were Protestant communities years ago there were scarcely a dozen families then, and where 50 or 100 could keep up a church years ago there were then only 10 or 12 families. They said that their farms were bought out by Roman Catholics. Whenever a Protestant was willing to sell his farm there was really a premium for a Roman Catholic to purchase it.

Mr. SCOTT. Is there any compulsion in the province of Quebec to exercise what are called the minority rights?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know anything about it. The writer says there are hundreds of Protestant farmers who are forced either to support Catholic schools or sell out, yet the Prime Minister says they have no cause of complaint :

> Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who, as premier, ought to be the guardian of the rights that pertain to every British subject regardless of creed or nationality, tells us it is no cause of complaint to compel Protestants to pay taxes to support a religious system against which their very name indicates they protest, and that is the system of schools he wants to fasten for all time on our great Northwest. There is not a Protestant farmer who has been under the thrall in Quebec, who would want to buy land in the proposed new provinces if he succeeds.

That is the answer I give to the statement of the First Minister, and that is why I say we ought not to do the same thing in a country which is new and being rapidly settled. In such a country we shoud avoid the mistakes committed in the past. For that reason I am supporting what I believe to be a national school system. Forty years ago we had church schools and pay schools and we had no public or free schools. Our educational system then was very poor, and we adopted the national school system because we believed it to be better than the other, and upon trial we found it a great improvement and extended it by degrees until we have it practically enforced throughout the province to-day. Shall we ever go back to these church and parochial schools ? Protestants never will because they prefer the national system and because they think it is the duty of the state to see that every child is educated. They have no desire to have religion taught in the schools but are content to leave that to the churches. The sentiment of the 19th and 20th century is in favour of that system. The enlightened, intelligent civilization of to-day recognizes that fact, and that policy is being carried out the world over. Are we going back to what has been discarded in the past ? We are told to-day that public sentiment is not against these clauses. Well, one of the cabinet ministers, representing that great western country, has resigned from the cabinet because he could not support the policy of the government, and the right hon. gentleman will not consult the Premier of the Northwest Territories. Dare he test public opinion in the Territories by calling on an election ? I challenge him to do it. Let him do it and he will soon find out what the deep seated sentiment of the people out there is. But he dare not make the attempt. If he were certain he could elect a member to support his government in that country and take the place in the cabinet rendered vacant by the resignation of the late Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), he would not loose a moment in having that place filled. Can he be said to be carrying out constitutional government on popular lines when the people of the illimitable west have no one to speak for them in the cabinet, especially at a time when a Bill is being forced through this House which will affect them for all time in the future. He is certainly not, as I understand constitutional government or as the people of the west understand it. The government dare not test public opinion to-day. There is a vacancy in the representation of the city of Toronto. My hon. friend the Postmaster General thinks he is in accord with public opinion. Well, I challenge him to open up Centre Toronto to-morrow with the best candidate he can get. Why in that very constituency the reform party had a meeting the other day and passed resolutions declaring against these clauses and protesting against their being forced on the people. Surely that ought to be a warning to the Postmaster General—a warning which he should take now, for later on it may be too late. The government dare not test public opinion anywhere west of Lake Superior or even in Ontario.

We are told that separate schools work satisfactorily. I need hardly refer to that question. The trend of the age is in favour of national schools. The educational system of Canada to-day is entirely different from what it was when the schools were sectarian and pay schools. They are now national and non-sectarian and we want to keep them so. But a comparison is made with regard to the prevalence of crime in countries where there are separate schools compared with those where the national public school flourishes. It seemed to me that was a most unfortunate comparison. Can the comparison be said to be a fair one between Canada and the United States ? No. But take the provinces that have no separate schools and compare them with those that have. Did the right hon. gentleman do that? Not at all. I however have taken the troube to look up the statistics and I find that there is practically no difference. Take Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, British Columbia and Manitoba, and I find practically there is no difference as regards the prevalence of crime between these provinces and the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. But the right hon. gentleman pointed to the United States and asked how we were to account for the prevalence in that country of divorces. Surely that is not due to the absence of separate schools. Why did he not show that the application for divorces from these provinces which have not separate schools are larger than those which have. The reason is evident. I looked into that question and I found no evidence of any difference so that the comparison between Canada and the United States is not a fair one. I have said that the trend of the age is in favour of national schools. They are to be found in Mexico, Bolivia, in most of the South American republics, Venezuela, Equador, France, Italy, Germany and Ireland. Then are you going

to establish in these new provinces something else ? The enlightened advanced intelligence of the twentieth century declares in favour of national schools, are you going back to something else ? Are you going to clothe these new provinces with the cast-off and tattered garments of those nations which discarded church and sectarain schools years ago ? We shall be committing the greatest of follies if we do. Our people out in the west are inured to a freedom far in advance of any enjoyed in almost any part of the world, and it is but natural that they should feel sore at being deprived of any of their undoubted rights. Why should we interfere with those rights, as we shall assuredly do if we establish separate schools in that country and compel these people to maintain such schools for ever after. These people are inured to western freedom and should continue to enjoy it. These young giants have in themselves and their surroundings all the capabilities of great development, if we will only avoid binding them with chains and shackles which will retard that development. They have in themselves the elements of great development. Surely we do not wish to retard or prevent them developing the highest capabilities of citizens in that great western country. Let them breathe the fresh air of heaven in their western freedom which is their birthright, let them enjoy the sunshine and the other exhilarating environments of western freedom which they enjoy to-day and grow up under these favourable conditions. Let their mental pabulum be the unadulterated food supplied from the national storehouse of the little red schools, and we need have no fear for the future citizenship of these people. They will grow up mental and colossal giants and be a source of strength not only to this country in the future but to the British empire. Our motto to-day is ' hands off the twins ; do not interfere with their rights.' Provincial rights are sacred and inalienable. They must not be interfered with, and therefore I shall vote for the amendment to strike those clauses from the Bill.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). It has been rightly said, Mr. Speaker, by gentlemen who preceded me, that we have come to the consideration of two very important Bills. From what has transpired in this House and the country, there is evidently a good deal of diversity of opinion on at least some of the points in those measures. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) who has just taken his seat has emphasized his objections strongly, those objections being mainly to one portion of the Bill. If I understood him aright, he objects also to another section which deals with the public lands. I did not quite catch whether he objected to those sections referring to the boundaries.

Mr. SPROULE. I have always been of the opinion that the lands should go to the provinces.

Mr. PATERSON. I understood that to be the hon. gentleman's position. The hon. gentleman, like others who preceded him, seems to have been influenced by the interest aroused in the country by what are known as the educational clauses. The House has been petitioned in reference to those clauses ; there have been petitions for and petitions against. It is for parliament to come to the consideration of this question, as I believe parliament has done and will do, in a calm and dispassionate spirit, and to endeavour to give due weight to any argument that may be advanced from any point of view. That is what this discussion is for ; that is how we may be benefited. In committee, of course, the educational clauses will be discussed at length. Still I may follow the example of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and deal largely with that subject. The government have proposed in this Bill certain provisions with reference to the matter. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), in his able speech, offered a legal argument against that portion of the Bill and submitted an amendment. Not only was a legal argument presented by the leader of the opposition, but the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) also directed part of his argument in the same line. And I have no doubt that other gentlemen in the House who are competent to do so will follow that line. But upon that portion of the case I shall not trespass. Like the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), I do not feel that I should be regarded as an authority upon the subject, and I know it would be hazardous for me—and even presumptious—for me to express an opinion ; not that I abandon my judgment in this matter, but simply that I do not argue the matter before the House. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) read an opinion from a very able legal gentleman, Mr. Christopher Robinson, K.C. I believe that gentleman stands almost, if not quite, at the head of his profession. The leader of the opposition is also admitted, I think, to be a gentleman of legal attainments of no ordinary character. And I think I am not saying more than I am perfectly justified in saying when I state that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) is also one of the brightest legal minds we have in the country. But these gentlemen do not agree. If I followed aright the argument of the leader of the opposition, he takes the ground that this parliament has no power to pass the legislation now proposed. If I followed him aright and was able to apprehend his argument, that is his position. But if I apprehend aright the opinion expressed in the telegram of Mr. Christopher Robinson, that gentleman does not at all take the view expressed by the leader of the opposition.

If I understand him, Mr. Christopher Robinson argues that it is doubtful whether the Premier's position in relation to section 93 would be borne out. If it is not, and if the Territories do not come under that provision, Mr. Robinson says, it would be necessary for parliament to supplement their action. Then, if parliament can supplement that action, it must be because parliament has the power——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) has misapprehended it. I have read the telegram carefully.

Mr. PATERSON. Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden), when the telegram was first read, understand it as I have just stated ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No.

Mr. PATERSON. May I ask the hon. gentleman what it means with reference to the action of parliament ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I read it ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This is Mr. Robinson's opinion :

The right of the Dominion parliament to impose restrictions upon the provinces about to be formed in dealing with the subject of education and separate schools, is, I think, not beyond question.

I said that, in my humble opinion, parliament had no such powers.

This would require more consideration than I have been able yet to give it, and must ultimately be settled by judicial decision. I am asked, however, whether parliament is constitutionally bound to impose any such restriction, or whether it exists otherwise, and I am of opinion in the negative.

Mr. GERMAN. Anybody would say that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) did not say that, but said the very opposite—and I suppose the hon. member (Mr. German) would say that the Prime Minister is somebody.

It must be borne in mind that I am concerned only with the question of legal obligation. What the parliament ought to do or should do in the exercise of any power which they may possess,——

Mr. PATERSON. That is the point I meant.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (reading) :

——is not within the province of counsel.

'Any power which they may possess.' Mr. Robinson says he is not advising as to what parliament should do if it has the power, but as to the power which parliament has.

Such a restriction, I apprehend, must exist or may be imposed, if at all, under the provisions of section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, and on the ground of their application to the provinces now to be formed. If that section applies, it would seem to require no enactment of our parliament to give it effect,——

My hon. friend will remember that I said that what we should do is to use simple general words bringing into force in the Northwest Territories the constitution which we already possess. I understand this opinion to go further even than what I suggested yesterday.

——and if not, no such enactment, so far as I am aware, is otherwise made necessary.

I must confess I do not exactly understand these words of the telegram. But Mr. Robinson continues—and the telegram is perfectly clear in this regard :

Upon the whole, I am of the opinion that section 93 does not apply to the provinces now about to be established.

The legislation before parliament not only seeks to make it apply, but amends it in making that application, and provides an entirely new section, although in doing so it is altering imperial legislation. Mr. Robinson continues :

Its provisions would appear——

That is, the provisions of section 93 of the British North America Act—

Its provisions would appear to me to be intended for, and confined to the then provinces, and to the union formed in 1867. There is not in any part of the Northwest Territories, as a province, any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools possessed by any class of persons, created by the province, or existing at such union ; and a right subsequently established by the Dominion in the part now about to be made a province does not appear to me to come within the enactment.

I had not seen or heard of this opinion when I spoke yesterday. So far as I am able to understand it, as very briefly embodied in the telegram, it seems to me altogether in accordance with the view which I expressed, except that I expressed a greater doubt than Mr. Robinson does about the power of this parliament to deal with this question.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, it is plain from what we have heard that lawyers differ. However, I still maintain my opinion, but I do so with deference, because neither am I able to make a legal argument myself, nor have I a sufficiently sharp mind to understand the contradictory legal arguments of others. Now I want to know what Sir Christopher Robinson means. If section 93 does give certain powers, should parliament exercise the power it possesses ? Now then what power does parliament possess ? The leader of the opposition says we have no power. Sir Christopher Robinson, as I understand, believes that under the amendment to the British North America Act of 1875, the right to make the constitution of

these new provinces is vested in this parliament, and if it be necessary to give effect to that right, we must do so. But he is not clear that section 93 does give that right.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He does not say so.

Mr. PATERSON. I am not arguing the legal point with the hon. gentleman, I am simply pointing out that the best legal minds we have in the country do not agree. Now there was a very large meeting held in the city of Toronto last Monday, in Massey Hall. The multitude assembled were evidently deeply moved by the subject of discussion, namely, the educational clauses of this Bill. There was present a legal gentleman whose standing in the profession I do not know ; I see he is a King's Counsel, and I have no doubt he is a gentleman possessed of legal knowledge. Evidently he felt warmly on this subject, for he moved a resolution protesting against the passage of the Bill. In the resolution which was to be forwarded to the Prime Minister he proposes one of three different courses in dealing with this question. I am taking now the report of the meeting published in the Toronto 'World,' which I presume will be accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite. In speaking to his resolution he replied to the arguments of the Prime Minister as to the bearing of section 93 of the British North America Act. He said that if what the Prime Minister had contended was true, then there was no necessity to do anything further. Then he considered what Mr. Haultain had contended for, and could not agree with that. The third view, and the one that was likely, from his own opinion, to prevail was that under the British North America Amendment Act of 1871, power was vested in the Dominion parliament to deal with this educational question in the constitution of the new provinces, as it saw fit ; and, said he, that is the supreme reason why we want to speak out now, because that power is in the hands of the Dominion parliament, and if they exercise it now it is irrevocable for all time to come. The legal gentleman to whom I refer was Mr. Thomson, K.C., of Toronto. Hon. gentlemen may read his opinion for themselves. Now amidst all these conflicting opinions as to whether we have this power, the leader of the opposition proposes to leave this question unsettled, no one knowing where they are, nothing definite, the country to be left in a turmoil in reference to this matter for a long time to come. If there is such a division among the legal gentlemen, may not the same doubt exist in the Supreme Court, the same doubt in the Privy Council ? And all this time you have the delay. What shall we do ? What shall I as a layman do ? Judging from the arguments I have heard, and bringing to bear what common sense I have on the subject, and what legal knowledge as a layman I may have, it seems to me we have power to deal with this matter. In dealing with this matter, I have regard to the fact that in those Territories, of thirty years, by Act of this Dominion parliament under which people have entered that country, knowing that the existing school system had been established by an Act of this parliament, knowing that under these conditions people have gone in there and settled there under that system of education, I say it is only just, and right, and sensible, and the proper thing to do in dealing with this matter on the basis of justice of law, to say that the advantages, whatever they may be, that these people have had for thirty years, shall not, by this Dominion government, be taken away from them now.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. Speaker, when you left the chair at six o'clock I had alluded to the fact that there were differences of opinion as to the constitutionality of the Act which has been submitted for the approval of the members of this House. I gave, as far as I understood them, the differing views. Whether I interpreted them aright or not it must be evident to every hon. gentleman present that there is a diversity of opinion when a very able and eminent lawyer whose words were read to us from a telegram this afternoon, speaks of doubts, speaks of the necessity for further consideration and hints that it is possible it may be necessary, in order to supplement section 93 of the British North America Act, that we should have recourse to the powers which parliament may possess to make it plain. If I apprehended him aright that shows that in his opinion it was contemplated that parliament had powers in this matter and that view, in my humble opinion, coincides with what I think to be the facts in the case. But, as I said before I do not intend in any way to argue the constitutional question. I point out this, however, that there being such a conflict of opinion and the authority to whom I have alluded saying that it might be necessary to get a judicial opinion that would require time during which you would have excitement, during which you would have unrest and during which you would not have that peace that is conducive to the prosperity of the Dominion and which would affect, I think, injuriously, the provinces that we are about to bring into the confederation. I think it will be admitted by all who have listened to the arguments that the view which is taken by many is not the correct view to take of the constitution of this Dominion in reference to educational matters.

I have not received many personal communications in reference to this matter. I have received, I think two letters from political friends who are opposed to the measure. I received one memorial from a body of gentlemen whom I hold in the highest respect. To each of these I returned the answer that I have received their communications, that I would give them every consideration, noting their views. As was my bounden duty I have done so. I might read to the House the terms of the resolution that was forwarded to me from that body of whom, I again repeat, I entertain the highest respect. It was that it—

> Desires to enter a vigorous and unqualified protest against the educational clause in the Acts constituting the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, and submits that the legislation proposed to be enacted is contrary to the whole spirit of confederation, which for the good of the whole Dominion, leaves to the control of the provinces such domestic problems as education.

I do not want for one moment to seek to state or insinuate that these gentlemen have not given what they believe to be a correct interpretation according to their contention. I simply say that in obedience to what I have stated I have given it every consideration, I have paid more attention to the British North America Act perhaps during the past few weeks than I had done in many years and I am unable to see eye to eye with these gentlemen when they say that——

> The whole spirit of confederation, which for the good of the whole Dominion, leaves to the control of the provinces such domestic problems as education.

And that it is contrary to the whole spirit of confederation to take another view. When the constitution was framed under which we exist there were certain subjects which were allotted to the local legislatures in which they have absolute and independent power. Others were reserved to the Dominion parliament in which they have absolute and unrestricted power. The question of education, as rightly stated by these gentlemen, is remitted to the local legislatures, but under the British North America Act, that is not given to them, as many other subjects are given to them to be dealt by them exclusively without any reservation whatever. There is a reservation, but the reservation is in the spirit of preserving to the minorities in the various provinces in the confederation the rights they enjoy at the time they enter confederation. Therefore, I repeat again, while having the highest regard for the honesty, yes, and the intelligence of that body of gentlemen who addressed that resolution to me, I am unable honestly to agree with them. My view is different. The whole spirit of confederation, as I understand it in reference to the educational question, is that the local governments may deal—shall deal—with the education question, but they shall do that subject to the restriction that secures the rights of minorities as it is embodied in the constitution that was given to us. The whole spirit of that, I say, is in the direction of securing the rights of the minorities. It was a confederacy of independent provinces that was being formed. It was necessary to secure unity in order that we might have progress and harmony and in order that we might become a nation. Therefore it was, that, finding that there were deep feelings on the subject in some of the provinces which entered confederation at that time, concessions in reference to the matter of education were given and secured to two of the provinces. More than that it was enacted that as respects other provinces entering the union, minorities having had educational privileges or rights prior to their union should have these conserved to them. What has been the result of that? Why, Sir, the fathers of confederation, or some of them, said it would be impossible to form a confederation under any other conditions or stipulations. The Hon. George Brown, who had always been a consistent opponent of separate schools, waived his objections in order to accomplish what he considered the great good of uniting the various provinces of British North America into a grand confederacy which would become, as it has become, the brightest gem in the British Crown; and it is proper to consider the question before us now in the light of promoting the unity, concord, harmony, peace, prosperity and progress of these united provinces which form the Dominion of Canada.

It has been said that the position taken by the government in this matter is wholly contrary to the position which they took in the year 1894 on the Manitoba school question—that then the Liberal party stood for provincial rights. I think it was the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who, the other night, in that aggressive speech of his, pointed out that the Prime Minister, the Postmaster General, the Minister of Finance, had all gone through the country proclaiming that—strong upon it; yes, and that the Minister of Customs had thundered in that direction. Well, Mr. Speaker, just by way of passing, I call to your attention how a noted orator like even my hon. friend from North Toronto is apt to make an inapt illustration. The idea of treating the Minister of Customs' usually placid, calm utterances as thunderings must seem to everybody as very inappropriate indeed.

Mr. FOSTER. I apologize.

Mr. PATERSON. To suggest that the Minister of Customs had pointed out, in his calm though forcible manner, certain

things, would have been correct. With the other gentlemen to whom my hon. friend has alluded, I was against the coercion of Manitoba ; I said it would be an infringement of provincial rights—why ? Because I did not sympathize with the minority ? No. Why, then ? For the same reason that actuated the other gentlemen and actuated the Liberal party. It had been declared by the court of last resort, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, that, as it seemed to the minority in that province, their rights had been abrogated by the Bill that had been passed by the Manitoba legislature, but that nevertheless the Manitoba legislature had acted within its powers, that, acting within its powers, it must be the judge, and that therefore it was inexpedient and would be against provincial rights, to pass a law in the Dominion parliament which would set aside, override, supercede, legislation passed by a provincial legislature which was entirely within its competence. That, Sir, was the reason we opposed interference. Now, I have not read what I said on that occasion, if it is recorded anywhere ; I have not had time. I have not even read the utterances of other gentlemen, as some of the hon. gentlemen opposite have done ; but if there are any recorded utterances of mine, I have no doubt that they will be found to be in the direction in which I have spoken. That position I took, and for that position I contended ; and in supporting this Bill, am I taking back anything I said at that time ? Am I in a position different from what I was in at that time ? Am I now an opponent of provincial rights ? Am I now supporting the Bill to override an enactment passed by a legislature having full competence to pass that enactment ? Nothing of the kind. There is no such proposition ; the cases are not parallel. Find the strongest utterance you can, made by any member of the Liberal party in defence of the provincial rights of Manitoba and the decision of the Privy Council, and you will find it none too strong, unless it was couched in offensive language, as I trust none was. But to claim, as we heard it claimed this afternoon, that the present measure is an invasion of provincial rights, is something that I cannot understand. What law of the Territories that are about to become provinces are we seeking to override ? It is said : you are passing a law—which is true. But what law of the Territories are we passing a law to do away with ?

Mr. LALOR. A law to do away with provincial rights.

Mr. PATERSON. The answer of the hon. gentleman is not a correct answer, and therefore I must ask again. Suppose I try the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) ; he would give me a different answer to that, I think. What are we doing ? We have submitted a Bill for the consideration of this House—what for ? To override legislation enacted by the Territories ? To wipe out and do away with laws which they have passed ? Will any hon. gentleman say that we are ? Most undoubtedly not. Do you say to me : but you are passing a law to continue an Act that is on the statute-book of the Territories. I say, yes, but who passed that Act ? This Dominion parliament ? No ; Premier Haultain, his government, and the members of the Northwest assembly. It is their Act. There is chapter 29, chapter 30, chapter 31, passed of their own free motion by the representatives of the people in the Territories. And what are we proposing to do ? What hon. gentlemen opposite wanted us to do in the Manitoba case—to repeal that, to abrogate it ? No ; simply to continue it. Talk about Mr. Haultain not having been consulted. He says he was consulted twice ; but if he had never been consulted, if no Northwest member had ever been consulted, I ask, what better indication can you have of the desires of the people of the Northwest Territories than their own legislation ? It may be said that Mr. Haultain has stated that he thinks this question should be left to the provincial legislature. But, if correctly reported, when asked : if it were left to the legislatures of the provinces when constituted, would they change the law ? His answer was, if I remember rightly : 'If I were a dictator to-morrow, I would not change it.' Yet these gentlemen talk about provincial rights being invaded by this Bill. Amid all the doubts and uncertainties that our constitutional lawyers in this House and outside of this House present, in reference to ascertaining what are the facts of the case, if, as I believe, from advice which I have received from men in whose legal knowledge I have confidence we have the power under the amendment to the British North America Act of 1871 to pass this law which we have submitted for the approval of this House and if this Bill simply provides for the continuance of the law which was passed by the men who represented the Northwest Territories three years ago, and which has been in existence for three years without, so far as I am aware, any man having lifted up his voice against it, is it not better to deal with this question now, to settle this question in this way, rather than to leave it open to be a very possible cause of discord, and a means of holding back the prosperity and the progress of this Dominion ?

Objection is taken to this law by friends in other provinces. Why ? Because they say that the law passed by the Territories provides for separate schools—and so it does. And this Dominion parliament in 1875 said that there should be privileges given to minorities, whether Protestant or Catholic, in the country to form separate schools if they so desired. That Act, passed under

the Mackenzie administration, a Liberal administration, was consolidated and re-enacted, as the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Brodeur) read this afternoon, in 1880 under Sir John Macdonald's government. For thirty years, this legislation has been enjoyed by these people. It was consolidated again and went into effect in 1902, three years ago. This is the law which was embodied in the Bill which is now before the House and which if this Bill passes will secure to the minorities in those provinces the rights that are given to them in the legislation contained in the laws which the assembly of those Territories enacted. Let us stop for a moment or two, to consider this question of separate schools. In the School Act, which is the first Act in that book, there are 180 sections and five sections out of that 180 deal with this question of separate schools—five and five only. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) in his argument this afternoon based his objection wholly on the fact that he objects to church schools, or as he calls them, denominational schools under the direction and control of the church and he pictured to us a condition of things——

Mr. SPROULE. I did not base my argument on any such contention. I based my argument upon the rights of the provinces to deal with education and said that I had no concern with what they did, that I would give them whatever kind of schools they liked.

Mr. PATERSON. Quite so. And I do not wish to misrepresent the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule), but when he was drawn out by a direct question from this side of the House he had to admit that the schools provided for in these Acts are not church schools. But why did he picture to us all the evils that had resulted from church schools in other countries and in other provinces? Why was it that he complained of what he was pleased to call separate schools that were church schools in other provinces when we were not discussing the system of separate schools in other provinces, but were debating the condition of the schools in the Territories which are about to become provinces? That is the question.

I think it would be perhaps worth while that I should hurriedly give to the House a portion of the law, particularly the sections of the Bill which the Bill now before us will continue as the law of the Territories. First as to the constitution of the Department of Education. Let there be no clouding of this question. The Territories did not enact church schools; they enacted state schools, national schools in every sense of the word.

There shall be a department of the public service of the Territories called the Department of Education over which the member of the Executive Council appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, under the seal of the Territories to discharge the functions of the Commissioner of Education for the time being shall preside.

The department shall have the control and management of all kindergarten schools, public and separate schools, normal schools, teachers' institutes and the education of deaf, deaf mute and blind persons.

A minister, one of the ministers of the government shall have control of that and that minister or commissioner as he is called, with the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, shall have power to make regulations of the department.

The commissioner, with the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, shall have power:

1. To make regulations of the department—
(a) For the classification, organization, government, examination and inspection of all schools hereinbefore mentioned;
(b) For the construction, furnishing and care of school buildings and the arrangement of school premises;
(c) For the examination, licensing and grading of teachers and for the examination of persons who may desire to enter professions or who may wish certificates of having completed courses of study in any school;
(d) For a teachers' reading course and teachers' institutes and conventions;
2. To authorize text and reference books for the use of the pupils and teachers in all schools hereinbefore mentioned as well as such maps, globes, charts and other apparatus or equipment as may be required for giving proper instruction in such schools;
3. To prepare a list of books suitable for school libraries and to make regulations for the management of such libraries.
4. To make due provision for the training of teachers.

The whole control of all these subjects is under the direction of a responsible minister of the Crown. Gentlemen who have these ordinances in their hands, on reading them will, I have no doubt, come to the conclusion that I have myself come to, that these are national schools in every sense of the word. I have said that there is provision for schools for the minority in accordance with the rights which they have enjoyed for 30 years, the rights given them by this very Dominion parliament under a Liberal government. What are they? They are set forth in sections 41 to 45. Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, if I read them for I think they are worth reading. Again I would remark that there are only five out of 180 sections that deal with this subject.

The minority of the ratepayers in any district, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish a separate school therein; and in such case the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate school shall be liable only to assessments of such rates as they impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

The petition for the erection of a separate school district shall be signed by three resident ratepayers of the religious faith indicated in the name of the proposed district ; and shall be in the form prescribed by the commissioner. The persons qualified to vote for or against the erection of a separate school district shall be the ratepayers in the district of the same religious faith, Protestants or Roman Catholic as the petitioners.

The notice calling a meeting of the ratepayers for the purpose of taking their votes on the petition for the erection of a separate school district shall be in the form prescribed by the commissioner, and the proceedings subsequent to the posting of such notice shall be the same as prescribed in the formation of public school districts.

After the establishment of a separate school district under the provisions of this ordinance, such separate school district and the board thereof shall possess and exercise all rights, powers, privileges and be subject to the same liabilities and method of government as is herein provided in respect of public school districts.

Any person who is legally assessed or assessable for a public school will not be liable to assessment for any separate school established therein.

My right hon. colleague, the Prime Minister, in introducing the Bill said its object was to secure to the minority what they now enjoy, namely, the right to have their own schools, to assess themselves for the cost of these schools, and to receive their equitable and proportionate share of the public grants for school purposes. My hon. colleague, the Minister of Justice, also declared that to be the object and intent of the Bill. It was contended, however, by some that there might be a broader construction placed upon the general Bill than was intended, as explained by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice, and to meet that objection, the clauses were amended so as to re-enact the existing provisions of the law and thus prevent any dispute in the future. It must be borne in mind that those separate schools are formed precisely as every school district is formed. Although the name separate school appears to convey to the minds of some people the impression that they are separate in the sense in which they are established in some other province, there is no distinction between these schools and the other public schools as regards organization, or the qualification of teachers, or the text books, or the right of state to inspection, or in the reports they have to make. In every respect they are under the commissioner of education in absolutely the same manner as is every other public school in the Territories. All they get is what? If they desire it, provided they have the requisite number of children of school age, they may upon petitioning the commissioners be permitted by them to erect a school district, pay for it out of their own pockets, and get only their share of the money they contribute. Is not that fair? Is there anything wrong or unjust in that? Point out to me if you can anything more fair. Oh, but you tell me, they may give religious instruction in these schools. Very true, but let us read the clauses. There are three sections dealing with that subject and I shall read them:

137. No religious instruction except as hereinafter provided, shall be permitted in the school of any district from the opening of such school until one-half hour previous to its closing in the afternoon, after which time any such instruction permitted or desired by the board may be given.

138. Any child shall have the privilege of leaving the school-room at the time at which religious instruction is commenced as provided in the next preceding section or of remaining without taking part in any religious instruction may be given, if the parent or guardians so desire.

139. No teacher, school trustee or inspector, shall in any way attempt to deprive such child of any advantage that it may derive from the ordinary education given in such school, and any such action on the part of any school trustee, inspector or teacher shall be held to be a disqualification for and a voidance of the office held by him.

These are all the sections of the Act, as far as I am aware, that relate to public instruction. In the separate schools from nine o'clock in the morning until noon and from 1.30 until 3.30 p.m. no religious instruction is to be given to the children. Precisely the same course of study that is followed in the public schools is to be followed in these schools ; but when the hour of 3.30 p.m. arrives, if the trustees of the separate school desire, religious instruction may then be given to the youth therein. Is that a concession made particularly to our Roman Catholic brethren ? Why, the same clauses apply to every school, Protestant, public and every other. No special right, no special permission is given the separate schools which is withheld from the other. Shall it be made a reproach to our Roman Catholic brethren that it be a matter of conscience with them, that they instil into the minds of their youth the principles of the Christian religion? Is that something to be deplored? The trustees of any school may avail themselves of those clauses and have religious instruction given to the pupils. I do not wish to intrude my personal views upon this House, but speaking for myself alone, I would desire if it could be accomplished—and it seems to me that it ought not to be impossible in these days of broad-minded charity among the various denominations—that some agreement might be come to under which certain portions of the Bible might be read and studied in the public schools of these Territories, if the trustees so desire. I am very sure that no child would be injured thereby. I am quite sure that no harm would thereby be caused any of the thousands of people now going into that country, many more or less indif-

ferent with regard to these matters—indifferent, not hostile—and who possibly do not read to their children from that Book which I think we all agree will make any man that studies it and follows its precepts a good citizen. I am sure we all agree that any one who studies that Book cannot be an ignorant man, and that if he follows its precepts he cannot be a bad citizen. If we believe, as I think we do, that it is righteousness which exalts a nation, who will say that it is wrong to have during the half hour at the closing of the school portions of that Book taught and read to the children?

Will it be worse for them if they know the Ten Commandments? Will it be worse for them if they know the sermon on the mount in which is contained the golden rule? Or the fifteenth psalm that describes what a citizen ought to be. If it be desirable—as it is—that during the Sabbath afternoon, the children should be brought together in order to teach them these things, can it be wrong—if it can be agreed upon—that during half an hour in the afternoon of five other days of the week they should have the same instruction? I do not seek to obtrude my own personal views, I speak for myself alone. But I trust that that spirit will take possession of the men in the western country, and that, instead of repining or complaining if our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, in obedience to their conscience, give religious instruction to their youth, they also will devise means whereby religious instruction may be given in the schools. As I have said, I am aware of the difficulties that in the past, have prevented this being accomplished. But I do think that, with the spirit of charity that is abroad, and with many Protestants seeking means for a concerted movement in this direction, it would be well worth their while at any rate to give the matter some consideration. There have been noble men, Canadians of French extraction, who have laboured in the Northwest as missionaries in days gone by; and there have been grand Protestant clergymen who have engaged in the same work, believing that it is the duty of Canadians to establish the Christian religion in that country as the foundation of its institutions. Many a time have I heard such a view expressed publicly and at least once in my own home by one who has passed away, but whose memory is revered, one who was a noble patriot if ever there was one—that the great object to be sought in the Northwest Territories was to follow with religious ordinances the population pouring in there, so that they might become a great people and enduring power in the state. I say that I for one have no objections; nay more, I am glad to find, that it is proposed to continue such a law in the Northwest to give permission to the trustees of each school, public or separate, to have such religious instruction as may be desired given during that half hour. Yet, it is provided that the children of parents—if such there be—who cannot approve of the teaching given have the privilege of withdrawing their children while that instruction is in progress. No man's conscience can be offended in the least. And the further provision is made, lest, perchance the possible case might arise of an inspector, or school trustee or teacher seeking to place the child so withdrawn by his parents during that half hour at a disadvantage because of that withdrawal, that such an Act would be an offence subjecting the one guilty of it to summary loss of his office. So, there is eminently safe provision made. In these provisions I find that which not only I do not disapprove but that which meets my cordial approval.

I was pleased to receive the resolution forwarded to me by the gentleman who acted as secretary on the occasion when it was adopted. He accompanied it with a personal letter to myself. The writer is a reverend gentleman whose personal friend I should deem it an honour to be considered. I believe he is also a political friend of the party in power. I cannot give the exact words, but he said in effect that he was not disposed to blame the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)—though he did not approve of this measure, of course—as some were disposed to do; but he was disposed to blame the members of the cabinet from Ontario. What are they doing? he said. I find Mr. Stapleton Caldecott, who presided at the meeting at Toronto in his opening remarks wanted to know where the Ontario members of the cabinet were on this question; were they favourable, or were they unfavourable? Well, I had supposed that Mr. Stapleton Caldecott knew enough of constitutional procedure to know that when the Ontario members of the cabinet remained in the cabinet after the measure had been proposed, he could pretty well know, or at least guess, where they were on that question.

Mr. FOSTER. Not now-a-days.

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. Caldecott stated that, while he had been a great admirer of the Prime Minister and his supporter, he must confess that he had lost respect for his judgment. When a gentleman like that did not know that the presence in the cabinet of the ministers of Ontario was an indication that they approved the measure, perhaps the loss of his respect for the Prime Minister's judgment on a constitutional question was not so serious a matter that it ought to break my right hon. friend's heart? Mr. Caldecott is a friend of ours, no doubt. But that leads me to remark upon something that has been more

than once hinted at rather forcibly by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). There is and has been an attempt in this House to weaken the influence and disparage the judgment of the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). In days gone by we were accustomed to hear from the other side of the House at times, and in the press, descriptions of the right hon. leader of this government being little more than clay that was moulded in the hands of some stronger man or men in his cabinet. Now the tune is entirely changed. My hon. friend from North Toronto, describing him the other day, and he was very indignant about it, said that that his conduct was like that of a Czar, who introduced a measure without consulting his colleagues, and who does whatever he pleases.

Mr. FOSTER. The strong men have departed.

Mr. PATERSON. Very well. I am dealing with the hon. gentlemen's estimate of the Prime Minister. The hon. gentleman complains that the Prime Minister alone is responsible for that Bill, and that his colleagues had, you might infer that from his statement, to accept it. Is it a fault in the eyes of the hon. member for North Toronto that we have a strong man at the head of the government? Does the hon. gentleman remember that a few years ago there was a government with which he was in perfect accord on all questions of policy, and on all intended measures that were to be introduced—thoroughly in accord, a united and happy party? But unfortunately the strong leader was not at their head, and the hon. gentleman and six others withdrew. Well, now, if we have got a strong man at the head of the government, and we have——

Mr. FOSTER. Some of you have found it so.

Mr. PATERSON—he ought to be very glad that such is the case. It is true that we have a strong man at the head of the government, but he never forgets to avail himself of the counsel of his colleagues, and to treat them with the utmost courtesy. We have a strong man, he has his views, and the very fact that he is known to be a strong man is the reason why his political opponents desire his overthrow and the overthrow of his government. If they can weaken the man that is a tower of strength to the party, then they weaken the party, and they hope to be able by that means to attain power. They say that he has lost the confidence of the Liberal party, that the Liberal party have lost the confidence of thousands and tens of thousands of their supporters on account of the introduction of this measure. It is true that many staunch and sterling men of character, integrity and honour in the Liberal party, who, I believe, desire well for the Liberal party, have not been able to see eye to eye with us on this question. That has been a source of sorrow and of grief to us, as it must be to any one, for we value the esteem and friendship of our fellow citizens, especially of those who have given us their confidence in times gone by. If the prediction made by a gentleman at the Toronto meeting comes true that if this Bill is put through it should consign to political extinction the Prime Minister and his government and of every member of parliament that votes for it—if that be true—and the gentleman who made the prediction at this meeting no doubt thought he was speaking the truth, then are we not entitled to credit in voting for this Bill, believing in our conscience that it is our duty to do so, even in face of this threatened extinction? It seems to me there is nothing for us to be ashamed of in that.

Mr. KEMP. May I ask the hon. gentleman who said that at the Toronto meeting?

Mr. PATERSON. Will you take the 'World's' report for it? It says that in speaking to his motion, Mr. E. E. Thomson, K.C., said so and so, and wound up with these words:

> If this thing were to be consummated, the righteous judgment of an outraged people should be the total and irrevocable political extinction of the government, and of every member of the parliament guilty of this betrayal of the public confidence.

And he concluded amid loud cheers. Well, he may be right, that may be so. But surely it must be admitted that if we proceed in face of warnings of that kind, we ought to be given credit, at any rate, for believing that we are doing what is right. Another gentleman spoke at that meeting, and he uttered a sentiment that I think was hardly proper and which I regretted to see coming from him. He said that the introduction of this Bill tended to promote racial and religious strife. According to this gentleman, that could only be averted by withdrawing this Bill and then this vexed question of race and religion would be eliminated altogether. He said:

> Our one great national problem is to unite our various creeds and nationalities in one common patriotism. If we fail now to do our utmost to insure the unity of race and creed in the new provinces, we shall be guilty of deliberate treason to the commonwealth. We are here to-night to ask the Ottawa politicians and the Quebec ecclesiastics to mind their own business.

Mr. KEMP. Who said that, may I inquire?

Mr. PATERSON. I did not wish to give his name, but I find this in the 'Mail' report of Mr. Willison's speech at Toronto.

Mr. FOSTER. He is the writer of the life of your leader.

Mr. PATERSON. And could my hon. friend who has interrupted me desire a greater honour to be conferred upon him than that Mr. Willison should be able to write such a life of him ? But I call your attention to that extract for the reason that the hon. gentleman who became so indignant last night with my hon. friend the Minister of Finance when he pointed out to them what their course meant and what, in his judgment, it was leading to, were rebuked. These things should not be said. Here is a gentleman who takes the view, or who states, that if we fail now to do our utmost to ensure the unity of the races who are crowding into those new provinces, we shall be guilty of treason to the commonwealth, and yet who proposes, as a means of cementing that unity between these different peoples of the Northwest, to take away from the minority the rights which they have had for thirty years. Sir, I care not what these men say.

An hon. MEMBER. Louder.

Mr. PATERSON. I will speak loud enough. I am not like the hon. gentleman ; when I have anything to say I am not afraid to speak it out. There are men in the Liberal party, grand men, excellent men, who have my esteem, and who will have my esteem even if they leave the party and feel that they cannot continue longer with us, because they think that we are wrong in this matter. I think when they thoroughly understand this Bill, when the past is past, when we enjoy that peace and unity that will prevail, and that progress and prosperity which will result, as we believe they will revise their opinions. But, whether they are able to do so or not, their views will be respected by me. I will give them credit for conscientiousness ; but I do think this, that if they had calmly considered the question, some of them, limited in their number, grand men, who, in the heat of their feelings on this question and viewing it from their standpoint, have uttered certain things against the right hon. Prime Minister of this Dominion, will regret themselves having said, for instance, that he has departed from the principles that he advocated in days gone by, that he has sacrificed the principles that he declared to be good and that he would ever stand by. While I regret that it is the case that such statements have been made, I only wish, in conclusion, to say this, if my words will carry any weight and my judgment is worth anything in this country, where for two and thirty years I have had the honour, which I value, of a constituency returning me as their representative, if, speaking from the knowledge I have of thirty of these years spent as a fellow-member in this House with the Prime Minister of Canada, eighteen years with him in opposition, eight years honoured by him as a colleague, necessarily brought into the most intimate relations with him—I say, if my words will carry weight, if my words will influence men who may for the time being, perhaps in the heat of their feelings, have uttered the ungenerous words, that, speaking out of the knowledge of the man that I have, Sir Wilfrid Laurier is, in my opinion, as he long has been, the one man pre-eminent above all other men that this Dominion has produced in cementing the nationality of the people of Canada.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, it is hardly necessary for one who speaks in this House after my good friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) to assure the House that he will be moderate, because there is something in the tone of my hon. friend, even when he gives utterance to the mildest thoughts, which leads one to believe that he is a man of such violent type that it is impossible to reach the the high vocal pitch he has done himself in propounding his opinions. But I notice that my good friend the Minister of Customs, although he spoke in a very deep voice, spoke somewhat low when he assured the House that this measure, which is being introduced to protect the minority in the Northwest Territories, was absolutely harmless, contained nothing which would in any way trench upon the rights of the majority, and that the importance of that enactment had been very much exaggerated, because it contained very little. My hon. friend's voice was very deep, but it was hardly lower than that of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) last night when he made the startling announcement that so trifling were the concessions we gave that the schools which this Bill was intended to create would almost infallibly disappear before long. My attention has been drawn, Mr. Speaker, to a caricature in to-day's Montreal 'Herald,' at which I feel very much offended. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) is represented as sitting on a wharf with a fish basket. At one side of him is the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) with a fish on the end of his line, and on the other side myself with another fish. We are both supposed to be fishing on each side of the wharf different kinds of fish that are called petitions, in order to put them into the basket held by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. The only difference between myself and my hon. friend from East Grey is that I have a tall hat on and he has a Christy stiff. It will be for the hon. member for East Grey to clear himself of this imputation, but for my part I can say positively that during the course of the present discussion I have fished for no petitions in the province of Quebec, and indeed I may say that I think this caricature would perhaps be more properly applied to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance and my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, from what they have said in their speeches in explanation of the measure which is now

before the House. I think it is necessary for me to explain, as briefly as possible, the reasons which have led me to oppose the amendment which has been offered to the main motion for the second reading of this Bill. I will do so as briefly as I possibly can. I feel very little guilt in connection with what, to my mind, has been a very needless agitation over this question. After the general election of 1896 the Conservative party held a meeting in the city of Montreal, of which some notice was taken in the Montreal 'Gazette' on the following morning. At that meeting, held subsequent to the general election, I declared for my part I would not in the future discuss the school question. I have adhered to that resolution, and on no occasion, at any meeting which I have attended, and I have attended a great many in the province of Quebec and elsewhere, have I ventured to mention that much vexed question.

It has been discussed in my presence by representatives of both parties, but I have stood firm to my resolution. I have not discussed it on any occasion; and if, indeed, it were not necessary that I should state what are the reasons which have separated me on some points from the majority of those who sit on this side of the House, I would be perfectly satisfied to give a silent vote on this question; because, Sir, I consider that it is an unfortunate thing that this question has been discussed with so much passion in public. I believe that many of the mischievous—I cannot call them by any other term—mischievous utterances which have been made on the subject of these Bills, have been the result of ignorance as to the real state of affairs in connection with the proposed legislation; and I sincerely believe that when the question has been fully looked into—I agree to that extent with my hon. friend the Minister of Finance—and all sides of it properly weighed, at any rate as regards the educational aspect of the question, the people of Canada will come to the conclusion that in the concessions granted, and the effort made by this parliament to create conditions of justice and equity in the Northwest, the practical result is not one of very great importance. That, at any rate, is my view of the subject. It is, I admit, an important subject in the principles which are to govern us in our decision of the question. It is important, no doubt, that one should state for what reason one gives a vote which may appear strange; but at the same time I think a great deal too much has been made of the extent to which parliament has been asked to go in connection with this legislation. Let me at once call the attention of the House to the seriousness of a statement made last night by the Minister of Finance. To my mind this is a question upon which every man can have a free and independent opinion without in any way alienating his co-religionists of different creed. I am pleased to say, and I desire to acknowledge, that in the words that fell from the hon. leader of the opposition last night—and I followed him very attentively—there was not one word which it seems to me could shock any man of any creed in the province of Quebec or elsewhere. He was led by logical deductions to the conclusions at which he arrived; and, Sir, I am proud to say, so far as I may represent public opinion in my own province, that there is one thing which we learn early in our schools, and that is, to respect absolutely the convictions of all of our fellow citizens. I am sorry to say that I do not think that part of our curriculum is to be found in all the other schools of the country. But when the Minister of Finance went so far as to say that in the event of the Prime Minister not being able to carry this measure through the House, and of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition being called upon to form a cabinet, the cabinet which he would form would necessarily have a purely religious colour, and would be a Protestant administration, I do think my hon. friend the Minister of Finance went quite beyond the bounds which anything which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition said could in any sense justify.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING. Will my hon. friend permit me to say that I did not attribute any remark of any kind to the hon. leader of the opposition in that relation. I expressed my own opinion as to the circumstances surrounding the whole case.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend spoke of that conclusion to which he himself had arrived as being the legitimate conclusion of the observations made by the hon. leader of the opposition.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend will allow me, I will at once say that I certainly did not mean to do so, and I am satisfied that I did not do so. I had no such thought, for I was not referring to anything the leader of the opposition said in any way. I am sorry to interrupt my hon. friend.

Mr. MONK. I am glad to hear my hon. friend say so. My hon. friend no doubt sympathizes with those who, perhaps not very readily, have arrived at the conclusion to which he arrived yesterday, to support this educational measure; because, if rumours are well founded, my hon. friend himself experienced very great difficulty in arriving at that conclusion before he spoke.

Mr. FIELDING. Not the least.

Mr. MONK. There was nothing in what my hon. friend said which indicated that state of mind; but my hon. friend knows what has been the public rumour. One of my hon. friend's friends stated to me

yesterday that the Minister of Finance was a wonderful swimmer, but that he had to be thrown into the water. I realize, with some degree of fear, that this debate may be protracted to a considerable length, and I wish to indicate as briefly as possible to the House through what mental process I have passed, if I may use that expression, in order to arrive at the conclusion at which I have arrived in respect to this measure. The question has been treated from a constitutional standpoint, and certainly it ought to be treated from that standpoint, since the very grounds on which we are legislating in this affair are constitutional grounds. I submit, in addition, that it must be looked at from a political standpoint—I say political in altogether the highest sense of the word. But, taking the constitutional standpoint, the House will permit me to say in what sense I understand that we are called upon to act, and how I interpret the three constitutional Acts which serve as the foundation for our legislation, and which must be read together. We have the Confederation Act of 1867, the Act of 1871 and the Act of 1886—all imperial Acts without which we have no jurisdiction whatever. Under section 3 of the last imperial Act, the amendment of 1886, these three Acts must be read together. I will not quote the sections; it would be imposing upon the attention of the House. But according to the Constitutional Act of 1867, from the very first section, it is evident that the scheme of the framers of our constitution was that the provinces should be associated together with an absolutely equal division of powers. It never entered into the minds of the framers of those Acts, particularly the Act of 1867, nor even into the minds of those who laid the foundations of that Act in the Quebec conference, that there should be the slightest inequality between the provinces. You will see that if you look at the Act of 1867, from section 58 to section 91.

Read section 91 and section 92 (which are the two most important sections in regard to the definition of the field of legislation), read section 93, section 109, section 146, and section 147 and you will come to the conclusion that the main object of the imperial legislature was to unite the varied provinces together and to distribute among those provinces, with the most absolute measure of equality, the different powers which were assigned to each. It is impossible to read these Acts and not arrive at the conclusion that this is the proposition which is the outcome of the efforts made by the imperial legislature in the direction of confederation. The plan of confederation itself rests upon the absolute equality, the equal division of powers between all the provinces, parties to confederation. Any variation, however small, from this rule is destructive of the fundamental principle of our constitution.

Section 146 which provides for the admission of other provinces into the Dominion upon the Order in Council of the home government, especially declares that the admission of those other provinces of Prince Edward Island and British Columbia and Newfoundland is to be done by the mere operation of an imperial Order in Council are which shall bring those provinces into confederation, subject to all the dispositions of the Confederation Act. This was so very well understood at the very inception that we find British Columbia first of all entering into confederation by the operation of section 146 by the mere passage of an Order in Council bringing the province into confederation and touching in no respect whatever upon any of the powers which are to be attributed to the new provinces or upon any of those powers then lying in the lap of the new province and which were by necessary inplication to be transferred to the Dominion. It is undeniable that when British Columbia and Prince Edward Island were brought into confederation, no other mention was made of the Order in Council which brought these provinces into confederation but this that they came in with a certain representation in parliament, stipulated and agreed upon between the Dominion government and the provincial powers, but as to a distribution of powers nothing whatever is said; reference is simply made to section 146 of the Confederation Act. It is there declared that these provinces come into the Dominion subject to that distribution of powers which, according to my interpretation of our constitution, acts automatically the moment the province enters the Dominion.

In the case of Manitoba there were special circumstances. Manitoba did not enter confederation under the ordinary rule. It was an exceptional case, and the terms upon which that province entered the Dominion were the subject of a special agreement between the representatives of that then part of the Northwest Territories and the Dominion government. An Act was passed beforehand by this parliament in order to create that province with certain rights, certain broad possibilities, and the charter of Manitoba is so little founded upon that Act of our own parliament and that Act was so clearly, in the judgment of competent lawyers, ultra vires, that it became necessary to pass in England the Imperial Act of 1871 which is really the charter of Manitoba, so that Manitoba did not enter the confederation under the same machinery as that provided for other parts of British North America. Its charter is a special one, and it is taken altogether out of the ordinary rule with regard to its entering

into confederation. These provinces, Sir, are to be created under a section of that Act of 1871, passed mainly in order to validate our own Manitoba legislation, and to the second section of which Act I wish to call your attention particularly. The second section of the Imperial Statutes of 1871 amending the Confederation Act says :

> The parliament of Canada may from time to time establish new provinces in any territories forming for the time being part of the Dominion of Canada, but not included in any province thereof, and may, at time of establishment, make provision for the constitution and administration of any such province, and for the passing of laws for the peace, order and good government of such province, and for its representation in the said parliament.

Now, that section is of some length. It is the only section under which we are empowered to act. It is in virtue of the powers conferred upon us by the imperial parliament by this section that we are creating this province. It is known, Mr. Speaker, to many members of this House that a popular impression exists to the effect that this parliament has the power of creating provinces and that at the time of the creation of provinces it can give those provinces such a constitution as it thinks fit. That is the popular impression and that impression is created no doubt in the minds of many by the reading of this section. But is that proposition well founded ? I think not ; I do not think there is anything in this section which authorizes us, in creating a province, to give any constitutional aspect to that province. We are not called upon to give it a constitution, we simply perform, if I may use that expression, a creative Act ; we create the province, the constitutional Act of 1867 provides the rest. That is how I read this section. It is true that in this section the words 'establish' and then 'constitute,' and then 'administer' are used. But what do these words mean ? There is one thing it seems to me that they do not mean. It is this, that in creating a province we can in any way vary the terms relating to the powers of that province that have been laid down in a uniform and definite manner by our Constitutional Act of 1867, and that is the reason which no doubt has led many and has induced probably the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) to arrive at the conclusion that we have no power in creating a province to make any disposition in regard to that province as far as educational matters are concerned, because if when creating a province we can give to that province a particular educational system we can equally confer upon this province other powers, for instance, those which are mentioned in section 92 of the Constitutional Act. We could deprive the province of a part of these powers. We can confer upon the province powers which it has not under the Confederation Act, which are enumerated under section 91 as belonging to the Dominion parliament alone, and that is, no doubt, the reason which has led many to conclude that we have no power under section 2 which I have just read to the House but that of creating a province, automatically come into force and are applied the dispositions of the Confederation Act limiting strictly the powers of the province and on the other side defining the extent of the powers of the Dominion parliament.

What is the sense which one must attribute to the words 'establish, constitute and administer.' To my mind it is clear that these words were used by the draughtsman for the purpose of giving to the Dominion parliament, when carving provinces out of the Northwest Territories, the powers necessary to perform fully all the functions of the creative act. We decree for instance that a province will be established. The word 'constitute' means that we define the limits of the province, that we declare what it will comprise, when it will come into existence and other details which are all comprised in the word 'constitute,' and we further have the power to administer that province until these automatic provisions of the Confederation Act come into operation, by which a power superior to our own has provided what will be the political constitution of the province. Otherwise if you once pretend that the words of the statute confer upon this parliament the power to modify in any way, what will be the political constitution and the attribution of the new provinces, where will you end ? Suppose to-morrow we should carve a province out of the Yukon, could we, in creating that province, declare that the minerals shall remain the property of the Dominion power ? Could we declare that the lands would remain in our possession ? I hold we could not, and that the only power we have is to create the province ? That however is my own individual opinion. It is the opinion of a lawyer, and we all know that lawyers differ very considerably, particularly on consitutional points. For instance my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, in defining the constitutional position he takes with regard to this Bill, gave it as his opinion, if I mistake not, that section 93 of the Confederation Act does not apply to the new provinces coming into the Dominion without any previous provincial organization, and consequently did not apply to provinces created by ourselves under the Imperial Act of 1871 and carved out of the Northwest Territories. I cannot, after a careful examination of section 93, agree in that conclusion, although I believe it is shared by gentlemen eminent in the legal profession. I believe that at the moment a province is created, even if it did not possess beforehand full legis-

lative autonomy, even if it did not enter confederation as an independent province, it falls ipso facto under the provision of section 93, and whatever rights in school matters the minority in that province may possess at the moment of its creation are preserved by virtue of that section. That is the way I read section 93 and I think the terms are extremely general. Subsection 1 of section 93—which is a section of very great importance in the determination of this question says :

> Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the time of the union.

Doubt might exist if instead of those very general words, the words used were 'which any class of persons possess by virtue of a provincial law or a law passed by the legislature of the province' or other such words clearly indicating that the legislators had in view exclusively the case of the entry into confederation of a province having full possession, previous to such entry, of its entire autonomy. But the words are extremely general. They speak of the rights with respect to denominational schools which any persons have by law within the limits of the province at the union. I therefore arrive at the conclusion that the moment a province is erected in the Northwest and that within the territorial limits of that province there exists a law passed by competent authority securing certain rights to any class of persons with regard to denominational schools, those rights are preserved by the mere fact of that territory coming as a province within the limits of the Dominion. That is the opinion I have, and much of the conclusions at which I have arrived in respect of this question is the result of that opinion. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) asks me if I consider the words 'establish, constitute, coming in,' to be all synonymous. My interpretation of section 2 of the Imperial Act of 1871 is that that Act clearly gives us the creative power. It enables us to decree the establishment of a province, to constitute it by defining its limits and entering into other details which are absolutely necessary for the purpose of such creation, but the moment that act has been performed our power is exhausted and the new province comes under the control of the different clauses of the Act of 1867, and these clauses apply in their entirety to it. Will the House permit me to give an example in another field. Take the question of the lands. It seems to me that in the new Bill now submitted for second reading, we have gone entirely beyond our power as regards the lands. Why ? Because under section 109 of the Confederation Act all lands, minerals, and royalties of every kind in every province are absolutely the property of the province and not of the Dominion. And in legislating as we have done with regard to these lands, in withholding from these new provinces the whole of their lands, for a consideration it is true, but keeping the lands entirely in our possession we are legislating ultra vires, we are decreeing what we have no right to do ; and not only as an act of policy, as a political act, but as a constitutional act, those Bills are absolutely in violation of the constitution.

Mr. BELCOURT. Are we to assume then that the Manitoba Act, which was in terms practically the same as this Act, which declared the ungranted lands of that province to remain subject to the control of the Dominion government, was ultra vires ?

Mr. MONK. As I stated a moment ago, the Manitoba Act itself was ultra vires—was so considered by the legal advisers of the Crown in England—and in order to make it valid it was necessary to pass the Imperial Act of 1871.

Mr. LEMIEUX. To remove doubts.

Mr. MONK. That is the preamble that my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) is citing. But, if he will go to the sources, he will find that there was a very strong opinion in England and also here—I believe it was shared by Mr. Blake—that we had no right. It validated the section to which my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) has referred.

Mr. BELCOURT. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) will not contend that any one questioned at that time or since that the Act was ultra vires in respect of the lands. The necessity of the Imperial Act, as I understand, was in reference to other matters, to remove doubts in reference to other matters than the lands.

Mr. MONK. It did not arise in that case. There was, as I stated, an agreement between Manitoba that was to be and the Dominion, and the lands clause to which my hon. friend has just referred was the outcome of that agreement. At any rate, it was never questioned before the courts. As my hon. friend, no doubt, is aware, this question has come before the courts in many instances and the interpretation given by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council upon section 109, to which I have referred, has always been favourable to the provinces, and has gone very far in the direction of maintaining that all public lands, whatever may be the source of the ownership of the public lands, once the province is created, fall under provincial control. A case arose in the province of Quebec, the case of Fraser who died without leaving a will, and without heirs. My hon. friend (Mr. Belcourt) is familiar with that case.

It was the case of the Attorney General of Quebec against the Attorney General of the Dominion. It was held in the province of Quebec, that, under section 109, the lands in dispute reverted to the Crown in right of the province. In the courts of the province of Quebec they held that upon the ground that, as the province had the exclusive right to legislate in regard to property and civil rights, it followed as a consequence that it might have legislated equally in regard to these lands, and consequently that these lands were the property of the province. And that judgment went through the courts and was maintained in the Privy Council. Then there was the Mercer case in Ontario. I speak of that from memory only and under correction. The last court of appeal in Ontario held that escheated lands fell to the Dominion, if I mistake not—the contrary of what our own Court of Appeals held. But the matter went to the Privy Council, and the Privy Council held that in the case of an escheat, the province had the right to the land under section 109. And, in the case of the St. Catharines Milling Company vs. the Queen, a case that lawyers will remember, the question involved was as to an Indian reservation which had been abandoned by the Indians. The Privy Council held that, under section 109 of the Confederation Act, these lands, abandoned by the Indians who were under control of the Dominion government and under the legislative control of the Dominion parliament, fell into the provincial domain under section 109. The latest case I have is the case of the Attorney General of British Columbia vs. the Attorney General of Canada, in which the question arose in a still more pointed manner and in which, I think, the Privy Council went even further. In that case, as hon. members will remember, British Columbia had conceded to the Dominion government a forty-mile strip upon the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway for a consideration, I believe, of $100,000 a year. That was an absolute cession of the lands. Gold was found in that forty-mile strip, and the question arose as to whether the Dominion power or the provincial power had a right to that gold and the royalties upon it—which of the Powers owned the mineral wealth. In that case, if I remember aright, the Lords of the Privy Council held that the words 'British Columbia' must be read into section 109 of the Confederation Act—that not only the four provinces then parties to the confederation compact, but, said the Lords of the Privy Council you must read into section 109 the names of British Columbia and all the provinces that have since been added to the Dominion, and the right to this gold and the royalties upon it is in the Crown in right of the province. So I am correct, I think, in saying that jurisprudence seems to favour the view that section 109 is of a most general character, and that all lands belonging to the Crown, fall to the Crown in right of the province the moment that province is created. It was so understood in regard to the provinces that entered the Dominion since confederation. It was so understood in regard to British Columbia. There was no special mention of the lands in the Order in Council by which the gates were opened to that province for its entry into confederation. There was no mention of lands in the Order in Council under which Prince Edward Island came into confederation. But, in the case of British Columbia these lands, by the very vigour of the Confederation Act were supposed to remain the property of the province, and, in the case of Prince Edward Island, where there were no public lands, the Dominion had to agree to a certain sum to be given to the province in lieu of public lands. So, I say, by common understanding of section 109 and the interpretation put upon that section since our constitutional questions have arisen, it would seem to be evident that public lands, by the very terms of the constitution belonged to the province the moment they enter confederation. And I see no reason for departing from that rule in regard to the province created out of a portion of the Northwest Territories.

Mr. BELCOURT. Are we not proprietors of the land in Manitoba, and proprietors of the lands in these provinces ?

Mr. MONK. I do not know that that makes any difference. And as regards the observation of the Solicitor General (Mr. Lemieux) that we purchased the lands, I do not think that that proposition is well founded. Even had we purchased the lands, they are not vested in the Dominion government, they are the property of the Crown, the property of the King. And under our confederation scheme, all public lands situated within the province continue to belong to the King in right of the province. As a matter of fact, we did not purchase the landed rights. There was an amount given to the Hudson Bay Company in consideration of the abandonment of its rights in that territory. But those rights were not rights in the lands, but hunting rights and commercial rights under charters obtained long ago under Charles II. But I do not think that those charters conferred any special title in the lands. So I do not think the hon. gentleman is right in saying what he does as to the purchase of the lands. The same remarks apply to that section of the Act in which we enjoin upon the province that it shall not interfere with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I venture the opinion that that is not intra vires. We can create a province, but we have no

right to formulate an enactment in the creating statue to say that the province or its municipalities that may in future exist shall not tax the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. That is an interference with that provision of the Confederation Act contained in section 92 which gives the provinces absolute and exclusive control over municipalities. It is an interference with section 92 which says that the province shall have the right to raise money by direct taxation within its limits. I do not say for instance that the Canadian Pacific Railway has not any valid defence to offer to any exactions that may be made by the province or by municipalities within that province. There may be a defence, although the question is certainly one that admits of much doubt. But in my understanding of the constitution, we have no power by positive enactment to say to the new province: Here are two powers which you have under section 92, the power of taxing directly, and the absolute control over municipalities, but you shall not exercise these powers in either case with respect to this particular company.

Mr. BELCOURT. It seems to me the point to decide is the jurisdiction of this parliament concerning lands contained in the Bills now under consideration. I would like to know from my hon. friend exactly what his legal view is. I understood him to say, in reply to my question, that the provision in the Manitoba Act with reference to lands, by which the control of these lands was retained in the Dominion government, was ultra vires, but that that defect was cured by the Confederation Act of 1871, section 4, which he read to the House. I would like to know whether, in the opinion of my hon. friend, the amendment of 1871 has had the effect of amending the British North America Act of 1867 generally or only with reference to Manitoba, particularly as regards lands ?

Mr. MONK. Well, it has amended the Confederation Act, no doubt ; it has added powers in order to define more clearly our power to create provinces. But the question has never arisen before the courts as to the validity of our enactment with regard to lands in Manitoba.

Mr. BELCOURT. I want to know whether, in the opinion of the hon. gentleman, our powers given in the British North America Act of 1867 have been extended by the provisions of 1871, not only with reference to Manitoba, but with reference to any new province coming into the Dominion ?

Mr. MONK. I think section 2, which is the basis of our powers under which we are acting now, is an addition, a further extension of what is contained in section 146 of the Confederation Act. There is an increase of powers—if that is what my hon. friend means. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to be brief, and I find it is very difficult. I am arriving at the point I wish to make with reference to the Educational Act. I have wandered away from it in order to give the House a better understanding of my opinion of these Acts, since we are on the second reading, and it will save me the trouble of explaining my views at a later stage. I hope that is the view which will prevail. I would like to point out, as a member from the province of Quebec, that it would be a great calamity indeed if the Minister of Justice and the government did not arrive at a conclusion that it is necessary to modify that section which has regard, for instance, to the lands. I do not see, looking upon it as a question of policy, what we have gained in the province of Quebec, and in the older provinces generally, by this enormous indemnity we are undertaking to pay the new provinces of the Northwest for their lands. As I understand it they have a legal claim to these lands. They are better able to administer them than we are here in Ottawa. They are on the spot, they know the necessities of their province, they have every interest in administering them with care, because these lands are their principal asset, and they are the best judges of the requirements of their province in respect to the lands. As to us in the province of Quebec, why, Sir, we have over 25,000,000 acres of good land for settlement, which we are trying to settle, which we are doing our best to settle. Instead of devoting all our energies and all our moneys and public resources to settle the lands in our own province, under the terms of the constitution, we are going to pay millions of dollars to keep a hold on the lands of the Northwest, which properly belong to our sister provinces. That is the way I understand this clause, and I hope it will be reconsidered.

Now, Sir, taking the views which I have offered to the House, being my own humble interpretation of the constitutional Act, I have entertained no doubt at any time that section 93 of the Act applies to this territory which we are to-day erecting into provinces. In section 93, as we all know, there was a protection for the rights of the minority in those new provinces. I assume that, but is it the case ? Eminent lawyers, men whose authority on constitutional matters is far greater than my own, do not assent to this view. They do not think that section 93 applies to these new provinces, which is a proof, if proof was required at all, that lawyers, like doctors, will disagree on constitutional points particularly. There is no set of cases coming before our courts where we have had a more uniform spectacle of disagreement among our judges than constitutional cases. Therefore, I say there is a grave doubt in my own mind as to whether section 93 applies. If it does not apply, then what guarantee, what security has the minority of these two provinces on entering confederation ? If it applies, if that

was certain and was admitted by everybody, you could not say more of this amendment which is before the House at the present time than that it duplicates what the constitution provides, and duplicates it uselessly. But if, as is pretended by some, section 93, the protecting section of the Confederation Act, does not apply, then they have no protection. Then I say, if that claim is well founded in equity, there is a moral obligation on the part of this parliament; if the claim of the minority is well founded, and if they do not find that protection which it would seem they have in section 93, then should we not provide it ourselves? Is there a man in this House, be he from the west or from the east, who will deny that at this very moment when we are creating two new provinces, we particularly of this parliament, who have for more than thirty years maintained, rightly or wrongly, the minority in that immense territory in the possession of their educational rights, we who have been the guardians of those rights, and on two occasions have solemnly affirmed that those rights exist—is there any man who will deny that we should at the present moment, when we are creating these provinces, when doubts are expressed as to our right to legislate in regard to this important point, is there a man who will pretend that we ought not, in the preservation of our own honour, to maintain those rights as far as we can? If the enactment is unconstitutional, it will be so declared by the courts. If the minority, under section 93 of the British North America Act, have full protection, this Act is surplusage. The same question would arise if we went beyond what section 93 assures, if we gave more than they have at the present time, or if we took from them something which has always been secured. But we are merely assuring to them the rights which they possess at the present time. In this connection, let me say that we have before us three drafts of proposed legislation. In the very able communication made by Mr. Haultain to the government, which has been brought down to this House is one of these drafts. That is a draft which, at first sight, seemed to me to go even farther than did the first educational clause of my right hon. friend, and farther than this last one, and that clause is to be found in Mr. Haultain's draft, at page 14 of the papers produced before the Northwest Territories assembly. Section 2 of the draft is as follows:

On, from and after the said first day of January, 1903, the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, except those parts thereof which are in terms made or by reasonable intendment may be held to be specially applicable to or to affect only one or more but not the whole of the provinces under that Act composing the Dominion, and except so far as the same may be varied by this Act, shall be applicable to the province of in the same way and to the same extent as they apply to the several provinces of Canada, and as if the province of had been one of the provinces originally united by the said Act.

As I at first felt under my interpretation of our Constitutional Act, I assumed that in regard to all school legislation the Act of union drafted by Mr. Haultain brought us back to the 1st of July, 1867, and I say that that disposition of law went even farther than the two other enactments that are before the House, because, if we went back to the date of the Union in 1867, the minority in these new provinces might properly urge the claim that since legislative autonomy has been conferred on the Northwest Territories they have had their educational committee. They have had their own administration of their own schools conferred to a greater extent than they have at the present time and therefore under that enactment and under section 93 of the Constitutional Act they may claim to be fully restored to all their privileges. I think they might urge that at any rate. As to the first educational clause that was brought down I must say that it did not seem to me to have any other effect than to create in the public mind an extremely erroneous impression as to what we were doing for the new provinces. Any man who takes the trouble to inquire will be able to ascertain that by the clause relating to education which was first submitted to the attention of the House we were not breaking in upon the educational system of the Northwest Territories, not introducing a separate school system exactly as it existed in the province of Quebec, but that we were following the established order of things in the Northwest Territories, and it is probably due to the haste with which that clause was drawn that all the agitation that subsequently arose is to be attributed, because, in reality, what did that clause give to the Northwest Territories? It gave separate schools. They have them. They have had them since 1875, but it gave nothing more. It is true it made a provision as regards the distribution of moneys resulting from the Northwest Territories Trust School Fund, but, as I understand that part of the question, I think there is no doubt whatever that under section 93 of our Confederation Act the words 'public schools' in the Northwest Lands Act is understood as applying to the schools of the Northwest Territories as they exist to-day. They are called separate schools but they are in reality public schools and will be so interpreted by any tribunal. We have this amendment in which it has been suggested that concessions have been made——

Mr. BOURASSA. Before my hon. friend leaves that subject of the Trust Fund may I just remind him that in the appropriations which have been made by the legislature of the Northwest Territories since their existence of the moneys coming from the Trust Fund supplied by the federal government the separate schools have always participated and not only have they parti-

cipated in the Trust Fund but in the money voted by the legislature.

Mr. MONK. I did not know that, but it goes to prove that interpretation and there is no other interpretation possible because anybody who takes the trouble to read from end to end the ordinances of the Northwest Territories in respect to schools must arrive necessarily at that conviction. I do not know what distinction there would be between what are called separate schools and public schools. They are not separate schools in the sense that we ordinarily understand the term.

Mr. LEMIEUX. They are separate schools but not denominational schools.

Mr. MONK. They are not denominational schools; certainly not. So, I do not see in the last enactment that there is any concession—very far from it. I think the last amendment goes perhaps a little farther than the original enactment which caused so much excitement because it defines more clearly what the privileges of the separate schools are. They were not defined at all in the original enactment. It defines them by reference to the chapters of the Northwest Ordinances where they are fully explained so that it defines more clearly these privileges and it may be argued that it secures to the separate schools the right of religious instruction. I am not just sure under the first enactment it would not have been possible to say in the Northwest Territories: You have the right to separate schools, that is granted, you will have them but you have no right even to the half hour of religious instruction because it is not laid down in the bond. It is not in the Dominion enactment and we will withdraw that right from you. This enactment goes a little farther because it refers to the ordinance which secures the right of religious instruction.

Will you just allow me to say one word in regard to what has been referred to by my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa)? Is it a fact that we are by this Bill establishing denominational schools in the Northwest Territories? Before I touch upon that let me say this to the House. The fact that a very great difference of opinion has existed among lawyers led me to the conclusion that there is certainly no harm, holding as I do that the minority is entitled to the preservation of its rights, in repeating in the form of an enactment, as we do by this Bill, what is already assured constitutionally to the minority by section 93 of the British North America Act. And, I may go a step farther. That section forms part of the constitution, it is true, but I think one, who has at heart, as I have, I must admit, the maintenance of the very limited privileges that the minority are going to enjoy under this enactment might say in addition that we have had the experience of Manitoba. Surely no case of any province could be presented in which greater precautions had been taken than were taken at the time of the creation of Manitoba for the maintenance of the rights of the minority. Everybody knows what happened. I will not repeat the story of that unfortunate affair, but, as a matter of fact, by legislation of the province, the rights of the minority were taken away. They were taken away after every assurance had been given to that minority that their rights would be preserved. There never was anything to my mind more unworthy than the action of the Manitoba legislature in abolishing its legislative council, and at the time of that abolition giving the minority who helped to put through that abolition, every possible assurance that honourable men could give that at no time would their privileges be interfered with. They were taken away. The minority carried their claims before the courts. Ultimately, after an endless litigation, the highest court in the realm declared that they had a right to redress. That judgment of the Privy Council rendered years ago remains, as the members of this House know, unsatisfied to this day. Does that not give to those whose mission perhaps more particularly it is to secure the rights of the minority in these new provinces, the right to take every imaginable precaution in order that those rights should be maintained even in the Northwest? And I say this with due regard to the people of the Northwest, because I have implicit confidence in that population. I hope on this occasion at any rate that confidence will not be misplaced. I know the disposition of the people who inhabit that large territory. They are generous, they are broad-minded, and I have every confidence—because, as any educationist knows, everything depends on the way in which an education law is administered—that they will treat that minority with justice. But we must admit that after the Act of 1875 had been passed, and after the Act of 1880 had been passed, the Northwest legislature did confer rights upon the minority—gave them a council of public instruction, gave them certain rights without which up to the present it has been considered impossible, by the minority, to carry on Catholic education, and they had the use of the French language. These things have been taken away, and, in reality as was said yesterday, what we are endeavouring to preserve for them is merely the right to the material separation of schools, the right to be exempt from double taxation in educational matters, to which Catholics are subject all over the United States, and the right to that half-hour of religious instruction at the end of the day which exists in the Northwest for all denominations alike, I am happy to say, because I am

not a believer in any sense in those schools where the name of God is never mentioned. But is this education, Mr. Speaker—denominational education? So much has been said that is displeasing, that is hurtful, we have heard so much about the hierarchy, about priestly control, about endowing the Catholic Church in the Northwest. I have met men who have told me this: We are ready to give every facility to our Catholic fellow-countrymen in the Northwest, but we are not prepared to endow a church. This is the way they understood this enactment. Well, it is reasonable, it seems to me, to ask ourselves what is in reality the effect of this enactment? Is it the endowment of a church? Is it even denominational education, as they have it freely all over England? It is not denominational education at all, because that supposes that the education in denominational schools is entirely under the control of men of a particular denomination. It supposes that the particular creed of that denomination is taught with the same care as other branches of knowledge. It supposes that the education in the schools, the text books, the qualifications of teachers, all that goes to make up denominational education, is under the control, not of clerics, not of priests or bishops, but of men who belong to that denomination. This is not at all the character of the education that is being provided for in these new provinces. Let me just indicate to you what has already been indicated, but what cannot be repeated too often in view of what has been said, that under the new regime in the Northwest Territories there is no Council of Public Instruction. There is a commissioner of education who with his department controls everything that is important in education—controls absolutely the formation of school districts, controls everything connected with normal schools for forming teachers; regulates the qualifications of those teachers, and can revoke them at any moment; controls the books, the courses of study, the hours, the holidays, compulsory attendance of pupils, the requirements of the schools in regard to sites and buildings. All these matters remain absolutely under the control of the government, at present a government entirely Protestant. It is true, there is an educational advisory board composed of five members, two of whom are Catholics, to whom these matters are referred. But that board can only advise; it has no power of deciding; and, as a matter of fact, the control of education in what are called separate schools, though they are really not so, is absolutely in the hands of the government. What, then, is the power of the Catholics under this legislation which we are called upon to sanction? Well, they engage teachers, but these teachers must have the qualifications which have been settled beforehand by the government, and those teachers may be revoked; they provide for the half-hour of religious instruction, and they levy the rate of taxation; and even in regard to these matters they are absolutely accountable to the government, are inspected by an inspector named by the government and having instructions from the government, and who may be and in most cases is not of their own creed. Under these circumstances I do not think we are imposing a great deal on the Northwest Territories, nor introducing a very revolutionary measure. The best proof of that may be found in the appreciation given by Archbishop Taché of the legislation which at present exists, and we are anxious to preserve, because it keeps for the minority some shred of what they had before. Archbishop Taché, speaking of the schools in the Northwest, said:

> The Catholic schools are under the control and direction of a council of public instruction (now it is a commissioner) in which there is not a Catholic who has a right to vote. The choice of all the books, both for teachers and for pupils, is entirely in the hands of Protestants, as well as the final formation of teachers and the right to give them permission to teach. The inspectors may all be Protestants, and in any case the inspection is made apart from any consideration for Catholic ideas. The ordinance destroys the Catholic character of the schools which formerly distinguished those schools, and leaves them no point whatever upon which the faith of parents can rest with any degree of confidence.

Further on, Archbishop Taché appreciating the system of education condemns the system and as a matter of fact those who have seen that system of schools in operation in the Northwest Territories, who have been called upon as Catholics to take part in it, have time and again been obliged to apply to the authorities for the redress of grievances which must necessarily take place under such a system of law. I shall give as an example the case of religious orders going up there to teach, nuns and Christian brothers. They are obliged to qualify under the ordinance of the Northwest Territories and without this qualification on certain occasions they have not been allowed to teach. This has given rise to a great deal of difficulty. As I said before everything depends in an educational law on the manner in which it is administered and what we are claiming by this enactment is little enough. The Catholics in the Northwest will have to a very large extent to depend on the generosity and broadmindedness of the majority there in order to be able to carry into effect the legal privileges which they have kept up to this day. These are the reasons which have led me to the conclusion that the very least we can do, taking my interpretation of the constitution, is to support that part of the Bill which relates to the maintenance of separate

schools. Of course it would be useless at this stage to point to the great differences which exist between our own country and England in respect to broadness of concession in regard to education, but in connection with this very important subject I have had occasion to look over the English educational law and the debates which have taken place on the Bill of 1902, and it is amazing, it is edifying to see to what extent they have gone in England in order to maintain the principle of religious liberty in connection with schools. Of course as every one knows, denominational education exists in England ; there are there denominational schools such as exist here, but denominational schools helped by the state, supported by the state, and in the educational Bill of 1902 they have gone to a great length, they have improved the system in every way but they have stuck with admirable tenacity to the principle that there shall be no schools without some kind of religion. There are board schools in England, where secular matters are taught, subject to what is known as the Cowper-Temple clause which provides that there will be religious education but not of any particular denominational character. They have not wished even in the board schools to exclude the religious principle. In the voluntary schools denominational education is provided and encouraged by the state, and, always faithful to the principle of liberty of conscience, there is in the voluntary schools a conscience clause which exists since the educational law of 1870 and which provides that any pupil attending a school, may, if his conscience or the conscience of his parents require it, absent himself during religious instruction. In England they have stood firm throughout all educational changes to the principles of absolute religious equality in the schools and true to the principle of religious teaching.

There is in this country, for some reason which I am unable to understand, a servile desire to imitate the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. We are very proud of English traditions, of constitutional liberty, of all that the British flag and the British constitution represent in the way of freedom ; but, for a reason which I do not know, when we come to schools, amongst a certain set of people we have a desire to do exactly as they do in the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. But as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, that system is on trial, it is on trial. It has only existed for some fifty years. Up to 1842, the primary education provided in the United States was exactly the same as that provided in England and out of those schools which existed in the United States and which were similar to the schools that we have in Quebec, and that exist in Ontario, have come the most famous men whom we have had in the world during the last century. These schools have produced men like Washington, Jefferson, Colquhoun and Webster, and many others who have not been followed by men of equal value in the public life of the United States. And even those state schools which originated in New York in 1842 and have since spread over the whole republic, are in a tentative state ; they are on trial. Have they given absolute satisfaction ? Far from it, they are only on trial and many people have condemned that system of schools, have found it insufficient, inadequate to meet the wants of the nation. I have taken the trouble to find out what the judgment in the United States upon that system of schools has been, the judgment of men whose opinion is worth considering, not men of my own creed, but men of other creeds, and I find that opinion is very much divided as to the value of these schools. If anybody has any doubt as to the matter, he should read the 'New York Herald' of October 20, 1871, in which are given the results of an inquiry made by no less a person than Professor Agassiz of the value in 1871 of the new educational system established in the United States. Speaking of the New York Act of 1842 which was the beginning of the new system, an eminent American publicist, Richard Grant White said :

> It was a misfortune, not only for the city of New York, but for the state and for the whole country.

In the 'Popular Science Monthly,' March 1871, H. M. H. Wilson said :

> Of all the acquisitions of American liberty, our educational system is the most vaunted, and as usual the most spoiled.
>
> However bitter it may be, the inevitable conclusion is this : the development of our present system of education carries with it the destruction of individuality, and that destruction means political, intellectual and social stagnation.

In the 'Journal of Education,' March 17, 1881, Mr. Hazen said :

> The moral aspect of our schools is distressing. It is no more a question of the Bible to be kept or excluded, of Catholic or Protestant influence, but rather of such immoral tendencies that our public schools are a menace to the family, the state and the nation.

The Rev. John Doane, at the ministerial meeting at Cleveland, Ohio, in June, 1888, said :

> I believe that immorality and drunkenness often are the work of that American God, the public school.

The Rev. Thomas Green, pastor of the St. Andrew's church, in Chicago, said in November, 1886 :

> There is a great evil in the public schools as directed.

Mr. Green's opinion was that the secularization of the schools is largely responsible of the evils to be found in the business and social world. Without the Bible, without Christ, without religion, almost without morals, they can only engender atheism and infidelity, and he desired the establishment of parochial schools to counteract to a certain extent the evil influence of the public schools.

The New York 'Methodist,' some years ago, declared the public schools to be 'hot beds of infidelity.'

At the beginning of the year 1889, the Boston 'Pilot' said :—

Let us be just and honest, It is a notorious fact which we should not forget, that thousands of children of both sexes, born of Protestant and American parents, do not receive in this country any religious or moral education.

Dr. Shearer, president of Dawson College in North Carolina, declared in December, 1889, that the non-sectarian character of the schools impeded the religious education of Presbyterian youths. He strongly recommended the establishment of schools to be maintained by the church for this purpose. The Presbyterian synod of California in 1881, adopted a report of the education committee presented by the Reverend Dr. Scott, recommending the opening of denominational schools. In 1862, the superintendent of public instruction for the State of New York reported that the teachers were so lacking in knowledge that the matter had become a source of great embarrassment. In 1873, Charles Francis Adams, jr., speaking of the Quincy schools says :—

In other words, it was evident that after eight years at school, children in general could neither write nor read with facility.

In 1877, a member of the Cleveland, Ohio, Board of Education complains of the system of schools and says :—

There is a positive delusion in the development of our schools.

In his report of 1878-1879, Mr. Ezra Carr quotes approvingly, the following from the 'Atlantic Monthly':—

Two things are particularly noticeable in our system of popular education :
It tends to stifle the taste for literature and the sense of the value of modern history. It is a serious defect. However its most characteristic and common result is a distaste for manual labour.

The Boston correspondent of the San Francisco 'Call' wrote in his paper in 1877 :

A great many people concerned in the administration of our public schools have come to the conclusion that the system in our city is a complete failure.

According to Mr. Richard Grant White, it was established officially in 1875, that the examination for matriculation of candidates for West Point during the preceding twenty-five years had shown a gradual falling off as far as elementary knowledge was concerned.

In 1880, Reverend Dr. McLean, of the Congregational church, said :—

Throughout the United States there is a continually increasing number of people who are dissatisfied with our present school system.

In 1881, the Boston 'Journal of Education' said :

In many of our large and small cities, the painful conviction is gaining ground that our public schools are not giving us our money's worth and are not realizing our expectations.

Mr. Z. Montgomery, formerly of Oakland, California, and a high official of the Department of Justice in Washington, made a campaign against public schools. He was a Catholic. Yet during his campaign he received many Protestant approvals. Rev. W. D. Blackwell, of Trenton, New Jersey, wrote him :

I am a Presbyterian, but in perfect accord with you on this question of the schools.

In February, 1882, the San Francisco 'Examiner,' in an article on education, said :

One of the most serious questions we have to examine in this regard, has reference to the value of our public school system ; the conclusion to which an impartial and intelligent observer is driven, is far from recognizing the wisdom and efficacy of the school organization maintained by the public.

Dr. Boyce, in his work entitled 'Deterioration and Race Education,' says :

Our present school system kills in the child every natural inclination for physical labour ; it fills the country with place hunters and the working classes feel that the children who are called to succeed them derive no benefit from such schools.

Richard Grant White, in an article in the 'North American Review,' in 1880, gave statistics as to criminality in states where public schools system has been in existence for the longest time. Finally, the National Christian Association, composed of over fifteen Protestant denominations, protested in 1880 against secular schools as follows :

To cultivate the intelligence without improving the moral character is to develop clever men only. The Bible must therefore be associated with books of science and education in all our institutions.

I do not wish to multiply these citations. There are a great number, and they all go to prove, not that the system is to be condemned, for you cannot condemn a national system which is untested, but that outside of Catholics themselves, there are in the United States a very large number of thinking men who perceive in these schools, from which religion is absolutely banished, a grave danger to the state. That is all I want to prove. I am not passing judgment on the system. I am not in a position to do it. But I say that all people are not

unanimous as to its merits. Under those circumstances, it seems strange that we should wander away from British traditions and be seduced into favouring a system which, to my mind at any rate, presents some very serious objections.

I did not wish to take up more time than I should, but I wished to give fully my views to the House. I regret to have to say it, but there has been in the public discussion of this question an endeavour to convey to the public that outside of all other considerations, outside of the constitutional question, which is a very grave one, it would be, from the point of view of expediency and policy, a great misfortune to see established in these provinces the schools of the Catholic minority. Are they then so inferior ? Are these schools productive of nothing but ignorance ? One is entitled to ask that question in view of what one reads and hears every day. Is that the fact? Well, in the United States where the natural rights of the parent to educate his child, the natural right of the citizen not to pay taxes for the support of schools to which he cannot send his children, is disregarded, what do we find? The calculation has been made and the statistics are there to prove it. We find that the Catholics, who cannot conscientiously send their children to these public schools, are obliged to expend, and do expend annually —what amount do you think ? Over $50,-000,000 a year in order to provide that adequate education for their children which their consciences oblige them to provide. I forget how many millions they expend in the city of New York alone. And they expend those millions to provide schools of their own with Catholic teachers. These schools are sometimes visited by impartial judges, and the education given in them is found just as good, and often better, than that given in the public schools. So that we have this spectacle in the United States, of a large portion of the people being obliged to pay taxes for schools to which they cannot send their children, and having to tax themselves further in order to provide schools which will satisfy the dictates of their conscience and enable them to exercise that right which is the natural undeniable right of every parent, the right to educate his own children in the manner he thinks best. But under this tyranny exercised under the American constitution, they are obliged, in order to exercise that right, to pay double taxation. Is that what we want to see under the British flag in Canada ? I say it is not desirable that anything of the kind should exist in this country. And outside, of constitutional considerations—the value of which I acknowledge and to the opinions of those who hold them I pay every deference—I will always uphold the principle in discussion under the present Bill, namely, the right of the parent to educate his child as he thinks best. And at the risk of being a little lengthy. will you allow me just to quote what the First Minister of England had to say with reference to that phase of the question in discussing the Educational Bill. Speaking of the religious question, Mr. Balfour said :—

> I cannot leave this topic of the necessity of the voluntary schools without saying that in my opinion they are necessary also for another and a very different reason. What is the theory which, on both sides of the House as I think—I do not recognize any difference of principles between us—we ought to adopt with regard to denominational education in public schools. We do not insist, as everybody knows, upon teaching the children of this country any particular religion. We do insist upon teaching them a recognized arithmetic, a recognized geography, history, &c. In the one case we decline the responsibility, leaving the responsibility to the parents, and in the other we are agreed that the state may properly take the responsibility of saying to every parent, so far as secular education is concerned, your child shall learn what we think fit to teach it. Of course the reason of this difference is known to all. We are agreed about secular education. We are not agreed about religious education. Whatever be the historic origin of the present state of things, we have, as a community, repudiated responsibility for teaching the particular form of religion. We maintain the responsibility, we gladly assume the responsibility for teaching secular learning. As we have thus left to the parents the responsibility for choosing what religion their children are to learn surely we ought, as far as we can consistently with the inevitable limitations which the practical necessity of the case put upon us, make our system as elastic as we can in order to meet their wishes.

And he goes on to explain exactly the position they take in England in regard to this difficult matter and how they have solved it. I have read many of the speeches of English statesmen upon this Education Bill, a Bill which has afforded ground for so much discussion in England. I venture to say that there is not a word in those speeches that could not be uttered from the pulpit of any Catholic Church in my province and to every sentence of which every member of the congregation would not be prepared to say, 'Amen.' Which shows how far they go in regard to religious liberty in educational matters on the other side of the water.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I feel that I have sufficiently made known my opinions in regard to this matter. I wish before resuming my seat, to make a very brief allusion to the character of the discussion of this matter in the public press. We have heard a great deal about freedom of the Northwest and about common schools ; we have seen in some papers a clear indication that, were opportunity offered, there exists a great desire to deprive this minority, once for all of even a shred of the rights which they preserve at the present moment in the

Northwest Territories. The discussion has gone even farther, and it has been time and again written and said that those in this House who defend the rights of the minority are under clerical influence, are acting under the dictation of the hierarchy, whatever that may mean. What is the meaning of these insinuations ? If they were uttered once or twice, if they appeared, so to speak, by accident, one would be prepared to treat them with the tolerance which must necessarily be the quality of a public man if he wishes to live. But it has been so often stated that those who in this House adopt the view which I adopt are under the domination of the clergy, that I wish at any rate for my part, to enter my protest against that insinuation. There is no foundation for that accusation, and those who make it know not of what they speak. I say, I come to this House to fulfil my duty to my country without any control over me of priest or bishop or anybody else. That control I have never admitted, and that control never existed. As a matter of fact, I venture to say, the clergy in my province do not exercise any control upon the decision of public questions and the votes which we give in this House. That control does not exist ; it is a figment of the mind. And, when men take the trouble to write in newspapers—not to speak in the irritation of the moment, but to write deliberately —that those who are in my position in this House are under outside control, are, so to speak, led by extraneous influences, they are casting upon us a libel which we do not deserve. I venture to say there is not a voter in the Dominion of Canada who would be more free from clerical influence than the average voter of the province of Quebec. Priests exercise no influence in these matters. They refrain from action in them. And they could not interfere with the exercise of the franchise. Take the case of my own county ; I verily believe that if the parish priests of my county—and they are respectable men—were to unite to secure my election, I would lose my deposit. They do not interfere in elections ; they scarcely vote. I am prepared to admit that there are isolated cases where a clergyman, not of my own denomination only, but of other denominations as well, has interfered. What has been the consequence in Quebec where these isolated cases have occurred ? They have led to lawsuits and to the final departure of the parish priest from the charge of the parish—that has been the history of such cases. As a matter of fact I repeat there is no man who would resent more promptly (and I could give numberless examples of it) any interference by the priest with the exercise of the franchise than would the average voter of the province of Quebec. And, as a public man, I believe that everybody is in the same position of independence that I am in myself. I would like to see anybody be he priest or bishop, interfere with me in the exercise of my functions in this House. I thought it necessary to make this declaration, because, these things being so often repeated it becomes essential that they should be denied. As to the boring underground of the black-robed men who are all the time acting by hidden, obscure, mysterious conspiracies upon members of parliament, upon the electors in general—all this is nothing but a chimera.

Mr. Speaker, I have finished. I do not wish to go one step farther, but you will allow me in closing to quote the last sentence of Mr. Balfour's speech upon the Education Bill :

> No other scheme—be it what you like—will give to the educational evils of this country the complete, radical, and final cure which this Bill will give. I count upon the support of our countrymen to enable us to close for ever these barren controversies which for too long have occupied our time, and in the interests alike of parental liberty and of educational efficiency to terminate the present system of costly confusion.

If I quote these sentences it is because they express in far better, far loftier language than I can command my own view in regard to these questions in general. If I could have my wish in the forming of these two new provinces, it would be that in the conduct of public affairs, particularly in the treatment of the minority—which, practically whatever we may enact, is entirely confided to the generosity of the majority—they may have men to lead the destinies of these two great provinces according to the example of these great statesmen of England.

Hon. CLIFFORD SIFTON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 24, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

That Mr. Sam. Hughes be appointed a member of the Debates Committee, vice Mr. E. F. Clarke, deceased.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

That the names of Mr. A. Lachance, M.P., for Quebec Centre, and Mr. Devlin, M.P. for Wright county, be added to the Railway Committee and the Private Bills Committee.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 127) for the relief of James Arthur Prior.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 126) for the relief of Edward Albert Murphy.—Mr. Grant.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the First Minister again to the information asked for on February 21 by the member for Carleton, Ontario (Mr. R. L. Borden), and not yet brought down, to which attention has been called on more than one occasion. Amongst other important things which we can scarcely do without in debating this question, he asked for the centres of population and the tendency of immigration since 1901, for the lands bonded for homestead purposes, the lands granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and what portion of them yet remains to be selected in the territory comprising these two provinces; the lands remaining invested in the Crown, a very important point if we are to take up the consideration of the financial aspect of this question. He also asked for the practical condition of education in the Territories at present. This would include, of course, the number of schools—public schools, denominational schools, or separate schools so-called. All that is information which the First Minister will see is pertinent to the discussion which is now going on.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think that a great deal of this information is already before the House; for instance, the homesteads granted have, I think, been brought down. I shall inquire. A return has, I think, been brought down already showing that all the lands have been selected by the Canadian Pacific Railway to which it is entitled. The information about the condition of the schools is information which is not at all hard to get; it will be in the library and elsewhere, but I shall, if it is thought advisable, try to have it collected.

Mr. FOSTER. It would seem to me that some such statement as the Finance Department made with reference to the different financial conditions since confederation ought to be put in the form of a memorandum embracing that information. Such a memorandum would be very useful. It would be authoritative, and that is what we want.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 69) to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta, and the amendment of Mr. Borden thereto.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Hon. CLIFFORD SIFTON (Brandon). Mr. Speaker I have been, upon a considerable number of important occasions, called upon to address the House; and upon a good many of these occasions, as I have risen, I have felt confident that at least a considerable section of the House would regard with approval the remarks I desired to make. But I confess that, upon the present occasion, although my old friends have been kind enough to receive me with some applause as I rose, I do not exactly feel the confidence of former occasions that everything I shall say will meet with their approval.

It surely must be regarded as the irony of political fortune that the introduction of this Bill, a Bill for the creation of the two new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, covering territory the administration of which has been my peculiar charge for the last eight years, and to the development of which I have given whatever of capacity and energy I may have possessed in official life, and have given it freely and I might almost say with an affectionate solicitude for their welfare; I say it must be regarded as the irony of political fortune that the introduction of this Bill should be the occasion also of my retirement from the office I held under the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who leads the government, and the severance of my official relations with the party with which I have had official relations now for some fourteen years.

It was necessary for me, Mr. Speaker, when giving to the House a statement of the reasons for my resignation—it being the constitutional practice to make such a statement—to say that the educational clauses of this Bill had not been before me prior to its introduction to the House. I was careful to say in that statement, although briefly, that the same thing did not apply to the other features of the Bill, or did not apply to its principles, because I had had an opportunity to give my advice to my colleagues upon the other portions of the Bill. Nevertheless some, as I think, rather ill-natured, comments were addressed to the Prime Minister in criticism of his alleged preparation of this Bill, or allowing it to be prepared, without consultation with or advice from the minister who must, under the circumstances, be supposed to have been in the best position to give him advice. These criticisms of which I speak are wholly without justification in the facts of the case. The belief that the Northwest Territories were to be given provincial autonomy is one that, in all the discussions which have taken place has, been forming itself not only in the minds of the members of the government, but in the minds of members of the House during the last few years. There may have been discussions in this House as to the particular time. But the subject has been present to our minds.

And for the last three years, I may say, I have myself, upon various occasions, given the most careful attention to the important provisions which necessarily would come within the purview of the Bill. As was explained by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) the other evening, before leaving Ottawa, as I was obliged to do about the New Year, I took occasion to put in writing, with sufficient fullness, the views which I entertained in regard to the important features of the Bill. This memorandum was placed in the possession of my colleagues so that they had the benefit of my suggestions, as also had the Prime Minister in the course of correspondence which he did me the honour to have with me upon various questions which arose during the discussions which took place from time to time while I was absent. I gave my advice to the best of my ability. And I may say, so far as that is concerned, that in the main, other than as refers to the question of education, and although there are some variations of detail—in the main, I say, and substantially, the Bill I recommended to my late colleagues is the Bill which has been introduced. There are some matters of detail respecting which difficulties arose, and different decisions were arrived at in the course of the discussions which took place with the representatives of the Northwest Territories. These were inevitable. But, substantially the provisions of the Bill are in accordance with the views I had formed in the course of my administration of that country.

So far as the question of the number of provinces is concerned, I formed the opinion which, I think, will be shared by almost every person on careful investigation of the case, that it was not desirable that this vast territory should be formed into one province. Certainly it was not desirable to carry out the old idea which prevailed that there were to be four provinces. I think the best opinion of the House will be met by the decision which the government has reached, that the medium course should be taken, and, that instead of one or four, we should have two provinces. Not only is the question of area to be considered as was shown by the Prime Minister in his remarks in introducing the Bill, but you must consider also the even more important question of population. The population of this one province, if this territory were made into one province, would eventually have such a preponderance as compared with the other provinces that it could not be said to be wise to make such an arrangement. These provinces are composed of territories which, almost acre for acre, is arable land and capable of sustaining population. No other provinces in the Dominion can be similarly described. And to make one province of that particular territory whose capacity for sustaining population is, on the average, so much greater than that of any other province in the Dominion, giving it ultimately so much greater population than the other provinces, would certainly and obviously be unwise. Other considerations supported the same conclusion. The western and eastern portions of this territory lend themselves to different industrial conditions. Great grazing areas exist in the west such as are not found in the east. Mining possibilities on a large scale are to be found in the western part of the territory, and in the north, towards Edmonton, we have what is known as a mixed-farming district. Different classes of local legislation will be needed, and different conditions must be recognized in the two portions of the territory. Everybody who knows the conditions of that territory will be satisfied that the best results will result from having two local governments and two legislatures. Each of these legislatures and each of these administrations will have ample scope for all the energy it may see fit to display in the development of the resources of the great territory which is committed to its charge. And this parliament may be satisfied, I think, that that arrangement which is suggested will give the surest guarantee that the future development of these territories will be best facilitated.

While on the question of boundaries, I may say, having reference, for a moment, to a statement made by Mr. Haultain in an open letter addressed to the Prime Minister, that I also suggested, and it was my idea, that the dividing line between the two new provinces should be about sixty miles further east than that which is provided for by the Bill. It was in the discussions which took place with the government that the present arrangement was arrived at. I have not heard the reasons which have led to this conclusion but I have no doubt that the conclusion thus arrived at after careful consideration, will be found upon the whole to be that which is supported by the best reasons. This in any event is a small difference of detail.

But there is one other point I will suggest, perhaps more for the future consideration of the House than for present consideration, that there should be some different principle adopted. I see no reason why these provinces should not extend to the northern boundary of the mainland of Canada. The experience which I have had in the Department of the Interior has led me irresistibly to the conclusion that just so soon as it is possible to do so, the federal government should divest itself of the local administration of distant territory: and therefore I see no reason why, in so far as the administration of these Northwest Territories come within the scope of provincial legislation, that their administration should not be carried on by the local legislatures that we are to establish. That however is not an insuperable objection. The Territories of course still remain the property of

Canada, and if it be thought wise at a future date they can be added to the provinces which we are now forming.

Upon the question of the lands which has been discussed at some length, I have very clear and positive opinions. I regard the question of a successful settlement policy—and my opinion is not changed by the fact that this policy may now require to be carried on under somebody else's supervision—I regard the question of a successful settlement policy in Canada as perhaps one of the most important, if not the most important of all subjects with which we have to deal. For the last two or three years especially, we have seen the effect of the small beginnings of success of the policy of settling vacant lands of the west upon the general prosperity of Canada, and I think every serious minded man will admit that under no possible circumstances would this parliament be justified in taking any step which would imperil in the slightest degree the success of the immigration policy which we have been carrying on, and which the government proposes to carry on in the future. That is a thing which demands the most careful thought and consideration at the hands of this parliament. It was suggested by the leader of the opposition, and has been suggested by others who take the opposite view, that the handing over of the public lands of the Territories to the provincial government would not seriously interfere with the conduct of immigration. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have had on my shoulders the duty of carrying on a policy of immigration, and of harmonizing the operations of the lands department of the government and of the immigration department for the last eight years, and it taxes the efforts of the department to the utmost, when both the land department and the immigration branch are in the same hands and under the same control, to avoid the difficulties which constantly present themselves in the administration of this work. It would be difficult satisfactorily to carry on that work even if we had the land department in another branch of the same government; it would be embarrassing and difficult to an extent that few men appreciate who have not had the duty of actually carrying on this business. But if you hand over the land to three provincial governments—because you would have to treat Manitoba in the same way as you are treating the Territories—if you hand over the land to three separate provincial governments, each with its own ideas of policy, each with its own Minister of Crown Lands, and if the federal government has to deal with three provincial governments, every man who knows anything about doing business between governments must know that it would be absolutely impossible that satisfactory results could be achieved. It is not necessary to suggest that the provincial governments would do anything that is wrong, it is not necessary to suggest that they would be improvident, that they do not know how to carry on business as well as we do. The people of the west are just as capable as the people in any other part of the Dominion; they are extremely capable, and when they achieve provincial status, if these lands were handed over to them, they would do precisely what people in the other provinces would do, they would administer these lands just as they saw fit and in accordance with their own ideas of policy. The result would be that you would have three governments to deal with, each with its own idea of policy, each with its Minister of Crown Lands, and possibly no two of them with the same ideas as to the policy that should be carried out in respect to this subject. It might be, Mr. Speaker, and probably would be, that instead of administering these lands for the purpose of settlement they would administer them for the purpose of revenue, and I do not know that we could blame them very much if they did so. But if they did that, the result would be that the settlement policy of the country would stop.

It would be quite as impossible to give those lands to the provinces with a limitation that they should carry on a homestead policy. A homestead policy would have to be carried out by provincial officers. And moreover the very day you gave these lands to the provinces with any limitation whatever, you would find an agitation arising to remove all limitations, and you would have that question on the floor of the House at every session of parliament. So, Mr. Speaker, I am clear upon that point; and if there is anything I can say to the members of this House that I think should commend itself to the judgment of both sides, I would say that nothing could be done which would more certainly imperil a successful settlement policy upon which the greatness and increase in the financial strength and resources of Canada depend, than, under any circumstances, to allow the public lands of the prairie provinces to pass from the control of the Dominion government.

As to the financial provisions, Mr. Speaker, I think they are generous and liberal, but I do not think they are too generous or too liberal. We expect that these great provinces will play a great part in the history of Canada, and it is creditable to us that on both sides there has come nothing but approval of the liberal and generous treatment accorded by the government to these new provinces upon the inception of their provincial career. Let me say, however, Mr. Speaker, not wishing to say anything ungracious or to throw a note of discord into the discussion of this subject, that there is one suggestion which I desire to

make to the right hon. gentleman who leads the government, and it is this: I find in this clause of the Bill relating to the compensation for lands that such compensation is based upon an estimated acreage and upon a price, and the price put upon that estimated acreage is, I think, $1.50 an acre. I have no fault to find with the amount which has been decided upon, and which the government proposes to give. I think it is reasonable and liberal, I think it is generous, and I am quite prepared to agree with it. But I submit that the amount should be fixed arbitrarily, it should not be fixed by a reference to the number of millions of acres of land, nor the price per acre. The moment I laid my eyes upon that clause I felt it was a mistake, and I felt that just as soon as it was published the representatives of the Territories would say: You have by this clause admitted that we are entitled to the beneficial ownership of these lands, you have admitted that we are the owners of these lands in fact, beneficially at least if not in law, by the very fact that you are basing the compensation you give us upon the acreage of the provinces. And so within a few days after the Bill was published and before parliament gave assent to it, our good friend Mr. Haultain seized upon this phase of the Bill to present an objection to the right hon. gentleman who leads the government. He immediately took the ground which it must be admitted he could take with some degree of force, that by that provision we admitted, impliedly at least, the right of the Territories to claim that they are the beneficial owners of the land.

What would be the effect? The effect would be that if this passes into a statute it becomes an irrevocable Act because it does become an irrevocable Act as soon as parliament passes it. The effect would be that our friends of the Northwest Territories so soon as they desire to have their financial arrangements re-adjusted will claim that while we have admitted their ownership of the land they have not admitted our valuation of this land and we will find that the Territories as represented on the floor of this House will raise this question of the re-adjustment of the financial arrangements and we will have a question raised that will cause great embarrassment to succeeding governments in the future. I bring this point to the attention of my right hon. friend because I believe we are making a mistake in regard to it. It may perhaps appear to be a matter of detail at the present time but it will not be found to be a matter of detail in future years and it is not too late to remedy it if, in the judgment of the government and of the House, the argument that I address to the House on this subject is correct.

Another point which was raised, especially by Mr. Haultain, in the letter which he addressed to my right hon. friend the hon. leader of the government, was that respecting legislation, on the subject of irrigation. That is a subject of vast importance in the Northwest Territories, and I must say that I take the responsibility of having, in all probability, induced my colleagues to accept the view which is the effect of the Bill that is before the House; that is to say, that the subject of irrigation for the present should be retained within the control of the federal government. The reasons can be given in a few words and to my mind they are absolutely conclusive. At the present time the right to use some of the principal streams which are of the utmost importance in connection with the irrigation in the Northwest Territories, is a subject of discussion between Canada and the United States and international complications have already arisen in regard to these streams. Obviously, if irrigation were under the administration of two provincial governments, it would be difficult to adjust a question such as that. In addition to that questions are going to arise in a comparatively short time between the residents of the western province and the residents of the eastern province in regard to the right of user of the water of these streams which flow from one into the other. It would seem to me most desirable, until the difficulties respecting international questions and the difficulties respecting interprovincial questions are settled, and until the irrigation system is further developed and a body of law upon the subject is built up, that the control should remain in the hands of the federal government. When a few years have elapsed, when the system is more fully developed, when it becomes a matter merely of local administration then there seems to be no good reason why the subject should not be relegated to the provincial governments.

As I explained a few days ago, the terms of the educational clause of this Bill which was introduced into the House and some of the remarks made by my right hon. friend the leader of the government were the cause of my resigning from the government as a protest against the terms of that clause and the principles to which it was designed to give effect. I have nothing to add to that statement now except to say that while my action was in no sense or nature due to experiencing any feeling of personal pique, yet I did feel, in addition to what I said upon a former occasion, that the right hon. gentleman had not been well advised in bringing this clause to the House of Commons and presenting it to the House without giving me an opportunity of expressing such views as I might desire to offer on the subject. I say I have nothing now to add to what has been said upon that subject and I merely desire, with the

indulgence of the House, to proceed to the discussion of the sections we have before us—the original section and the amended section—and to give the reasons which have guided me in coming to the conclusion at which I have arrived as to the support of this Bill or otherwise. I am in a somewhat peculiar position, Mr. Speaker, finding as I do that I agree much more with the statements of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) than with the statements and arguments of my right hon. friend the leader of the government who is my party leader and who was my leader in the government for so many years. Nevertheless, the conclusion at which I arrived will probably not be the same as that of the hon. leader of the opposition. In the first place let me say that I think he was wrong in his view—and I agree with my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in this—that when we are about to consider legislation which will bring a certain state of affairs into existence in the Northwest Territories, we should shut our eyes absolutely and entirely to the examination of the actual educational effect of the proposal before us. It seems to me that almost everybody will agree with my hon. friend the Minister of Finance that the man in the street, hearing the hon. gentleman who leads the opposition say that he stands by the constitution, and hearing the right hon. gentleman who leads the government say that upon the rock of the constitution he stands, and seeing these two hon. gentlemen both standing on the rock of the constitution but coming to diametrically opposite conclusions will be likely to say : I cannot hope to understand the law or the constitution, but I do want to know what kind of schools they are going to have in the Northwest Territories. Therefore, I desire to address a few words to the House upon that which I think will interest not only the man in the street, but some of the men in the House upon the subject of the nature of the schools we have in the Northwest and the kind of schools we shall have after this Bill is passed. I am not going to enter into questions as to the manner in which legislation has been passed or the remarks which have been made by legislators when it has been passed. My right hon. friend the leader of the government, in the remarks which he made to the House upon two occasions, or at least upon the first occasion, discussed at length the method under which the educational legislation affecting the Northwest Territories was first introduced. That discussion has been amplified by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance in the remarks which he made the other evening, and I shall not attempt to add anything to what my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has said or to what I believe to be the accurate discussion which we have listened to on that subject. But, I do desire to call the attention of hon. members of the House, for the purposes of my argument, to the actual terms of the Act of 1875. The clause which is the basis of all that has followed reads as follows :

When and so soon as any system of taxation shall be adopted in any district or portion of the Northwest Territories, the Lieutenant Governor, by and with the consent of the council or assembly, as the case may be, shall pass all necessary ordinances in respect to education, but it shall therein be always provided that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the Northwest Territories, or any lesser portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name the same may be known, may establish such schools therein as they may think fit, and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor ; and, further, that the minority of the ratepayers therein, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein, and that in such latter case the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assessments of such rates as they may impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

That was the clause in the Act of 1875. I read it because it is important in view of the remarks I intend to address to the House, that its exact terms should be in the minds of the gentlemen who are honouring me with their attention.

What followed the passage of this law ? There was established in the Northwest Territories a complete dual system of schools ; a system of schools under which the denomination regulated the text books, and the conduct of the schools and by which everything that appertained to the Roman Catholic schools was directly under the control of a Roman Catholic board of education. We had in the Northwest Territories at that time, under that Act, to all intents and purposes what are generally known as church schools or clerically controlled schools. That was the system that was built up under this Act of 1875. It went on for some time. It was exactly the same system—I do not know as to the efficiency, for I am not familiar with that—but in principle it was the same system we had in Manitoba up to the year 1890, when it was abolished by the Public School Act of that year. This system went on for some time in the Territories, and then the legislature began to interfere and to curtail the privileges of the separate schools. This curtailment proceeded from time to time until the year 1892 when what was known as the dual system was entirely swept away and that system which we have in the Northwest Territories, substantially as we have it at present, was established. I am not going to trouble the House with any lengthy quotations, but I desire to point out what was conceived by the people of the Northwest Territories connected with these schools, to be the effect of the legislation of 1892. The quotations which I shall give will be found in the papers presented to the federal government when a

petition was presented for the disallowance of the Act; because, when the old privileges of minority schools were abolishd finally by the Act of 1892, a petition was taken by the Roman Catholic clergy to the federal authority asking that the ordinances of the Northwest Territories of 1892 should be disallowed, and in support of that petition many documents were filed, from which a few extracts will probably help to clear our minds as to what actually took place then and what the changes in the school system were. The statement made by Mr. Forget was as follows:

Until the date of the ordinance of 1892 we had never been denied the right to administer our schools, to regulate the programme of studies, to choose the text books, to control the religious instruction and to authorize the use of the French language whenever thought convenient. These rights were exercised by the Catholic section of the board of education, and strictly speaking they were sufficient to preserve to our schools their distinctive character of Catholic schools.

That is what was said by Mr. Forget the present Lieutenant Governor of the Northwest Territories, and at that time one of the members of the Catholic board of education. He continued:

Now all this has disappeared, the board of education no longer exists nor its sections.

He refers to the Catholic and Protestant sections of the board.

All the schools, public and separate, Catholic and Protestant, are placed by the ordinance of 1892 under the direct control of a Protestant superintendent of education and of a council of public instruction.

Mr. Forget of course does not mean that the ordinances said the superintendent should be a Protestant, but that as a matter of fact it provided for a superintendent, and the man who was appointed was a Protestant.

And a council of public instruction, composed of the members of the executive committee, in which the Catholics have not one single representative.

That, I may say is not the case now. The ordinance very properly I think under the circumstances now provides that a certain number of members shall be Roman Catholics. We have another statement made by Mgr. Taché, late Archbishop of St. Boniface, a most distinguished and able prelate of the Roman Catholic church. In one of the documents addressed to the government on the subject he said:

The petitioners had this and other dangers in view when they said:

The effect of the ordinance is to deprive the Catholic separate schools of that character which differentiates them from public or Protestant schools and to leave them Catholic separate schools in name only, and such it is submitted is its obviously necessary effect.

Again on page 62 Archbishop Taché says:

In spite of all these protestations this ordinance in the dispositions which concerned us had and could have had but one object, that is, the abolition of all distinct character of our schools. Thanks to that ordinance and to the regulations of the council of public instruction which followed, this end has been to-day practically attained. Nothing essential now distinguishes the Catholic schools from the Protestant schools but the designation, now ironical, of separate schools.

Judge Rouleau, another member of the Catholic board said (page 341):

After mature examination of this ordinance I have come to the conclusion that it is ultra vires of the powers of the legislative assembly, for, amongst others the following reasons:

1. Because it is not provided by the said ordinance that the separate schools should be governed and controlled by the minority, but that they are in fact controlled and governed by the majority. In a word, we have no separate school system such as provided by the spirit of the law, chapter 55, section 14, of the Act of 1875.

3. Because the section 32 of the said ordinance is in contradiction of section 14 of the Northwest Territories Act, in that it limits the rights of the minority more than it is limited by the said section 14. But of course the principal objection of the Catholics to the school ordinance is the absolute control, the choice of text books, the school inspection and so forth by the Protestant majority. If separate schools exist now in name they do not exist in fact.

I have read these extracts for the purpose of showing that when the ordinance of 1892 was passed the distinctive character of these schools as separate schools, as denominational schools, as schools controlled by a sectarian body for sectarian purposes, absolutely disappeared. We have here the statement made by these gentlemen for the purpose of bringing the matter before the executive of Canada at that time, and in which they set out their grievances clearly and distinctly and in the most moderate terms. We have it that the clerical control of these schools was absolutely abolished. Every one recognized that it was absolutely abolished and in addition to that, I desire to say—whatever we may think of the justification for the action which was taken—it seems to me perfectly clear, that in abolishing the distinctive character of the schools, the legislature of the Northwest Territories did go beyond the powers that were bestowed upon it by this section of the Act of 1875. Upon that point Sir John Thompson expressed his opinion. In making a report on one of the ordinances passed shortly before 1892, but somewhat similar in its effect—not so sweeping in its effect—Sir John Thompson in substance reported, that this ordinance, contracts or diminishes the rights of minorities to an extent not contemplated by the Act of 1875, and that the Act of 1875 must nevertheless be held to remain in force notwithstanding the passage of the ordinance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have in the Northwest Territories at the present time, this system of public schools which was established by the Act of 1892 and referred to in the statements which I have read. I have endeavoured from a careful study of the ordinances: ordinance 29, which provides for the establishment of the schools, ordinance 30 which provides for the method of school assessment and ordinance 31 which provides for the distribution of the legislative grant—having reference to the efficiency of the schools and paying by results; rewarding the school which is efficient at the expense of the school which is not efficient, and thus introducing a good and sound principle into the education of the Territories—I have endeavoured by a careful study of these ordinances to come to clear and definite conclusions as to the main characteristics of the school system which exists there at the present time.

Now, what are the characteristics of this school system? My hon. friend the Minister of Customs discussed the matter with great clearness last evening, and read from the ordinances to give the House a definite idea of what the condition of affairs was. Let me give what I conceive to be an accurate resumé of the principles which are enforced and carried out by these ordinances. We have one normal school with uniform normal training for all teachers, and when I say all teachers, I mean teachers of all schools, separate and public; uniform curricula and courses of study for all schools of the same grade; uniform text books for all schools; uniform qualification of teachers for all schools; complete and absolute control of all schools as to their government and conduct, by the central school authority set up by the legislature under the ordinances; complete secularization of all schools between 9 o'clock in the morning and 3.30 in the afternoon, except that any school, if the trustees so desire, may be opened with the Lord's prayer; distribution of the legislative grant to all schools according to educational efficiency on principles set out in chapter 31.

Then, where there is a public school, the minority, Protestant or Roman Catholic, may organize a separate school; but every separate school is subject absolutely to all the foregoing provisions, and is in every sense of the term a public school. If the Protestants are in the minority in a district, their school is called a separate school; if the Catholics are in the minority in a district, their school is called a separate school; but both are public schools. They are absolutely similar save for one distinction: where the trustees are Protestant, there is Protestant teaching from half-past three to four, and where the trustees are Roman Catholic there is Roman Catholic teaching from half-past three to four. That is absolutely the only distinction between these schools.

Now, we are about to form two provinces, and we have to deal with the educational subject. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister says it was his intention by the legislation which he proposed, to continue the existing system in the Northwest Territories; and I accept that statement, of course, as expressing his intentions. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Hon. Chas. Fitzpatrick) the other evening accepted, as I understood, the responsibility for drawing the clause which contained the educational provisions, and I understood him also to say that the intention was to continue the existing state of affairs. Nobody would think of holding the Prime Minister responsible for the exact drafting of this clause, and I suppose it is not likely that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice drew it either. But I am bound to say, Mr. Speaker, that when my hon. friend the Minister of Justice employed a draftsman to draw this clause, with instructions to maintain only the existing state of affairs in the Northwest Territories, the draughtsman either wholly misunderstood his instructions or he possessed a most remarkable faculty for covering things which were not covered by his instructions. I propose to devote three or four minutes to an examination of this clause for the purpose of showing what I think it means. I am not going to address a lengthy legal argument to the House on this subject. When this clause was introduced by the government of which I was then a member, I conceived it to be my duty to protest against it, and to carry my protest to the extent of laying down the seals of office. I have no regret for the action I took. I think I then understood what the clause meant, and I think I now understand what it means; and while it is perhaps of no moment whatever to convince anybody who may have any doubts on the subject, or who may be difficult to convince as to what this clause means, it is unquestionably my duty, speaking to this House on this occasion, to say what I thought this clause meant, and what I think it means now, and why I felt called upon to make the protest that I did. In the Bill for the purpose of creating the territory of Saskatchewan, section 16, is the educational clause. It consists of three subsections. It says in the first place:

> The provisions of section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, shall apply to the said province as if, at the date upon which this Act comes into force, the territory comprised therein were already a province, the expression 'the union' in the said section being taken to mean the said date.

Now, what does that subsection do? It applies to the new provinces the provisions of section 93 of the British North America Act, which we all know by heart:

> In and for each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education,

subject and according to the following provisions :

1. Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the union.

Inasmuch as 'the union' is made to mean the date of the passing of this Act, and the word 'province' is changed to 'territory,' this subsection would read :

Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the territory at the time when this Act comes into effect.

What would that preserve ? First of all, Mr. Speaker, it would preserve everything that is set out in chapters 29, 30 and 31 of the ordinances ; there cannot be any possible doubt about that. In the next place, it might preserve everything that is set out in section 14 of the Act of 1875. It might, and it might not. It might be held by a court that the privileges held by law at the union were the privileges *de facto* possessed under the ordinances as they existed at the union, and the court might refuse to go back to the provisions of the Act of 1875. It is evident that there was a doubt about this, because the Bill re-enacts clause 14 of the Act of 1875, and thus it is revived, crystallized and made absolutely certain. I have pointed out to you what Mr. Forget, Mr. Justice Rouleau, Archbishop Taché, Sir John Thompson, and Mr. Haultain, thought as to the Act of 1875. It is the fact that under the Act of 1875, a complete dual system of clerical schools was established in the Northwest Territories, and it is the fact that legal authorities, like my friend Mr. Haultain, a quotation from whom I could read if I saw fit, like Sir John Thompson, to whom the matter was referred, thought that when those privileges were curtailed and taken away, they were taken away in defiance of the clause of the Act of 1875 which we find in substance in clause 16 of the Bill before the House. Therefore we should have the privileges by this Act retained as they are in chapters 29, 30 and 31, of the ordinance of 1901 and as they are in the Act of 1875.

Now, what more ? Here is subsection 3 :

In the appropriation of public moneys by the legislature in aid of education, and in the distribution of any moneys paid to the government of the said province arising from the school fund established by the Dominion Lands Act there shall be no discrimination between the public schools and separate schools.

It does not stop there.

There shall be no discrimination between the public schools and the separate schools, and such moneys shall be applied to the support of the public and separate schools in equitable shares or proportion.

I have had something to do with the administration of school laws. For a number of years a good deal of my time was spent in dealing with subjects of that kind, and I can give to the House my opinion, which they can take for what it is worth, but I am fairly confident that it is an opinion that will be justified by any court to which it may be referred, that the effect of that clause will be that if twenty years from now the province of Alberta undertook to apropriate $250,000 to build and equip a provincial university, a proportionate amount of money, proportionate to the number of separate schools as compared with the public schools, would have to be set aside for the establishment of a separate school institution. That is the opinion I have upon that clause ; that is the opinion I expressed to the Prime Minister at the time I objected to the clause, and I say it would be impossible for us to pass that clause, to allow it to go into effect, without putting a constitutional, irrevocable earmark upon the public funds of the Northwest Territories and upon the $50,000,000 worth of public lands that are in the public school trust. We would earmark that fund for ever, and would compel the legislatures of these provinces to divide that money, and in all probability to constitute one of the greatest endowments of sectarian education that has ever been proposed. That is the proposition which I understand to be concealed—partly concealed, not concealed to me—which I understand to be expressed by the terms of this clause.

I have been always a strong party man. I do not think that my political friends in past years have had any cause to complain that I have not been willing to do my share of the fighting, or that I have not been willing to take my share of the blame. If men are going to act together politically, when one makes a mistake the rest have to take the blame, and I have always been willing to take my share of the blame, and have always been willing to shoulder the load along with the rest. But I declare, and I am serious—if I had not been serious about it I would still have been a member of the government—I declare that I would join with anybody in Canada to resist the passage of that Bill in the terms in which it was placed before the House by my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have nothing more to say with regard to that. It was an unpleasant necessity for me to speak of it, but there are occasions on which people have to do things which constitute a very unpleasant necessity.

We have before us now a different proposition. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition says that he cannot see any difference between this proposition and the other.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The words that I used were that I saw no difference 'in principle.'

Mr. SIFTON. 'In substance' the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps I may have said 'substance' as well.

Mr. SIFTON. The hon. gentleman said 'substance,' because I have it here, but if he intended to say 'principle,' I will not dispute over the word, because I think that, although my hon. friend and I may not be able to agree on many things, I could convince him that these clauses are very different. What is the effect of the clause now before us ? I like the first section for one thing, although for another thing I do not. I like it, in the first place, because it is clear. I am bound to say that I think one of the things that is important in legislation of this kind is that it shall be such that the people can understand it after it is passed, and shall not have to go into the courts and fight for years to find out what the law is. I think everybody can understand what this means

> Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to separate schools which any class of persons have at the date of the passing of this Act, under the terms of chapters 29 and 30 of the ordinances of the Northwest Territories passed in the year 1901.

What does that preserve ? I have read these ordinances through, and all that I can find this section to preserve—and it is an important thing—let us not exaggerate or minimize, let us know exactly what we are doing—I think that this is what we are doing and all that we are doing. This section preserves the right of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority to have their school, a separate school in name, but a public school in fact, in a separate building if they wish. That is the right it preserves. It preserves, secondly, the right of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority in such school to have religious teaching from 3.30 to 4 o'clock in the afternoon. The hon. gentleman from East Grey endeavoured to work on our sympathies yesterday by referring to the difficulties which some Protestant families in Quebec have, because they have to attend what is, to all intents and purposes, a denominational Catholic school, and I understood the hon. gentleman to be arguing against the proposal which is contained in this Bill when he cited that fact as an illustration of the evils of separate schools.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say to the hon. gentleman that I never contemplated advancing that as an argument at all, but I gave it as an answer——

An hon. MEMBER. Did anybody give him credit for an argument ?

Mr. SPROULE. If I am entitled to any respect from that side of the House, I ought to be at least able to say what I intended. I was giving it as an answer to the statement of the Prime Minister, who had said that in Quebec the Protestants have nothing to complain of. I was not advancing it as an argument with reference to the Northwest Territories.

Mr. SIFTON. If my hon. friend did not intend his argument to apply to the conditions of the Bill it will not be necessary for me to answer, but I may go on to say that if anybody else had in his mind any idea that difficulties of that kind would arise, he may disabuse his mind of the idea, because they cannot arise under the system which is proposed in this Bill. In the first place, there is no such thing as a denominational school. Whether it is a separate school or a public school, a Catholic separate school or a Protestant separate school, it is a secular school from 9 a.m. to 3.30 p.m. Then if the religious teaching which is given is contrary to the faith of the parents of a child attending it, there is a conscience clause that the child does not need to remain. So that there is absolutely no reason why any person should be embarrassed by the practice of the school system which is actually in effect in the Northwest Territories under these ordinances.

Now, something has been said—a good deal has been said—in the press about subsection 2, and I wish to say a word about that. The House, possibly, may well understand that I am not particularly enthusiastic about subsection 1, which provides for the establishment of separate schools in the Territories, as I would not be enthusiastic about any provision establishing separate schools of any kind. Only, I am not addressing the House with the idea of convincing hon. members that I am an enthusiastic supporter of this subsection 1, for I am not. But, if we are to have subsection 1, if we are to have a provision which allows the separate schools to be established, then, surely, Mr. Speaker, we ought also to have a provision making it certain that the separate schools may have in them the possibility of being efficient schools. Why, Sir, it would be a crime against education to crystallize in the law of the Northwest Territories a provision that such and such people should have the right to organize such and such schools as public schools and not to protect them in the right to get the money which will make those schools efficient and enable them to advance and increase in efficiency in accordance with the desires of the persons in charge of them. I hesitate to vote, I find great difficulty in bringing myself to vote, for subsection 1. But it seems to me obvious that subsection 1 without subsection 2 would be much more objectionable than the whole section is as it stands. I should think that, without subsection 2, the proposition of the government would be much more objectionable than it is. If I have made myself clear, it will be seen that my observations are addressed to those who look upon subsection 2 as a very outrageous interference with the control of public funds by the legislature of the province. It is an interference—

there can be no question about that. But, as I have said, it is an interference only to the extent of requiring that when a separate school absolutely and entirely complies with the law and then comes before the educational authorities and says: Having complied with the law, being, in every sense of the word a public school, but called a separate school only because we happen to be less in number than the people who organized the public school, we asked to be paid this money in proportion to the efficiency we can show we possess under the educational statutes which you have seen fit to pass—that, when that is shown, the money necessary to the efficiency of the schools shall be given. There is a theoretical—I imagine it would only prove to be a theoretical—interference with the control of the public funds to that extent; but that is the inevitable corollary of subsection 1; and I would object to subsection 1 establishing separate schools very much more if it were not accompanied with the provision that the schools established under subsection 1 should be entitled to receive their share of the legislative grant.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) a question? Because, he is very familiar with these ordinances. Subsection 2 says:

> In the appropriation by the legislature or distribution by the government of the province of any money for the support of schools organized and carried on in accordance with said chapter 29 or any Act passed in amendment thereof or in substitution therefor, there shall be no discrimination against schools of any class described in said chapter 29.

If a university such as the hon. gentleman has mentioned should be established by an Act in amendment of or in substitution for the ordinances, what, in the hon. gentleman's opinion, will be the effect upon the application of public moneys?

Mr. SIFTON. I would not think it necessary to give an opinion. Because, why in the name of common sense the legislature of Alberta, when establishing a university, should establish it by an amendment of the school ordinance, I cannot possibly conceive. And, if knowing that in taking such a course, they were going to make themselves liable to a division of the funds, they had so little intelligence as to take it, I do not think this parliament can see far enough ahead to protect them against the consequences of their lack of foresight. I can tell my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) that my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) is the kind of man they have in the district of Alberta; and I want to ask him if he thinks that my hon. friend from Edmonton, if he were in the legislative assembly of Alberta, would be likely to get into such a trap as that? If the legislature of Alberta puts itself under this section unnecessarily and with malice aforethought they will have to take the consequence; but they are not obliged to put themselves under this section at all. And let me point out further that the effect of this clause is simply to require that, when the schools—the schools mentioned under the ordinance, and, as a matter of fact they are the primary schools, what we call the public schools, and not the grammar schools, the high schools or collegiate institutes, for I understand that to be the effect of the clause—when they comply with the provisions of the law, they get the ordinary share of the legislative grant. The legislature may set apart money for management, for the conduct of normal schools, for teachers' institutes; they may set apart money for high schools, universities, agricultural schools—for any and every purpose of education that they may desire; and to these the section will not apply in any way. The legislature will be free unless they deliberately put themselves under this clause intentionally, as they would if they did what my hon. friend suggests.

Now, what I have tried to do in this discussion has been not to waste the time of the House going over and over, and over again what has been said by other speakers as well or better than I could say it, but to endeavour to make clear what the effect of the legislation now proposed to the House will be when it is actually carried into operation. And the conclusion, therefore, is this—that if this legislation is carried into effect it preserves just the two privileges which I spoke of the privilege of the Roman Catholic or Protestant minority to have a separate school house, and the privilege of having religious instruction between half-past three and four o'clock in the afternoon. But there cannot be under this system any control of the school by any clerical or sectarian body. There cannot be any sectarian teaching between nine o'clock in the morning and half-past three in the afternoon. So that, so far as we have objections to separate schools based upon the idea of church control, clerical control, or ecclesiasticism in any form, this system of schools is certainly not open to that objection.

Now, I wish to say a word or two, if the House will pardon me, about my own position in regard to the principle involved in this discussion. I have a record upon this question, as hon. members are all aware. It is of no special importance to the House, and I should apologize for mentioning it were it not for the fact that some reference to it is necessary to the argument which I intend very briefly to present. When we, in the province of Manitoba undertook to remove what was a separate school system, that was 'inefficient to a point of absurdity' we found ourselves confronted with many and serious difficulties.

The school system which we abolished by the Public School Act of 1890 in the province of Manitoba, was precisely the

same school system as the system that was abolished by the ordinance of the North-west Territories in 1892. The two were abolished almost at the same time; but I am bound to say that our friends in the Northwest Territories succeeded in getting their reform with a good deal less difficulty and a good deal less turmoil that did the little province of Manitoba. If hon. gentlemen will look at the documents relating to the suit that took place between the province of Manitoba and the Dominion, or if they will look at the speeches that were made by men speaking on behalf of the province and who know the circumstances of the case, they will find that, although I myself and others took strong ground against the principle of separation in education—and my opinions upon that subject are just as strong to-day as they were then—although we took strong ground upon that principle, yet the attacks we made were not so much on that account as they were on account of the fact that the separate school system of the province was admittedly inefficient, and that children were being allowed by thousands to grow up in absolute ignorance and illiteracy. That was the ground upon which we attacked that system. We said then: Your system is inefficient; you have taken the public money and you have not applied it for the purpose of giving the children the education they ought to have; and we pointed to the fact that in districts where this clerically controlled system had been in force, the children had grown up in ignorance and the population was illiterate, and that fact could not be disputed.

Sir, my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, speaking last night, referred to the fact that it was said that the province of Manitoba had been harsh in abolishing that system. Well, Sir, I am here to say that you cannot abolish abuses of that kind by handling people with kid gloves. I am here to say that if there is any act in my public life I am proud of, it is the fact that I was one of those who helped to abolish that system of education in Manitoba in the year 1890. I know perfectly well that I am speaking upon a subject upon which there may not be very much unanimity of opinion; but I claim the right to have my own opinion on this subject, and I do not think that any man in this House, Roman Catholic or Protestant, will think any the less of me because I have the courage to state what I think. Although that was the fact, and although my hon. friend who sits opposite, the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), was one of those who tried to restore that inefficient system and compel us again to bring about a condition of affairs in which the public money would be wasted and a proper system of education would not be given to the children, they failed in that attempt. And why did they fail? They failed because the right hon. gentleman who leads this government stood in their way—that is the reason why they failed. And I want to say that we from the province of Manitoba who were engaged in that contest have never forgotten that gentlemen on the other side of the House, that my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) with whom unfortunately I do not often agree, and many others, left their party upon that question and stood for what I believe to be the proper principle, and I venture to think that the gentlemen who did so will always be remembered as having on that important occasion done what they believed to be right, though contrary to the interests of their party. But my right hon. friend the Prime Minister did not take the stand he did because he necessarily agreed with the views that I entertained, and that we in the province of Manitoba entertained upon that subject. As I understand the right hon. gentleman, he has always been an advocate in principle of separate schools, he does not dispute that. But he did dispute the moral right of the gentlemen who then controlled the administration of Canada to override the deliberate judgment of the people of Manitoba upon a matter which was vital to them, and which we in the province of Manitoba knew very much more about than the gentlemen who were endeavouring to thwart us.

Now, notwithstanding the fact that our opinions upon that subject were so strong, notwithstanding the fact that we had gone through a violent contest, a contest in which the feelings of men were deeply aroused, nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Greenway) then the Prime Minister of Manitoba and my leader, and myself, at that time, prior to the year 1896, recognized the fact that it was necessary in some of these cases to compromise, that we could not expect to have, altogether and at all times, our own opinions carried out to the fullest possible extent. When the government of Sir Charles Tupper sent commissioners to the province of Manitoba for the purpose of discusssing this question with us, the commissioners consisting of Lord Strathcona, then Sir Donald A. Smith, the late Mr. Dickey and Senator Desjardins—when they were sent up for the purpose of discussing this question, I had the honour of being appointed with one of my colleagues, Mr. Cameron, to discuss the question with them. We then recognized the fact that a compromise of some kind would probably have to be adopted in the end, and we made certain proposals to these gentlemen looking to a compromise with the view of meeting the wishes of our Roman Catholic friends. We told them that, whatever our private disposition might be, yet by reason of the pledges we had made to the people of the province of Manitoba in the election we had just gone through, we could not possibly compromise upon the

question of the separation of the children in the school houses, but we offered a compromise upon other things. But the commissioners declined our offer and came back, and the government then undertook to proceed with the Remedial Bill. When the election was over and the government of Sir Charles Tupper had been defeated, and Mr. Laurier, now Sir Wilfrid Laurier, came into power, he sent for the members of the Manitoba government to which I then belonged, and asked us what our views were. We pointed the right hon. gentleman to the proposition we had made to the commissioners of Sir Charles Tupper, the same proposition ipsissima verba, and we said that was the best we could do. The right hon. gentleman accepted that proposition, wisely, as the result shows, because matters are going very much more smoothly and satisfactorily in Manitoba since then. We drew up a basis of compromise. It will be found in the sessional papers of this House. The terms were submitted to the leading men of both political parties who had stood by us in the fight in which we had been engaged. We did not desire that any principle should be yielded without full consultation. Amongst others it was submitted to the late Dalton McCarthy, and it was approved by him. That compromise was carried into legislative effect. It does not go quite so far as the compromise upon this question which is before the House at the present time; but it was a substantial compromise on the general principle with which we had to deal. Yet at that time there were some men who said: No compromise; who said: Don't give in till you get the whole thing, you will get it if you stand up. I did not agree with that view. I thought that some compromise should be made. My colleagues in the government of Manitoba thought the same thing, and a compromise was made. But, Mr. Speaker,—and this is an observation I desire to commend to the attention of the House—there were very very few people who said, no compromise. And why was it that so few people then opposed the compromise? It was because the people of Canada had been fighting about this question for five years, they were sick and tired of the contest, and desired that there should be a compromise of some kind so that they might have peace. More than that, the material progress of this country had been stopped. My hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) knows perfectly well that the Manitoba school question paralysed governmental activity for a considerable length of time. The members of the government practically did nothing else; they could do nothing else but attend to the agitation and difficulties that arose out of this question. When a question of this kind has to be met it has to be met in a practical way. Complications arise, governmental activity and administration are absolutely destroyed, it is impossible for ministers to attend to their departmental duties or to attend to the business of the country as they should. Therefore, in 1896 when this settlement was made—although it was a settlement that hon. gentlemen opposite had refused to accept—although it was a settlement which led my right hon. friend the leader of the government out of a great difficulty and made his path smooth, yet the settlement has never been combated or criticised by any member of this House from that time up to the present moment.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. minister—just——

Mr. SIFTON. Not minister—member.

Mr. FOSTER. Member—former minister—just for the information of the House just tell us briefly what the difference was between the conditions before the compromise and after?

Mr. SIFTON. The principle was embodied in the compromise that wherever there was a certain number of Catholic children there should be a Catholic teacher. In that way it goes farther than the compromise we have here. I cannot from memory give the exact figures but in a rural district there was a certain number of children called for and in a town a larger number was called for, and wherever a certain number of Catholic children attended a school then, for each unit of that number, a Catholic teacher was required to be employed. Further, a provision we inserted that the children should, where the rooms in the school house permitted it, be divided up at half-past three for the purpose of having religious exercises, the Catholic teacher taking the Catholic children and the other teacher taking the Protestant children:

(An hon. member having handed Mr. Sifton the statute in question he read.)

In any school in towns and cities, where the average attendance of Roman Catholic children is forty or upwards, and in villages and rural districts if the average attendance of such children is twenty-five or upwards, the trustees shall, if required by a petition of parents or guardians of such number of Roman Catholic children, respectively, employ at least one duly certificated Roman Catholic teacher in such school.

Where the school house permits it by reason of different numbers and different rooms the children are divided, the Roman Catholic teacher takes the Roman Catholic children and the Protestant, or public school teacher takes the other children, and religious exercises are conducted in that way. As a matter of fact this compromise was a great and substantial advantage to the Roman Catholic people of Manitoba because in a very great number of cases where the Roman Catholic people live they are in

groups and where you find a considerable number of Roman Catholic children in a school they are nearly all Roman Catholic children. It is in such case a Roman Catholic community, and by this Act they have the right to have a Roman Catholic teacher and to have Roman Catholic exercises after half-past three ; so that in practice it gives them a greater advantage than it would appear to do from a casual reading of the Act. It has been fairly satisfactory although it does not give them the principle of separation as is given by the Act which is before us at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, we are face to face with the necessity of dealing with the question of giving these provinces a constitution and dealing with the question of educational legislation. I understand that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition takes the position, in which I concur, that we have a right if we so desire and the legal power to modify in detail the terms of section 93 of the British North America Act in such a way that the province as it was formed would have complete autonomy or liberty in regard to its educational legislation. If I am not correctly representing my hon. friend he will correct me.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is not quite my belief. Does my hon. friend wish me to state what it is ?

Mr. SIFTON. Certainly, I would be very glad.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My position is that if you apply to these provinces the terms of the constitution as they are to-day, they will give to these provinces the absolute right to deal with their own educational affairs.

Mr. SIFTON. I am sorry that my hon. friend said that because I had thought from the resolution which he has placed before us that his position was the position which I stated, and to my mind it would be a position that would be very much stronger. My hon. friend's amendment, I find, is as follows :

> Upon the establishment of a province in the Northwest Territories of Canada as proposed by Bill (No. 69), the legislature of such province, subject to and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Acts 1867 to 1886, is entitled to and should enjoy full powers of provincial self-government including power to exclusively make laws in relation to education.

If I understand my hon. friend aright, and I regret his position is not as I stated it, he says that by the application of the British North America Act, ipsissima verba, the effect of it would be that the provinces would have unlimited power in regard to education. But, my hon. friend can only give his opinion to that effect as a lawyer. Other lawyers do not think so. Other lawyers think the direct opposite. Other lawyers think that if you put section 93 of the British North America Act into effect the time when the province came in would be regarded as the 1st of July, 1905, and that the condition of affairs which would be preserved by the British North America Act would be the condition of affairs as they exist on the 1st of July, 1905. I do not say which is correct. It is a difficult point to decide, but surely we are not, when we are about to legislate upon this subject, going to allow the provinces to settle this question by a long course of litigation, turmoil and dispute. To show how difficult it is to have a positive opinion upon such a point I have heard men who are considered to be good lawyers flout the idea, or the proposition of law which my hon. friend suggests and I have heard men who are pretty good lawyers flout the opposite idea. In a question of that kind we who are lawyers all know it is absolutely impossible to tell how it will be held when it comes to be threshed out in the courts. To my mind for this parliament, sitting here in all its sovereign responsibility to give these Territories a constitution, to deliberately go to work and, for the purpose of getting out of the responsibility of doing one thing or the other, give that constitution in such terms that they will have to have a series of lawsuits for half a dozen years to have the question settled would be the most unstatesmanlike thing that we could do.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not want my hon. friend to misunderstand me. He has in the first place only quoted part of my argument. He speaks of the provinces coming in. A large part of my argument was devoted not to the question of a province coming in but to that of a province being created which my hon. friend has not dealt with at all. But, apart from that and in answer to what he has just said my view is a very simple one. I say that we have the right and only the right to apply the constitution as it exists at present in respect of the distribution of legislative power. My hon. friend seems to think that we can go on and do something more. If my view is correct we cannot go on and do anything more, and if we enact from now until this time next year it will not alter the result, because in the end our right to legislate must be determined in the courts. That is a very simple proposition.

Mr. SIFTON. My hon. friends statement does not alter my view in regard to his position. First of all, we would unquestionably have to change section 93 of the British North America Act before we could do it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Certainly.

Mr. SIFTON. Unquestionably we would have to feel we had that right. For my part, so far as concerns the changing of

the terms of section 93 by striking out the limitation contained in that section, I have not the least doubt in the world of our constitutional capacity to do it under the British North America Act of 1871. If my hon. friend takes the trouble to look up the opinion of so eminent a predecessor of his own as Sir John Thompson, he will find that Sir John Thompson expresses the same opinion. I think there can hardly be any doubt whatever that we can and should exercise that power. But, Mr. Speaker, if there were any doubt about it; if we passed this Act in acordance with our own judgment and our own discretion, giving these provinces such a constitution as we in our judgment think they ought to have by making a change in section 93, and there were any remote doubt about the constitutionality of that; is it not perfectly clear that all the Prime Minister would have to do would be as was done in the case of the Manitoba Act get a confirming Act from the imperial parliament. There would not be any difficulty about it, and if there were the least doubt that is the course that should be adopted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is any doubt about our power, I say that in fact nobody else but us can deal with it. We are here as the only possible constitutional body to deal with this question upon its merits. Does any one imagine that the imperial parliament is going to discuss this question and undertake to settle it upon its merits? Then, who is going to settle it upon its merits? The imperial parliament would never do that, they would deal with it as we recommended; they would say: you are the governing body; possibly technically you may not have enough power given you by the Act of 1871, but if you have not we will give it to you; it is your business, settle it as you see fit. And Mr. Speaker, that is the only way it can be settled. We are unquestionably in the position of being the only body that can ever deal with the merits of this case.

For my part, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in saying what my own opinion would be: it would be that the province ought to be left entirely free to deal with its own educational affairs. But, I would not get at it in the way that my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) does, by saying, the constitution does that, but as there is a certain amount of doubt about it I would strike out the limiting clause and I would make it so clear that there would not be any doubt in the minds of any one.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If we undertake to do that and do not possess the power under the British North America Acts 1867 to 1868, would not the courts control in the end as they have a dozen times, as they have a hundred times both with regard to provincial and Dominion legislation?

Mr. SIFTON. What was done in the case of Manitoba? Was section 93 of the British North America Act applied ipsissima verba? If my hon. friend will look at it he will find it was not. He will find that in the case of the province of Manitoba a special section was enacted by this parliament and he will find that although questions were raised as to the competence of this parliament to pass that Act, the doubt was not as to the competence of this parliament to pass section 93, but as to other sections. If he will go back further he will find that notwithstanding that questions were raised as to competence of this parliament, the law officers of the Crown in Great Britain said we were perfectly competent, and that the Manitoba Act was within the competency of this parliament. If this parliament had the power in the case of Manitoba to put in a separate provision for the purpose of placing separate schools clearly and distinctly upon the province of Manitoba have we not the power to change section 93 by taking out the limitation? If we can do one thing we can do the other; if we can change a subsection then we can take a subsection out. That proposition is entirely obvious.

I said that so far as I was concerned I thought we had the power to leave the provinces absolutely free, and that for my part if I had my own way that is the policy I would pursue. But I quite recognize the strength of the argument upon the other side. We are face to face with two positions--I shall only detain the House for a few minutes longer; I apologize for speaking at such length.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. SIFTON. We are face to face with two propositions. We have the principle of the British North America Act to apply. The leader of the government and myself can agree that we ought to apply the principle of section 93 of the British North America Act, but as to the particular way in which we are to apply that principle we do not agree. But we ought to apply the principle, and when we come to the question: how are we to apply it, we come up against two separate and distinct and irreconcilable propositions. From my standpoint I say: inasmuch as the Northwest Territories are not a constitutionally free community; inasmuch as the ordinances passed are ordinances passed under a special and limited power; therefore when they come into the family of provinces we ought not to apply to them the principle of observing the status quo, because the status quo was not brought about by their own unlimited powers. There is also the view that is presented to us by our friends led by the right hon. the Prime Minister, and held by many other gentlemen here. They say—it was well stated by the

Minister of Finance—they say: you constituted that territory 35 years ago; 30 years ago you established separate schools; you said when you were doing it that you intended it to be permanent; those who made speeches when the Bill was presented to parliament, said we bring this Bill to parliament because we want the people of the Northwest Territories to know what kind of institutions they are going to have, and among others they are going to have separate schools. Half a million people have gone into the Northwest Territories knowing what the laws were. Although I am not absolutely convinced by the argument made by these gentlemen, yet I know that out of that population of half a million there are 125,000 Roman Catholics, and I further know that many of these people actually went to the educational department at Regina by their authorized representatives and got copies of these school ordinances so that they might know whether they would be allowed to have separate schools before they came into the Northwest Territories. Therefore, our friends say: here is a state of affairs existing for thirty years, carried on under your direction, creating vested rights in 125,000 people who have gone there upon the strength of your guarantee. And so, with some degree of plausibility they argue: you are far more bound to maintain that state of affairs than if it had been created by the province, because you are responsible for it yourselves. Here we have two separate and irreconcilable propositions. If I talked for ever I do not think I would convince the gentlemen who do not think as I do upon this subject. I do not think I could convince them that we should leave the legislature of the Northwest absolutely free in this matter—although I am for my part convinced after the history of the question in the province of Manitoba, and from the knowledge I have of what public men in the Territories think on this whole question from beginning to end—I am firmly convinced that it would be better for the Roman Catholic people of the Northwest Territories if the legislature were left absolutely free. But, I shall never convince the gentlemen who do not think so; I shall never get them to think as I do on the question, because if I talked for a hundred years their views would be just the same as they are to-day.

I am very much inclined to think, Mr. Speaker, that they will not be able to convince me. I do not think they would be able to convince me that it would not be better that the legislature of the Northwest Territories should be free. Now, what are we going to do? We are face to face with an absolutely irreconcilable state of affairs. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance put it very well the other evening. He said: What are you going to do? what are you going to decide? The King's government must be carried on; the business of the country must be carried on; and there is only one of two ways in which this question can be decided. The Protestant people of Canada can say to the Roman Catholic people: You cannot convince us, we cannot convince you, but there are more of us than there are of you, and we are going to vote you down. I put aside a proposition of that kind. There is no man in this government who would contemplate attempting to carry out a proposition of that kind if he had the power. Least of all would my hon. friend who leads the opposition desire to see a proposition of that kind carried out, no matter what his views on the merits of the question might be. Then, what are you going to do? What is the position of affairs going to be? You cannot make a political religious issue of these questions either for the members of this House or for the inhabitants of the Dominion of Canada; and even if you did—as my hon. friend the Minister of Finance very well said: if those who thought in this House as I do combined with me and if the result of their efforts were to drive the right hon. gentleman (the Prime Minister) from office on this question, all that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance said the other night, and much more, would be true. No greater political misfortune could happen to hon. gentlemen opposite than that they should be called upon to take office under such circumstances. Suppose it happened. Every man who knows the political history of Canada knows that we might fight about this question year in and year out for years, the political and financial progress of the country might be paralyzed, the business of the country would be blocked by the condition of affairs, and after it was all done, we should be simply where we had started, and the people would have to come together on this question and compromise their differences.

What I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, is that I have very strong views on this question. I have not concealed those views from the members of the House. There is a certain distance that I am prepared to go in the way of compromise; I have so expressed myself to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. To the extent which is embodied in the proposition before this House I am willing to go. I am willing to go that far because I believe that the essential principles of a first-class, thoroughly national school system are not impaired, and the taint of what I call ecclesiasticism in schools, and which in my judgment always produces inefficiency, will not be found in the school system of the Northwest under this legislation, unless the people of the Northwest choose to have it, in which case it is their business and not ours. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I have found a very great deal of difficulty in deciding upon my course on this question. When I saw the

Bills that had been introduced, I at once came to the conclusion that I could not decide upon my course while remaining a member of the government, in the enjoyment of office and the emoluments of office. I came to the conclusion that, whatever anybody else might do, my course was perfectly clear: I should, when this question came up, be in a position to speak with a freedom with which a member of the government could not speak, and I should be called upon to decide to what extent and how far I would be prepared to compromise opinions which I had publicly expressed, and opinions which I still hold in order not to destroy the government of the country. That question which comes to every man in public life sooner or later, comes to-day to a good many men in this House of Commons. The question is how far a man is justified in compromising his opinion for the purpose of preventing a political crisis. That is a question which nearly every man in this House has had to decide before; but perhaps no person has had to decide it under quite as remarkable circumstances as the present. For myself, as to the political effect upon myself, I care not for that. I have relieved myself, I think, of the imputation that the course I have taken has been influenced by considerations of office or the considerations of my party remaining in office; and therefore I have to say, having given the subject the best consideration that I am capable of giving it, and having given it that consideration not only from the standpoint of the position of affairs in this parliament but from the standpoint of the position of affairs in the Northwest Territories in time to come, that I can, though not with very much enthusiasm, and with some degree of reluctance, give my support to the Bill.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that when the mountain would not go to Mahomet, Mahomet went to the mountain, and that saying has been illustrated, I will not say in a very pleasing way, this afternooon. I was very much puzzled, while my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) was speaking, to know just what line I should be compelled to take in what appeared to be a triangular duel. I was afraid to appear even to assent to the opinions of my hon. friend, lest I too might be treated with the same contemptuous indifference that the government according to his own account, had given to him; and I was afraid to appear to differ from him, for I did not know how long it would be before I would find that he and I were in perfect accord. I thought, when the hon. gentleman opened his remarks, that he would perhaps shed a bright light on the subject under discussion, which would enable us to understand how and why this country is being plunged into the excitement which prevails, and why the right hon. gentleman who brought down this Bill brought it down so hastily, so inadvisedly, and apparently with so little preparation. When the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat gave his reasons a short time ago for leaving the government, he told us that he had discussed various things with the Prime Minister. He told us to-day that he had not discussed the educational question; and yet, when he spoke the other day, he was careful to explain that he had not neglected the educational question, but that, to quote his own words:

> When it was determined that during this session of parliament legislation should be introduced creating new provinces out of a portion of the Northwest Territories, I felt called upon, in view of the history of the educational question in Canada, to give very serious consideration to the position which I should take with regard to the legislative power to be conferred upon the provinces in regard to the subject of education.

And so, Sir, although the Minister of the Interior, as he was then, was spending his recess in giving calm and I suppose judicial consideration to this important question of education, and although meeting his leader from time to time and discussing the minor features of the Bill, he never thought it worth his while to discuss with his leader, nor did his leader waste his time in discussing with him, this important question of education.

And so, Sir, it is that we find that, although conference followed conference, nothing was said at these conferences on the subject of education, but the Minister of the Interior retiring to the privacy of his own chamber, then apparently gave himself solely and exclusively to rapturous contemplation of this interesting subject of education. Perhaps the reason that the hon. gentleman did not before suggest education to his colleagues was because he had received so little respect and consideration from them in the matters he had consulted with them about, that he did not think it worth his while even to mention this subject. He has told us that although he had made suggestions, being Minister of the Interior and best cognizant of the needs of the Northwest, he could not even persuade his colleagues where they should draw the line between the two territories, perhaps as trifling a proposition as could be considered. They would not even accept his suggestion on such a trifling matter as that, but put the boundary some sixty miles west from where he thought it should be. He thought, too, that the provinces should extend to the north, and no doubt did his best to persuade his colleagues that they should extend to the north, but although he knew the situation ten times as well as his ex-colleagues he was not consulted, he was not made a member of this important subcommittee, and all his suggestions on these points were treated with contemptuous indifference. Then on the important question

of the financial arrangements and the land question, which are so closely connected as to form one subject, we find that although the hon. gentleman had strong views —and I may say that I think his views are far more correct than those of the government—although he presented his case as ably, as eloquently and as persuasively as he has this afternoon spoken to the House, still, on that point too, the government refused to listen, and so the land and fiscal questions are complicated by the introduction of a principle which, as pointed out by the minister this afternoon, shows that the government, by admitting to the provinces that we should pay for the land, have admitted that the provinces have a right to the land. Again I say that, although he was right in his representations, the government treated them with contemptuous indifference. Then, after making these protestations and after being badly treated, treated with indifference in this way, could one imagine that there was no irony concealed in his remarks when he said in this House that there was no pique when he resigned after this Bill was brought down two days before his arrival? We have heard many details of the hon. gentleman's exploits in the west; many rumours have drifted down to us during the past ten years, but I venture to say that not one of them will be received with less credulity by the country than the statement he made this afternoon as to the causes of his resignation. Just think for a moment the position that he put his colleagues in. Had the ex-minister come out flatly, and bravely said: 'I resign because I refuse to occupy a seat in a cabinet with men who do not understand business,' then we would have understood and the country would have understood. But when we see the pitiable spectacle of ministers bringing down such a Bill, standing up and advocating it in spite of such tremendous objections to it as those which the ex-minister pointed out, and the existence of which they admitted by changing the Bill, what are we to think of the capacity of a cabinet that would plunge the country into all the excitement and turmoil of the past few weeks on a measure to which they have given so little attention as they have given to this?

The hon. gentleman to-day touched on many subjects. There is one subject on which I did not intend to speak, but I shall refer to it in consequence of the remarks of the hon. the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), coupled with what was said a night or two ago by the Prime Minister and also by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) last night. When the premier was speaking the other day he pointed out, with regard to the agitation which convulsed this country in 1896, that the Conservative party had undoubtedly misunderstood their position, that at that time Manitoba stood in the same position as Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, and that the Conservative party,

in endeavouring to pass the Remedial Bill dealing with Manitoba which stood on the same footing as Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, had entirely misconceived the position. The right hon. gentleman pointed out that the Privy Council held that there were no separate schools in Manitoba prior to the union, and therefore no rights of Catholics in that province. Therefore, the right hon. gentleman objected to the exercise in this House of the powers of remedial legislation. I refer to this, because his colleague last night repeated the same statement, and I tell the right hon. gentleman, and I tell this House, I tell the Protestant minority in Quebec and the Roman Catholic minority in Ontario, I tell the minorities in every province in this Dominion, that the remedial clause of section 93 of the British North America Act has been practically blotted from the statute by the right hon. gentleman and those who supported him at that time. The Prime Minister, the other evening, gave a very interesting and very accurate account of the circumstances under which the educational clauses of the British North America Act were framed. I entirely agree with every word he uttered on that point, but let me add one or two words to what he said. It is perfectly true that when confederation was about to be formed it was agreed between the politicians of Upper and Lower Canada that two Bills should be introduced to this House, one giving educational privileges to the Catholic minority in Upper Canada, the other giving educational privileges to the Protestant minority in Lower Canada. These Bills were introduced but for reasons which we need not now discuss, they were not passed, and those Bills, not having been passed, and confederation being about to be effected, the whole scheme would have fallen through, because the Protestants of the province of Quebec refused to enter confederation until their educational rights were secured. Then Sir George Etienne Cartier and Sir Hector Langevin, speaking for the Roman Catholics of Quebec, said: If the Protestants of Quebec will consent to going into oconfederation without this legislation, we pledge our honour that at the first session of the local legislature of the province of Quebec, after confederation has been formed, we will see that the rights you would have secured by the Bill of last session, had it passed, are conferred on you by a statute of the local legislature. Sir Alexander Galt replied: I am perfectly satisfied to take the word of you gentlemen and believe that you will adhere to it, but times are fleeting, lives are uncertain and a day may come when others will control the legislation of Quebec, and in that case what the local legislature gave it can take away, and the minority may be deprived of the privileges granted to them. Then it was that Galt, as the right hon. gentleman said, drew with his own hand his famous clause, that if after confederation any right given to

a minority by a legislature after confederation was taken away, the minority had a right of appeal to Ottawa in order to secure their just rights. On those terms, Sir, the Protestants of Quebec and the Roman Catholics of Ontario came into confederation. My hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) seems to be oblivious of the terms on which Manitoba came into confederation. It came in under very peculiar circumstances. The people of Manitoba treated with the people of the Dominion and made a compact. The Protestants and Roman Catholics in Manitoba alike wished to have a provision for separate schools. We all know the history of these things ; we know that it was uncertain whether the Roman Catholics or the Protestants would be in the majority in Manitoba, and it being wholly uncertain whether there would be an invasion of Roman Catholics from Quebec that would make Manitoba a Catholic province, or an invasion of Protestants from England and Ontario which would make it a Protestant province, the Roman Catholics and Protestants combined in asking the legislature to make such provisions that the minority would have separate schools. And so it was that the Act was passed, an Act not worth very much on its face, but being a compact between the people of Manitoba and this Dominion, the Act passed by this House was validated by the imperial parliament, and therefore it is a good law to-day. What is the position of the people of Manitoba ? They came in under an express bargain which provided for separate schools. They have, under section 93, the express right of appeal to this parliament at Ottawa in case they should be deprived of any right after they had come into confederation.

Well, Sir, when they came into confederation they were, as everybody supposed, given their separate schools. My hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) this afternoon attacked gentlemen on this side, because, he said, we wished to restore these inefficient schools. But he must remember that one of the conditions we insisted on was that the old inefficiency should be done away with ; and Roman Catholics were willing to agree that the schools should be made efficient. All that we on this side wished to do was, as loyal Canadians to stand by our word and keep the honour of Canada unsullied.

The appeal came to Ottawa. As the Prime Minister said, the highest court in the realm, the Privy Council decided that it was intended to give separate schools to Manitoba, and that this legislation was strong enough to give them had it been properly based. But, as a matter of fact, owing to the circumstance that the schools were not there under the law or in practice before Manitoba enterd confederation, they had failed, and they were not entitled under the law, to the separate schools. The Roman Catholics, having appealed to the courts, like good subjects bowed to the decision, but they came to us for a law to remedy their grievance. And the reason why I say the right hon. gentleman has wiped that clause out of the statute-book and deprived minorities throughout the Dominion of the protection they had, is that no one can conceive of any circumstances under which any province could come to Ottawa with a stronger case than that with which Manitoba came here. Every one knew that separate schools were meant to be given, that the attempt was made to then give it, and that it was believed that that attempt was effective. Every one knew that Manitoba itself understood that the separate schools were established. And, under these circumstances, the strongest that could arise, the minority in Manitoba came asking us not to coerce the province, but to give the minority the rights which, it was intended to give them. And when the government of the day, though anxious to live up to the spirit of confederation and protect minorities , they were prevented from doing so by the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If the local legislature of Quebec should repeal every law that has been made to assist the Protestant minority since confederation—and many of them have been passed—if the provincial legislature of Ontario should repeal the laws under which the separate schools of that province have been maintained, they have the legal power to do it. It is beyond question that to-day every single privilege in regard to their schools that the Protestants of Quebec and the Catholics of Ontario enjoy, they owe to generosity and forbearance of the majority. All the provisions for the protection of separate schools under the constitution are practically worthless because they are unworkable. Therefore, I say the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) should speak with some reticence on the educational question in view of the lamentable experience of the minorities of this Dominion solely through the attitude taken by the right hon. gentleman himself. I would not have dealt with this subject of Manitoba, had it not been referred to by the Prime Minister in presenting the Bill, and last evening by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) and this afternoon by the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) their utterances on the subject making it necessary to say a few words to show in what way they have misconceived the position of the Conservative party at that time. If the right hon. gentleman has misconceived the attitude of his opponents at the time when he came into power we may excuse him if he has forgotten some things which he might well have remembered when he brought this Bill down for the consideration

of the House. In introducing the Bill on the 21st of February, the right hon. Prime Minister used the following words :—

> A great deal has been done in fact, more has been done than we have to do to-day. We have to take the last step but it is easy and comparatively unimportant in view of and in comparison with what has already been accomplished. The metal has been in the crucible and all we have to do now, is to put the stamp of Canadian nationality upon it.

The right hon. gentleman's colleague the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) spoke a couple of nights ago. He had seen this Bill, not before it was introduced but before he spoke. But between the Prime Minister's speech and his own, apparently, he had heard something from the country that his leader had not anticipated, so that when he spoke—and he is a most careful speaker—he said :

> We have to-day before us perhaps the most important measures that have ever engaged the attention of the parliament of Canada.

Now, Sir, is it not, to put it mildly, a little disappointing to hon. gentlemen on this side, when called upon to discuss a measure which is evoking such a feeling as this Bill is, that the right hon. Prime Minister in introducing it should tell us that it is a matter of such little importance that it is hardly worth while wasting time over it; —while, a few days later, the Minister of Finance—who might have been justified in using the language of his leader, and saying the Bill was of no moment, because his leader thought the Bill of so little importance as to be not worth while submitting to the consideration of the Minster of Finance and the Minister of the Interior, the two experts whose opinion would be required—frankly admits that it is the most important measure that we have had in many a day. I go further than the hon. gentleman and say, in all sincerity, that not only is it the most important measure before parliament to-day, but I believe that it is the most important measure that has ever been before this House, the most important measure—and I say it with a due consciousness of the seriousness of my words—that will be brought before any English speaking assembly for many a day to come. Let me explain why I say that. A great deal has been said by some speakers in the way that I sincerely regret. I trust I shall be able to express myself on these vexed questions without using a single word that will be offensive to any one. I do not see why one cannot express his views conscientiously and frankly without being offensive. And I must pay the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) the compliment of saying that there was nothing said by him this afternoon that could be offensive to any one on either side of the House. I hope to follow the good example that the hon. gentleman has set. But, when we are dealing with half a million square miles of territory of our Northwest, we must not forget that time is fleeting, that history moves on, and that nowadays great changes take place within a few years. We have often been referred to the year 1875 in this debate, the year when the law was passed for the regulation of the Northwest, when the school law was placed upon the statute-book. Who would have expected at that time that people to-day would be spending time in discussing the school regulations for a country in which, I understand, there were in 1875, only about 500 people. We know that that part of the country was then regarded as a part that would not attain anything like the importance it has attained to-day. Within a quarter of a century, since the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, wonderful changes have come over that part of our country. Immigration is pouring in and development is rapidly progressing. Not only are the eyes of the old provinces fixed on the Northwest, but the eyes of the empire are upon that country as the future granary of the empire. More than that, Sir, we know that the eyes of the whole world are turned to the Northwest as being the most attractive place for immigration for those leaving the countries of the old world, which are not so free as ours, and wishing to find new homes. It seems that we are approaching this subject in a parish spirit if we cannot see more in it than a few details concerning the regulation of a few schools. The ex-Minister of the Interior has quoted some eminent Roman Catholic prelate as saying that these schools differed nothing from public schools except in the name. If there is so little to distinguish them, if they are practically one and the same thing, why should the right hon. gentleman have thrown this firebrand into the political arena ? The right hon. gentleman discussed the Bill, with a subcommittee consisting of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) whose ability as a lawyer we are all proud of in this House ; the Secretary of State and the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock). If in discussing it with these gentlemen—which one representing the Northwest I do not know, which one representing the adverse view on education to that held by the Prime Minister himself I do not know—none of them was willing to discuss it from the standpoint of the majority of the Northwest, why could not the Prime Minister have waited until his Minister of the Interior had returned ? Why could not the right hon. gentleman have waited till his Minister of Finance returned ? Why could he not have waited an hour or two until Mr. Haultain could have been found ? Why could not the right hon. gentleman have done something

to avoid the introduction of this unfortunate question into the political arena ?

Now, Sir, the position unfortunately is this, that, as I said a few moments ago, the right hon. gentleman has by his own act practically blotted out clause 3 from section 93 of the British North America Act, and therefore it is that at such a time as this we should endeavour to legislate, not in the spirit suggested by the right hon. gentleman the other evening, as representing individual constituencies, but legislate as representatives of the people of Canada. When the right hon. gentleman was speaking he pointed out that it would be impossible to do certain things, for instance, to extend the boundaries of Manitoba, because the representatives of the Northwest objected to that. Now, I object for my part to such an interpretation of our duties as that. I submit that we shall certainly come to grief if we cannot in the first instance, understand our own duties and responsibilities here. We are here as representatives, not primarily of our individual constituencies ; every man sitting in this House is the representative of all the people of Canada, and I claim to represent the people of the Northwest just as much as any gentleman coming from the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. And when the right hon. gentleman is prepared to adopt the views of seven gentlemen from those Territories, gentlemen elected on different lines altogether, without regard to this question in deciding the future of that great country which at no distant day must hold the balance of power in this Dominion, I can only say on that point emphatically, that I differ from him. If we could induce the right hon. gentleman, assisted perhaps by the ex-Minister of the Interior—because we would be delighted to have his assistance, though we would want to have it before we got very far away, because he might change his mind before we met again—if we could possibly induce the premier to be guided in some way by considerations of the trifling character of the change suggested in the schools as pointed out, though a tremendous change as some people think, surely something might be done to avoid this difficulty. Something has been said about the law of 1875 being a law under which the people were induced to go into the Northwest, and that they have a right to believe that it will be maintained. Now I would like to ask the ex-Minister of the Interior how many of his Doukhobors or Galicians could he name to-day who went to the Northwest because they had read the parliamentary debate of 1875, and were satisfied that their school rights would be maintained ? If by any possibility any weight were to be attached to that argument—which I do not think the hon. gentleman himself really considered as an argument, I myself took it merely as one of his pleasantries—if there were any weight to be attached to that argument, then at least the same weight must be attached to the opinion of men of the standing of the Hon. David Mills, and Sir Louis Davies, and Sir John Thompson, who all said that when parliament came to form the provinces it would be perfectly free to do as it saw fit.

Now, before discussing the subject itself, let me consider one or two remarks of the ex-Minister of the Interior. When the hon. gentleman was speaking of the causes that led him to withdraw from the government, he pointed out that the original clause as introduced by the government had a certain meaning, and that subsequently it was modified so that he could accept it. The hon. gentleman pointed out that in the first instance the difference between what he wanted and what he got was so great that he was compelled to lay down the seals of office, to abandon all the patronage and emoluments of office, and to sink down to the level of an ordinary member, and all for conscience. But what was it the hon. gentleman had to salve his conscience for all these serious losses ? I think if I remember his language correctly he said there was a possibility that if a university were endowed, there might be a discussion as to the rights of the respective parties as to a share in the money. Then the hon. gentleman said that under the original clause as introduced, all the provisions of the Act of 1875 were also enacted. Now if the hon. gentleman will look at the 1875 Act, he will find there is nothing in that Act whatever that provides machinery by which these schools shall be carried on. The 1875 Act says in effect that Protestant and Roman Catholics, respectively, whenever in a minority, are to be allowed to have separate schools, are to be allowed to appropriate their own taxation to the support of their schools, and are not to be compelled to support any other schools. That is all there was in the Act of 1875. There was not a word in it about giving the Roman Catholic hierarchy charge of the schools, there was not a word in it about this, that or the other regulation, or ordinance, but the local authorities were to be allowed to do as they saw fit, except that they must not interfere with the rights of minorities to have their own separate schools, be they Protestant or Roman Catholic, and to apply their own taxation for their maintenance. Subsequently the hon. gentleman pointed out that certain changes were made by the local authorities. Now would the hon. gentleman pretend to say that anybody whose opinion was worth considering ever thought that the local authorities which had passed those ordinances had not the right to repeal them ? They passed them, they existed for a time, and they repealed them, and that is all there was about it. And if the Act as first introduced had gone into effect, the

people of the Northwest would have had just such schools as they will have to-day, with all the rights and privileges attaching to those schools as they are to-day. Will the hon. gentleman say that is not the case under the present Act? Would he pretend to say that under the Act now before the House minorities in the Northwest have not exactly the same rights and privileges they would have had under the original clause, except that he suggests that they might in some occult way be put back to the day of 1875 when the hierarchy were controlling the schools? Then the hon. gentleman's reference to the university was rather an amusing one. I am inclined to think that if the hon. gentleman will read the clauses carefully side by side he will find that there is no ground whatever for the objection he raises. Let me read the original clause as it appeared when the Bill was first introduced:

> In the appropriation of public moneys by the legislature in aid of education, and in the distribution of any moneys paid to the government of the said province arising from the school fund established by the Dominion Lands Act——
>
> Any moneys appropriated by the legislature for education, or any moneys coming arising from the sale of lands.
>
> There shall be no discrimination between the public schools and the separate schools, and such moneys shall be applied to the support of public and separate schools in equitable shares or proportion.

That is to say, that every dollar applied for schools is to be divided equitably between public and separate schools. But what is there in that clause to suggest that if the legislature choose to endow a university, either the majority or the minority will be discriminated against because in 1910, perhaps, the legislature might give a sum to endow a university? The hon. gentleman had to go very far afield to find such an argument as that to justify his course. When we come to simmer it down—if I am omitting any point I am willing to be corrected—when we come to simmer it down he who, for two or three weeks, has stood on the highest pedestal in the Dominion of Canada, worshipped as a martyr from one end of the country to the other, whose praises could not be drowned even by the rolling waves of the Labrador coast, and which were wafted even to the sunny slopes of the west, that hon. gentleman who has posed for two or three weeks as a conscientious martyr who would lose anything rather than principle, who was prepared to suffer anything except a wound to his conscienne—that hon. gentleman comes down to-day and kisses the hand that smote him, and the only possible excuse that he can give for his ingratitude, for his disloyalty to his chief, is that he thought that under this second clause, if passed, there might possibly come a day when they would endow a university, and there might be a dispute between the majority and the minority as to the distribution of their funds for that university, while under the amended clause there could be no trouble.

Surely, if ever there was a cause to which the old adage parturiunt montes, nascitur mus—the mountain has laboured and brought forth a mouse—applies, it is this one.

I think I will be justified in saying that when a measure of the importance of this is brought before this House the burden rests entirely on those who proposed it, of showing parliament that the measure of such a character that it is our duty to pass it. It is not part of the duty of the opposition to show that the measure is not a proper one. The burden surely rests on the government of the day, bringing down such an important measure, to show that it is one that should really be passed by this House. The right hon. leader of the government in introducing the Bill—and I am sorry he is not here at the present moment—laid great stress—page 1517 of 'Hansard'—on the fact that we, the people of Canada, occupied a peculiar position, because we have bought and owned these Northwest lands. He declared that we had bought these lands, that we owned them and that we own them now and therefore surely the old saying should hold good: Can a man not do as he likes with his own? I am sorry he is not here, but I see the hon. Minister of Justice in his place, and. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Justice, on behalf of his chief, to tell me from whom Canada bought these lands, when she bought them and how Canada got her title to those lands? When the statement is made, from which inferences are drawn, that we own these lands, I say that the right hon. gentleman should be prepared with some proof to substantiate that statement. I am quite prepared to admit that an hon. gentleman sitting behind him having heard him make the statement that we did own these lands might give his support to the measure which he might not give if he knew we did not own these lands and that we never owned them. If there were any doubt about the question one would only have to look at the state papers at the time the Hudson Bay Company ceded its rights to the Crown. A committee was appointed, composed of Sir George Cartier and Mr. McDougall; they looked thoroughly into the subject and they made a report. Their report was to the effect that the Hudson Bay Company had no title whatever to these lands, that they never did have a title and they gave an abundance of reasons why the Hudson Bay Company never could have had a title. Without occupying the time of the House by going into this simple question I might

merely in a few words illustrate the point by saying that at the time the Hudson's Bay Company obtained its grant from Charles II the grant did not profess to give the lands in the Northwest Territories. In the next place if the Crown did profess to cede to the Hudson Bay Company the lands in the Northwest Territories, Great Britain did not own these lands at that time and did not acquire them from France for many years afterwards. It is certain that if Great Britain did not own them Great Britain could not give them and did not give them to the Hudson Bay Company. All that Great Britain did was to grant certain rights to the Hudson Bay Company in regard to fishing, trade and commerce. The Hudson Bay Company never owned these lands in the Northwest Territories and never professed to sell them to the Dominion of Canada. In Vol. 11, No. 5, sessional papers, 1869, paper 25, April 23, after giving all the reasons why the Hudson Bay Company had never acquired any title to the Northwest Territories, Sir George Cartier and Mr. McDougall concluded as follows :

> The country which in view of these facts must be excluded from the operation of the charter includes all the lands fit for cultivation and settlement in that part of British America.

Then as to Rupert's Land, which of course is no part of the land we are now dealing with, they say :

> We are thus led to the same conclusion as in the case of the territory claimed, but not owned by the company, viz., that what they propose to sell has no pecuniary or commercial value. They are there, however, by at least a show of right. Being there they obstruct the progress of imperial and colonial policy and put in jeopardy the sovereign rights of the crown over one-third (and as some think even a larger portion) of the North American continent.
>
> What is it worth to have this obstruction quietly removed ? This is, perhaps the true question, but the answer we submit, belongs rather to Her Majesty's government which has the power, in the case of resistance, to remove the evil by summary process, than to those who are little more than spectators of the negotiation.

That report having been given the Executive Council made the following report :

> Report of committee of executive council approved 22nd June, 1866, volume 1, No. 7, 1867-1868. Sessional papers.
>
> In the first place the committee do not admit that the company have a legal title to that portion of the Northwestern territory which is fit for cultivation and settlement. This fertile tract is a belt of land stretching along the northern frontier of the United States to the base of the Rocky Mountains, and Canada has always disputed the title of the company to it.

So we have the unquestionable fact that Canada always disputed with the Hudson Bay Company that they had any title to these lands, and we have the fact that the Hudson Bay Company ceded all their rights to the Crown. But, my right hon. friend must say if the rights are in the Crown in regard to these lands then we have a right to administer them. There is where we take issue with the right hon. gentleman. We take issue with him when he says the Dominion is supreme. The Dominion is supreme in its sphere, but the provinces are just as supreme within their spheres. In a province the Crown is represented by the province just the same as in the Dominion the Crown is represented by the Dominion. The contention we put forward is that by virtue of the British North America Act as soon as the provinces come into existence the Crown, as to the land within them, will be represented by the provinces themselves and that while the Dominion may have the power to make certain laws for the peace, order and good government of these provinces the title to the land is in the Crown and the Crown is represented in the provinces by the provincial authorities. We had that matter before the House a short time ago. The Attorney General of British Columbia brought action against the Attorney General of the Dominion. We all remember that when the Canadian Pacific Railway was built a grant was made of an area 20 miles on each side of the road out of the British Columbia lands. The province of British Columbia received $100,000 a year from the Dominion in consideration of the grant, but after this land was granted gold was discovered and the question arose : To whom does this gold belong ? The Dominion said : We have the grant of land ; it is our gold. The province gave us the land and now we have the land and the minerals on it. But, the Privy Council said no, that the province represented the Crown and that the Crown could not part with its minerals unless it expressly said that it parted with its minerals ; the minerals remain in the Crown, the Crown is represented by the province and the province is entitled to them. In the same way we are asked to believe that these lands belong to the Dominion. The right hon. leader of the government says that the Dominion own these lands, whereas we say she never bought them, she never owned them and the province is the proper authority to administer them.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

ONTARIO AND MINNESOTA POWER COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 86) respecting the Ontario and Minnestoa Power Company, Limited.—Mr. Campbell.

On section 12,

Mr. SPROULE. Why do you want the Railway Act to apply to this private corporation ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. They will build pulp mills, flour mills and saw mills, and possibly some sort of a railway will be required in connection with their timber limits. What is the objection ?

Mr. SPROULE. The objection is that you are making a Railway Act apply to a private concern. It seems to me the only reason it should apply is for the purpose of appropriating property, and I do not think it should apply for that purpose.

Mr. GRANT. I was present in the Private Bills Committee and this very section was thoroughly threshed out. On the advice of the Solicitor General and other lawyers it was deemed to be in the public interest that this clause should be inserted.

Mr. BARR. I think it is to enable them to acquire property. This was very carefully considered in the Railway Committee.

Mr. SPROULE. I have now the Railway Act before me, and its application to this case is that the company may erect telephones.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. This provision is to oblige them to have the consent of the municipalities.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

ATHABASKA RAILWAY AND OIL COMPANY.

Bill (No. 117) to incorporate the Athabaska Railway and Oil Company—Mr. Oliver—was considered in committee, reported, and read the third time.

Mr. OLIVER moved that the Bill do now pass, and that the title be 'To incorporate the Athabaska Railway Company.'

Motion agreed to.

INTERNATIONAL TERMINAL AND BRIDGE COMPANY.

Bill (No. 87) to incorporate the International Terminal and Bridge Company—Mr. T. G. Johnston—was considered in committee, reported, and read the third time.

Mr. T. G. JOHNSTON moved that the Bill do now pass, and the title be 'To incorporate the International Bridge and Terminal Company.'

Motion agreed to.

TEMAGAMI RAILWAY COMPANY.

Bill (No. 91) respecting the Temagami Railway Company—Mr. McCool—was considered in committee, reported, and read the third time.

Mr. McCOOL moved that the Bill do now pass, and the title be 'Respecting the Ontario, Northern and Temagami Railway Company.'

Motion agreed to.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 118) respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 63) to incorporate the Brantford and Woodstock Railway Company.—Mr. Schell (Oxford).

Bill (No. 57) to incorporate 'La Compagnie du chemin de fer électrique de Trois-Rivières, St. Maurice, Maskinongé et Champlain.'—Mr. Bureau.

Bill (No. 73) to incorporate La Compagnie du chemin de fer Montréal, Québec et Sud. —Mr. Gervais.

Bill (No. 74) respecting the Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Railway Company.—Mr. P. Talbot.

Bill (No. 109) respecting the Hudson Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 88) to incorporate the Athabaska Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 96) respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 100) respecting the Guelph and Georgian Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 122) to incorporate the Grand River and Western Power Company.—Mr. Zimmerman.

Bill (No. 123) respecting the Board of the Presbyterian College, Halifax.—Mr. Sinclair.

Bill (No. 124) respecting the Farmers' Bank of Canada.—Mr. Thomas Martin.

Bill (No. 125) to incorporate the Crown Casualty Company of Canada.—Mr. Gervais.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST.

House resumed consideration of the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 69) to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta, and the amendment of Mr. R. L. Borden thereto.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Mr. Speaker, when you left the chair at six o'clock, I was about to consider the position this House is in with regard to one particular clause of the Northwest Bill, that is to say, the educational clause.

Perhaps, before considering our position, it would not be out of place to remind the House of a matter known to all, and that is that every civilized nation looks after the education of its youth. There must, of

course, be some reason other than individual reasons ; there must of necessity be some public, national reason, when we find in every land the nation, in self-defence, taking charge of this particular item of education, and when we find every civilized nation agreeing as to the importance that is attached to supplying its youth with the best possible education they can receive. I think, Sir, we may take it for granted that the reason the state desires to control the education of its youth is that intelligent peoples recognize that the greatest handicap to which youth can be subjected is the want of education. We know perfectly well in our own country that if two lads start out in life, one handicapped by a lack of education and the other possessed of an education, there is no doubt who will be the successful man and who will be the hewer of wood and drawer of water for the other. The same thing applies as between nations. We all recognize that if one nation looks after the education of its youth, while another nation neglects to do so, the nation which neglects the education of its youth will be the servant of the other. To-day the nations of the world have taken upon themselves to look after the subject of education for the reason that I have given.

Why is it that in this country education is, by the British North America Act, allotted to the provinces ? We have the division of a great many powers given under the British North America Act. To the Dominion is allotted the power to legislate exclusively on many subjects and to the provinces is allotted the power to legislate exclusively on many other subjects. Is there any reason why, in our own country, this particular subject of education has been allotted to the provinces ? I think there is a well-known reason, and I am going to point out that, although it has frequently been said in this debate that the provinces have not the exclusive right to legislate on that subject as they have touching other matters, practically they have the exclusive right. There is a limitation to their right to legislate upon education. They cannot legislate as freely perhaps as they can legislate on other subjects, but their right is exclusive. No other power has the right to legislate, except that in certain cases an application can be made to the Dominion, under the remedial clause, which, as was illustrated in the Manitoba school case, has been practically blotted out of the statute-book. We ask why it is that in our country the Dominion has no jurisdiction or legislative power, except in exceptional cases, in regard to education and that the power of legislation is given exclusively to the provinces? We have the answer to that. We know that the great father of confederation, Sir John Macdonald himself, favoured a legislative and not a federal union. His idea was to have a great central parliament, as they have it in the mother country, conferring greater powers on the county councils and, to save expense, dispensing with the local legislatures. But he was unable to carry out his idea of a legislative union, and the main reason why a legislative union was not carried out by the Dominion of Canada was that the great province of Quebec insisted that the control of education must be left to the provinces. Let me quote a speech in the parliamentary debates on the New Brunswick School Act. Sir John Macdonald, then premier, spoke as follows :

> It was known to every one that the question of education had threatened confederation at its very inception, and a proposition that education should be left to the general legislature of the Dominion would have been enough to secure the repudiation of confederation by the people of Lower Canada, and it was therefore expresly provided in the Act of union that the question should be entirely left to the different provinces with the provision that whenever there was a separate system in force that system should not be interfered with.

So we find that to-day what we of the opposition are contending for, that the exclusive right of legislation touching education shall be left to the newly created provinces, was carried out in accordance with the principle laid down by the province of Quebec, which determined the question whether or not we should have a legislative or a federal government in this country. We now come to these educational clauses that we have before us. We have heard a great deal about the rights of minorities, and I would be very sorry to say a word against the rights of minorities. I have in days gone by in this House stood up for the rights of minorities, even though I knew the penalty I must pay was the loss of my seat in this House ; and I have never since regretted that, because, although I lost my seat, I had the consciousness of doing what I believed to be right. I have no hesitation in saying that it is incumbent on any majority, not merely to be just to the minority, for there is no credit to a majority any more than to a man in being just, but I think it is in honour incumbent on the majority to be generous to the minority in all matters in which the minority take a deep interest, and there is no matter in which they take a deeper interest than in that of education. Therefore, I say there is no hon. member of this House who would have greater consideration for the feelings of the minority, to whatever class the minority might belong, than I myself. But while paying all possible respect to the feelings of the minority, we would be unworthy of our positions in this House if we entirely shut our eyes to the feelings or rights, or supposed rights, of the majority, because, where there is a minority, there must be a majority. It has been said in this House, and I was very sorry to hear the statement—a statement with which I do not agree, made by no less a personage than my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding)—that so grave was this question, so violently exciting to the country, and so bitter were the passions that had been aroused, that if the right

hon. leader of the government were turned from power, it would be impossible for the hon. leader of the opposition to form an administration, because no such administration could be formed on any other than a Protestant basis. I do not think it was necessary for that hon. gentleman to have said that. I do not think, in the face of what was said by the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) this afternoon; I do not think, in the face of what was said by the hon. Minister of Finance himself only a few minutes before, that he was justified in so speaking. Let me quote to the House what the hon. gentleman said that evening. At considerable length he recited the condition of affairs in the Northwest Territories; he recounted the various ordinances, or the result of these ordinances, minimizing as much as possible their effect, to show that after all there was no great question at issue, or, as he himself said, no principle involved in this question, and he went on to say:

I want the House to consider seriously, I submit the proposition again, that if it be true as I say, and I believe I am correct beyond the power of contradiction, that from the moment that the school opens in the morning up to half-past three in the afternoon there is no difference between a separate school and a free national school, and if the only point of difference between them is that half hour of religious instruction, is there enough in it to quarrel about, and to have public meetings and agitation throughout the length and breadth of this land? I believe that the great mass of the people to-day who are joining in petitions and holding meetings have not had time to understand this question. I believe that they have an erroneous view as to what the condition in the Northwest Territories is and as to what the condition which we propose to perpetuate is. When they discover, as they will, in the light of the debate which will take place in this House now and in the next few days, when the people of Canada shall learn that we have in the west to-day a system which is practically a national school system, and that the only point of difference between us is with respect to that small matter of half an hour of religious instruction, I think the great mass of the Protestant people of Canada will say that they regret that there has been any agitation on the subject.

That, Sir, is the view expressed by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance in the presence of the right hon. leader of the government and not repudiated by him. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), who has had some hand in framing this Bill, spoke in this way of the educational clause:

I wanted to make the position of the people in the Northwest with respect to educational matters so clear and simple that any man might understand the clause when he read it. I said that nothing should be left to doubt, uncertainty or misconception; and in so far as I am concerned, that clause, in the terms in which it is now drafted, was prepared merely for the purpose of giving to the people of the Northwest Territories those things which they now have and it never was intended to go one inch beyond that.

Now, then, we have the hon. Minister of Finance declaring that the only point in dispute is one half hour's religious instruction in the schools of the Northwest Territories, with the hon. Minister of Justice declaring that in drafting the Bill he had no intention of going one inch—and you could hardly name a smaller distance—farther than to perpetuate that system which the hon. Minister of Finance himself described. I have not had any conference with my hon. friend the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), but, if that be the temper of the government, if the members of the government were honest in stating on the floor of this House what the real difference is, I venture to say that my hon. friend from East Grey will assent at once, and every hon. member on this side of the House will assent joyfully to such a proposition, if the only point is whether or not instructions shall be given for one half hour. If so, we say by all means give the children religious instruction for half an hour by whatever clergyman of whatever church is desired.

Now that we find this statement made, it is only fair—speaking as I do for the majority—it is only fair to consider that the majority must be influenced by hearing such statements made. But in looking about and seeing the facts that are patent to every one, let us recall some of these facts. It will not be denied that the government, although appealed to again and again from the Northwest Territories through the proper channels, to give autonomy to the Northwest Territories refused again and again, sometimes stating as a reason even for not considering the question, the absence of the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) from Ottawa. It will not be denied that the government suddenly decided to give provincial autonomy to the Northwest Territories just at the commencement of a political campaign. It will not be denied that in the interest of fair play and justice, if the government intended offering such an important proposition to the Northwest Territories the scheme itself should have been laid before the people of the Northwest Territories so that in pronouncing a verdict in the last election an opportunity would have been given them to pronounce upon that important matter. No such opportunity was given. It will not be denied that the government having thus suddenly promised in the heat of an election to give autonomy to the Northwest Territories, when the duly accredited representatives of the Northwest Territories came to Ottawa, negotiations were held which extended over a considerable period of time and which covered many subjects, but at these negotiations the question of education was never discussed and only suggested once. Can it be a surprise to any one

if some persons in the country are inclined to think that there must have been a reason for such treatment of the duly accredited representatives of the Northwest in connection with this important matter. The Minister of Finance is the gentleman who on the part of the government would be held responsible for the financial terms which however lightly they may be spoken of in this House and however slightly they may be discussed by members who may not feel competent to discuss such an involved and intricate question, are of immense importance to this country in view of the fact that some millions of dollars a year are to be paid out to each of these provinces. Yet, it cannot be denied that the one minister in the government who should have been consulted on the financial terms was not even in the city of Ottawa when the Bill was brought down, for it was brought down two days I think before the date on which it was known the Minister of Finance would arrive here. The Minister of Justice was the member of the government who above all others was most intimately acquainted with all the questions involved in this measure, and yet it cannot be denied, for he himself has admitted it, that although he discussed different other questions with the government, although he had given long and anxious consideration to the education question, this, the most important of all the questions had never been mentioned between him and his leader up to the time the Bill was laid before the House; and the Bill was hurriedly brought down within a couple of days before the hon. gentleman's expected return. Surely we cannot be surprised if some people should think that this is a suspicious circumstance. We find, from the statements made to the House, that this important matter was deferred to a subcommittee of the government. I have not a word to say against the members of that sub-committee, but I would venture to suggest that perhaps those whom I may describe as the minority must not be surprised if those who happen to be in the majority think it rather strange, that when Mr. Haultain could not be consulted on the education clause, and when the ex-Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Finance could not be consulted, that a commitee composed of the Premier, Mr. Fitzpatrick, the Minister of Justice ; Mr. Scott, the Secretary of State, and Sir William Mulock were the four to whom was referred this important question. Surely there is something in that to cause the people of this country to wonder if everything is as simple and plain as has been represented by hon. gentlemen opposite. We find on the return of the Minister of the Interior, that he promptly resigns and having resigned he was heralded through the country as a man who had made sacrifices on the ground of principle. Time went on, and to-day we have had the Minister of the Interior before the Canadian House of Commons. I stand in the judgment of all those who heard him this evening, if a more pitiable attempt to explain what could not be explained was ever presented to any intelligent body. I am sorry the hon. gentleman is not here to-night. I was at a loss while he was speaking to know, whether one should pity him or pity his ex-colleagues the more. Just think of the position he was in. The Minister of Finance says the only difference between the parties is that one half hour of religious education ; the Minister of Justice says he did not intend to go one inch beyond the present conditions, but the clauses are drawn in such a tangled net that a man of the intelligence of the Minister of the Interior did not know what they meant, and he believed they were something so terrible that he had to resign from the government. There is an end to everything in this world, and you would have thought that about that time there was an end to the want of confidence the ministers exhibited towards one another. You would think that gentlemen of the intelligence of the Minister of Justice, the Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Finance when they met together and found they were in absolute accord as to what they wanted ; you would have thought it would not have been very difficult for them to have said : There is a slight misunderstanding, we will make it clear in a few words ; and then and there the Minister of the Interior would have been contented with the clauses and would not have resigned. Evidently there was no such discussion, or the discussion that was held was not what we have been told. Evidently we have not been told all the truth, or else there was more all round stupidity displayed than ever before was displayed in this or any other country by three cabinet ministers.

Then, when the Minister of the Interior had resigned, and the country had sounded his praises from one end to the other, we had this incident. The newspapers sometimes foresee what is to happen, and among them the Montreal 'Witness' of to-day, a paper published before the explanation of this afternoon, writes :

Hon. Clifford Sifton.

It is said he will return to Cabinet and accept the Autonomy Bill as modified.

The Hon. Clifford Sifton, who recently resigned as Minister of the Interior on account of dissatisfaction with the educational clauses in the Autonomy Bills, will, it is said, return to the federal cabinet within the next ten days, and continue in control of the Interior Department.

Mr. Sifton, according to a private despatch received in the city from Ottawa to-day, will make a strong speech in parliament early next week, announcing his acceptance of the educa-

tional clauses in the Bill as explained in their modified form by the premier in the House the other day.

Now Sir, that prophesy of the Montreal 'Witness' is pretty nearly correct. It is not absolutely correct because the ex-minister (Mr. Sifton) did not wait until next week and he most certainly did not make a strong speech. With these two trifling exceptions the 'Witness' article is true. When one considers the position of the ex-Minister of the Interior it reminds us of the cartoon which was widely circulated throughout this country some years ago at the expense of another politician; it was a very pretty picture with the legend at the bottom: The cat came back.

We had the privilege of hearing the exminster this afternoon and you remember the excuse he gave. He was perfectly prepared to accept the present clauses, but he feared the original clauses because he thought they might be liable to introduce some of these ordinances of an ephemeral character that had come and gone years ago, and he also feared that peradventure a university might be founded in years to come in the distant Northwest, and when founded it might lead to dissensions between majorities and minorities in that unhappy country. One feels inclined to protest against such an affront to the intelligence of the members of this House, as for a gentleman who occupies such an exalted position to venture to come before parliament with such an excuse as this. We cannot be very much surprised if the majority in this country are inclined to think that the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth has not been told them by hon. gentlemen opposite in their account of the effect of this Bill. If further confirmation of such suspicions were necessary, one has but to look at the arguments advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite in support of their Bill. As I have said, the burden rests on a government which brings down a Bill to show good and sufficient reason to justify its passage.

Let us look at the arguments advanced by the leading gentlemen on the opposite side of the House who have spoken. The right hon. the Prime Minister spoke first, and assuming that a gentleman of his ability made the best argument that could be made in favour of the Bill, let us see what his statements were. His first justification for it was, because of the cleavage between Roman Catholics and Protestants; a cleavage on matters of dogma. Now, if the statement of the hon. Minister of Finance is true, what earthly difference does such a cleavage make? Let the Roman Catholic children be instructed by their priests from half-past three to four and the children of any Protestant denomination be instructed by their ministers from half past three to four, and where is there any necessity of referring to a cleavage in dogma, and how can that affect the question? But even if it did affect it, what is the meaning of cleavage in dogma between Roman Catholics and Protestants? Roman Catholics and Protestants are not all the people of this country. The Minister of the Interior is perhaps responsible for other complications that may arise when we come to consider cleavage in doctrine; because I believe the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) will object to some of the settlers in the Northwest being classed as adherents of the Protestant faith. Where will you put the Doukhobors, the Mormons, the members of the Greek Church? Are they Protestants? If the only cleavage to be considered is a cleavage in doctrine, between two bodies, perhaps something may be said for separate schools; but if the cleavage between Mormons and Protestants is as broad as the cleavage between Protestants and Roman Catholics—and I trust that it is broader—or if the cleavage between Protestants and Doukhobors is as broad—and I believe it is just as broad—then why should there be separate schools instead of national schools? The Hon. George Brown, whose speeches in the Senate have often been quoted in admiration, in objecting to separate schools, pointed out that if they were allowed, Anglicans and Presbyterians, Methodists and Baptists were just as much entitled to them as any other class of the community; and hon. gentlemen opposite who are sufficiently instructed in theology will bear me out when I say that the difference between the high church Anglican and the Roman Catholic is much less than the difference between the high church Anglican and the adherent of the denominations commonly known as Protestant.

Then the hon. gentleman said: Give the Northwest the same rights as are given to Quebec and Ontario. Why did the hon. gentleman say that? In the British North America Act there was no confederation of Quebec and Ontario. There was a confederation of four provinces—Quebec, Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were not given separate schools, Ontario and Quebec were not given separate schools, by the Act of Union; and when these provinces are coming into a partnership in which there are seven provinces, and only two have separate schools, on what ground can the hon. gentleman say that as a matter of right and justice, these new provinces are entitled to the special privileges which the two provinces have rather than the five provinces which lack those special privileges, if such they be. Besides, it must be borne in mind—and I am trying to speak with all calmness and frankness in calling the attention of hon. gentlemen to the views of

the majority—that the Protestants of Quebec and the Roman Catholics of Ontario were not given any rights at all. In consequence of a mutual exchange the Protestants of Quebec and the Roman Catholics of Ontario established separate schools, and it was agreed to give separate schools to both. When the hon. gentleman, then, says that we should give the Northwest the same rights that we gave to Ontario and Quebec, he is asking for something that is impossible, because we did not give those rights to Ontario and Quebec. But if we take the hon. gentleman at his word, and give to the minority in the Northwest Territories the same rights that the Protestants have in Quebec, would that satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite ? Would that satisfy the premier ? Would it satisfy some of our extreme friends in the province of Quebec ? What are those rights ? What is the condition in Quebec ? The schools which we call public schools in other provinces are church schools there ; and I say all credit to the Roman Catholics for insisting on an education in religion in the schools. I think it would be better for Protestants if they did the same ; but unfortunately the divisions among them prevent that desirable consummation. But in the province of Quebec, as a matter of fact the majority have their schools conducted on religious lines. There is a great difference between a Protestant going to what is practically a church school and being trained in the doctrines of the Catholic faith, and a Roman Catholic child in the Northwest going to a public school of which the worst said is that he is not trained in his own faith. Surely there is all the difference, to use the language of the prayer book, between commission and omission in the two acts. And so, when hon. gentlemen opposite plead with us to give to the Northwest the same rights that are given to Quebec and Ontario, I venture to say that, the Protestants, being in such an immense majority in the Northwest, in many cases it would be a practical impossibility for the Roman Catholics to have their separate schools. They would feel that a gross injustice was being done to a Roman Catholic child if we set up a national school in the Northwest in which the distinctive tenets of Protestantism were taught.

The right hon. gentleman said, on page 1458, in introducing the Bill :

> Having obtained the consent of the minority to this form of government, having obtained their consent to the giving up of their valued privileges and their position of strength are we to tell them, now that confederation is established, that the principle upon which they consented to this arrangement is to be laid aside and that we are to ride rough-shod over them ?

Now, Sir, I must confess that I am utterly unable to grasp the meaning of that language. I am not aware of any rights that were given up, any valuable privileges of which they were shorn, any position of strength that was abandoned. If any compact or bargain has been made by which the people of this country are in honour bound to give to the Northwest separate schools or anything else, then I will take the same stand that I took in 1896, and say, if the honour of this country is at stake, let us preserve our honour. But surely it is on hon. gentlemen opposite to show that there was some compact by which we are in honour bound to give some system of education to which we are opposed.

The right hon. gentleman, in introducing the Bill, made another statement, on page 1458 ; and it is rather singular that he used such an argument and others when the real point at issue is whether or not religious education should be given for half an hour a day. The right hon. gentleman said :

> When I compare these two countries, when I compare Canada with the United States, when I compare the status of the two nations, when I think upon their future, when I observe the social condition of the civil society in each of them and when I observe in this country of ours a total absence of lynchings and an almost total absence of divorces and murders, for my part, I thank heaven that we are living in a country where the young children of the land are taught Christian morals and Christian dogmas.

I was rather amused when the right hon. gentleman said that. He was greeted with thunderous applause by the gentlemen behind him. Those hon. gentlemen, I sometimes think, have got into such a habit of applauding their leader for the eloquent passages with which from time to time he regales them, that they often applaud though they fail to grasp the point. I saw some gentlemen applauding that statement who I thought should more properly have held a brief for the Roman Catholics of the United States ; and I call their attention to this statement which the right hon. gentleman has advanced as an argument why we should pass this Bill, which is in effect a statement that in the United States there is no religion taught in the national schools; that in Canada you have national schools without religion for Protestants and separate schools for Roman Catholics ; and that the consequence is that under this educational system Canada has escaped the murders, divorces and lynchings so common in the United States. Now, what does that mean if logic means anything ?

I will not try to put it in words because one is so apt to be misquoted or misreported that I am afraid somebody will be unkind enough to say afterwards that I charged the Catholics of the United States when it is the right hon. the Prime Minister who has done that, and I stand here to defend them.

If it be true as he said, that we have public schools in Canada, in which no religion is taught and separate schools where the tenets of the Roman Catholic church are taught, and that in the United States they have only public schools wherein no religion is taught; therefore the murders lynchings, and the divorces in the United States must be attributable to the Catholics of the United States, according to his logic. It could not be attributed to the Protestants because the system of education is the same for them in Canada as in the United States and the only possible argument that can be advanced is: Give us separate schools here because the tone of morals will then be so much higher that we will shine in comparison with our less blessed neighbours to the south. This logical conclusion is irresistible, yet the hon. gentlemen opposite showed their approval of this as one of the Prime Minister's strongest arguments. The hon. gentleman spoke of the obligation resting on us to maintain separate schools in the west because they were given by legislation and pointed out that we here had given the Canadian Pacific Railway a certain exemption from taxation and that nobody would think of revoking that Act passed by this parliament. I thought at the time the right hon. gentleman could hardly be speaking seriously. Surely he must admit that there is all the difference in the world between an ordinance passed by a legislature that can give one day and recall the next a solemn bargain between a country and a railway company whereby in consideration of certain things done and promised by the country the company agrees to build a railroad. In one case there is a bargain and in the other there is no bargain. If these were a parallel—I do not think there is an exact one, but if I were looking for one—I would find it in the case of the Land Act of the Northwest Territories, whereby land was set aside for purposes of education and subsequently this House deliberately changed that to reserve the lands for the public schools, and from that day to this thousands and thousands of acres of land have been held in trust for the benefit of public schools. If any settlers went in under any inducement what would be a greater inducement than to come to a land where hundreds and thousands of acres were set aside solemnly by the Dominion parliament for the aid of public schools? And yet the hon. gentleman does not hesitate to break that law and that trust by this Act ruthlessly to lay hands on the public lands and divide the proceeds between the public and the so-called separate schools.

The Minister of Finance gave us an assurance the other night that was certainly very gratifying when he told us there was no legal or binding obligation to re-enact the law of 1875. If there is no legal or binding obligation to re-enact that law, then we on this side of the House cannot be blamed, I suppose, if we prefer not to enact it. The hon. the Minister of Finance whose intelligence we all admit, whose capacity fully to understand the full effect and grasp of the possibilities of the resolution before the House quite as well as some hon. gentlemen who sit behind him, would come to the discussion of the subject in the House with a breezy freshness which the hon. gentlemen would lack because he did not see the Act as soon as they and so it is fresher in his mind; that hon. gentleman the other night said:

> We do not propose to override any Act of any legislature. What we propose to-day is to confirm and continue for all future time a measure which the free voice of the Northwest legislature has placed upon the statute-book of the Territories.

The free voice of the Northwest Territories legislature compelled by this House to have separate schools, being the best they could do by the burdens laid on them. I refer to the remarks of the Minister of Finance perhaps more frequently than those of other gentlemen because I enjoyed them as an oratorical effort. He favoured us with a description of the Paradise Regained in the little province of Nova Scotia; he described the absolute bliss that reigned there among those religious classes which are warring in other portions of the country and pointed to the absolute harmony, concord and progress which prevailed there because they had not any separate school system and in triumph, glorying as he was in this happy state of Nova Scotia, his colleague the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Emmerson), not wishing to be completely eclipsed, called his attention to the fact that a similarly happy condition of affairs prevails in New Brunswick where there are no separate schools. The hon. gentleman held this House spell-bound with an eloquence which we can admire without attempting to imitate, in one of the most glorious oratorical efforts ever given in this House while he proved that inasmuch as Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were so perfectly happy and free and prosperous without separate schools, therefore we ought to impose on the Northwest Territories separate schools. Is it any wonder, Sir, when we find an Act introduced into this House under such circumstances as those under which this Act was introduced, to which we have called attention before, and when we find that Act supported by such argument and eloquence as that, is it any wonder—and I ask it in all seriousness—that this class of people who have been referred to as the majority sometimes wonder if there is not more in the Act than is stated by hon. gentlemen opposite? If there is nothing more in the Act than the Minister of Finance said—and far be it from me to transgress the rules of the House or, outside of the House, to doubt his word, if there be nothing more than he said, viz: the paltry half-hour for religious instruction

for Heaven's sake let us as two-hundred and fifteen intelligent men, put our heads together this night and settle this question of education in the Northwest Territories.

I was looking over the several ordinances of the Northwest Territories the other day. They are rather voluminous, I have not had time to study them since I received them, but while not pretending to say that there is anything in what I am about to say to cause any hon. gentleman to change his mind about the true purport of this Bill, still it is possible there are some who do not understand hon. gentlemen opposite as well as we do and have less confidence in them than we have. Some people outside, in the country, if they should read these ordinances might be suspicious. Clause 10 provides :

All general regulations respecting the inspection of schools, the examination, training, licensing, and grading of teachers, courses of study, teachers' institutes, and text and reference books shall before being adopted or amended be referred to the council for its discussion and report.

A rather important clause you would think covering almost everything touching education. Clause 11 provides :

The council shall consider such matters as may be referred to it as hereinbefore provided for by the commissioner, and may also consider any question concerning the educational system of the Territories as to it may seem fit, and shall report thereon to the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

Still further powers. I do not wish to misrepresent a single word, and therefore call attention to the fact that this educational clause with these broad powers is really an educational adviser to the educational commissioners of the Territories. I do not pretend to say, and hope I shall not be accused afterwards of misleading the House by trying to make hon. members believe, that this council has power to do everything that it has power to report upon. But, when we find a member of the government given an advisory clause in some special line like education, we can well believe that he would feel bound, except for very good reasons to the contrary, to follow the advise they gave. As the present Prime Minister of Ontario, Mr. Whitney, said in advocating an advisory board : he said the minister will not be bound to take their opinion, but he should be assuming a grave responsibility if he ventured to differ from the educational board selected for him. So, with regard to the educational clause of the Northwest Territories, I do not say that their findings are absolutely conclusive but I do say that they are entitled to the greatest weight, and that in the practical carrying out of education they would be found to have tremendous weight. And how is this clause composed ? Let me read the section on that point :

There shall be an educational council consisting of five persons at least two of whom shall be Roman Catholics to be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, who shall recommend such remuneration as the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall decide.

Now, Sir, I make no comment ; I find no fault. Still, we find an ordinance of this kind appointing a board of five, of whom two at least must be—the whole five may be—Roman Catholics. And we have been told of the schools of that part of the country that there are, as I understand, ten or twelve separate schools and 1,000 or 1,200 public schools, for the population is overwhelmingly Protestant. Is it any wonder that some people dislike crystallizing into law for all time to come this provision for a board of five members two of whom at least must be Roman Catholics ? Without a word derogatory to my Roman Catholic friends or to any gentleman in the ministry, let me assume that one of the three non-Catholics takes no more interest in education than one of the Protestant members of the sub-committee, Sir William Mulock, did in the present Bill, and where would the rights of the Protestant majority be ? We have a mixed population there. Give the Roman Catholics all, and more than all, they are justly entitled to, because they are a minority. But surely if the tables were turned my Roman Catholic friends would object to have it provided for all time to come that two of the members of the educational council must be members of the opposite faith.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I would like to ask him a question. Can these two members of the educational council vote ?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I see nothing here to prevent it. They all stand on the same footing.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. But can the members of the council reach an effective decision, or have they only advisory powers ?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I was very careful, in introducing the subject, to explain the powers that they had not, so that I might not be accused of misleading the House. So, I think I am justified in what I said, that, while I do not claim that this council has the power to crystallize into law what they wish on these subjects, yet the commissioner of education must be expected to be guided to a large extent by the decisions of those selected for that important trust.

Then, looking a little further—and I merely mention this as an illustration of something in the Act that goes a little further than the Minister of Finance thought —I find ordinance 31 which regulates the public aid to schools. There is no religious point involved in this ; it is simply a pract-

ical point as to securing the best education possible for your children :

To rural districts an amount to be calculated as follows :

(a) To each district containing 6,400 acres or less of assessable land as shown by the last revised roll of the district, $1.20 for each day school is kept open ; to each district containing less than 6,400, as aforesaid, one cent more per day for each 160 acres or fractional part thereof less than 6,400 acres ; and to each district containing more than 6,400 acres as aforesaid, one cent less per day for each additional 60 acres or fractional part thereof.

Mr. SCOTT. That ordinance is not embodied in the Bill.

Mr. NORTHRUP. It is the one officially sent to me.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. It is not embodied in the Bill.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I see that. But I gave this merely to illustrate how the Act must work out for a similar ordinance must be passed. Here is the point I want to make : Certain grants are made out of the public treasury for these schools. Take a rural school section, of, say, 6,400 acres. A certain amount of money will go to that section. Now, simply as a practical illustration of what would arise under the ordinance——

Mr. SCOTT. But what purpose is to be served by giving such an illustration when there is no provision of that kind in the Bill ?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I suppose that when the public moneys are to be distributed under this Bill, they must be distributed equitably among the public and separate schools. If a certain amount of money is to go to one section, and there is only one school, that school will get more than it would if another school were established in the same section. That, I think, is self evident. I expressly said that I gave this as an illustration of how it would work out. I suppose it will be admitted that, as that country is sparsely settled, it must be rather hard, in many sections, to maintain the schools. If another school is started in the neighbourhood, a heavy burden is placed upon both classes of the community and the schools are less efficient than they otherwise would be. I have another reason. I was in the Northwest about two years ago. I found regions which foreigners, as for instance the Galicians, have come in and settled. Now, if the Galicians get control of the school in one section, is it more likely or is it less likely that Americans, let us say, will settle there under the proposed legislation than they would if the public school only could be established there ? As a practical question is it not clear that the moment a number of foreigners settle in one section, they will effectively exclude other people settling in that section unless they are prepared to accept the conditions that would be suitable to foreigners ? Take, for instance the Galicians, and speaking of them with all respect. Is it unfair to say that the children of Galicians not knowing a word of English, would not be regarded as the most profitable fellow-students at school for the children of a farmer coming from the south side of the line. Therefore I venture to say that the idea of splitting up the schools is not calculated to improve the class of immigrants coming into the country and that it will practically shut out from the country a great deal of a certain and excellent class of immigration.

I have tried calmly and quietly to call the attention of the hon. gentlemen opposite to the fact that a majority may have feelings as well as a minority, and that it would be well in all these matters to consider the feelings of the majority as well as the feelings of the minority. I trust, Sir, that since it has been admitted on both sides of the House that painful excitement exists in the country, that fears have been aroused and passions excited, that probably many long days will be required to quell, I think I am justified in view of these facts admitted on both sides of the House, in appealing to the right hon. gentleman to tell us what is meant, and either say that the Finance Minister was wrong in his definition, or if he stands by what he says and calls it right, then let us here to-night, before we leave this chamber, settle on terms which will be satisfactory to every one of the majority in Canada who would gladly see all the children of this country trained every day in the year, for half an hour or more, in the faith taught them by their fathers.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton). If I have the permission of the leader of the opposition, whom I am sorry to see is not now in his place, to venture a few remarks in regard to what is especially a Northwest question, I would like to take up the time of the House for a little while to-night. That gentleman has several times referred to an occasion of two years ago when he saw fit to bring before this House a motion in regard to provincial autonomy, and it has seemed a grievance to him that on that occasion he was replied to by a humble member representing part of the Northwest Territories instead of by a member of the government. I do not know what qualification the hon. leader of the opposition demands from members who address this House, but I would think, with all humility, that a member who has spent the greater part of his life in the Northwest Territories, who had some part in the local government of the Territories for many years, might possibly be able to contribute something to the information of the House on a question so closely connected

with the welfare of those Territories. I observe that on this particular occasion the leader of the opposition, in conducting the debate, if he has control of its conduct, is apparently of the view of that great American humorist, Mark Twain, who declared the less he knew of the subject the more fluently he could speak on it. I notice that his colleagues sitting beside him, members of a government who themselves, not so many years ago, were painfully interested in a certain school question, have not so far replied to the three ministers of the cabinet who have dealt with the question in this debate. The duty of replying to one of the most important speeches that has been made on this occasion has been relegated to my hon. friend who has just sat down (Mr. Northrup), and I think all will agree with me that no serious light has been thrown upon the subject, that the speech has not done credit either to the cause or its leader, nor has it done discredit to the ex-Minister of the Interior or to the cause which he champions. It seems to be the strong point in the argument of these gentlemen that because they do not see fit to see something, that, therefore, it is not there. Now, there is no one so blind as he who will not see; and the gentleman who can see no difference between the provisions of clause 16 as originally introduced and the provisions as they now stand for the approval of the House, is certainly very blind; I won't say that it is because he does not want to see, very probably it is because he cannot see. The difference between these two provisions, as I understand them, is radical. I do not say that it was intentional. We have had enough disputations in regard to constitutional points in this House during this debate to leave us all with the full knowledge that there may be honest differences of opinion with regard to all these points. To my mind the difference is very important. As stated by the ex-Minister of the Interior here to-day—and I speak as one who knows something of this matter, as one who has had experience in regard to school legislation, as one of those members of the Northwest Assembly who made the change in the Northwest school law between what it was before 1891 and what it is to-day—I say the difference, as I understand it, is a difference between clerical control of schools and national control of schools. If that is not a sufficient difference, then I do not understand what we are disputing about. I think it is a radical difference. It is what threw this country into a turmoil in 1896 and caused a change of government at that time. It is the reason why those gentlemen are sitting on that side of the House instead of on this side.

But I wish particularly to deal at this time rather with the financial terms of these Bills than with the educational sections. To revert again to the leader of the opposition and his troubles, it seemed to be a great worry to him that two years ago several members representing the Northwest had the temerity to vote against his proposal for immediate provincial autonomy to the North west Territories. He objected very strongly to the reasons given on that occasion. I can only say that the reasons seemed to be sufficient to him at the time and afterwards, because, although he alleged that the measure was immediately important at that time it was the last reference he made to it, so far as I can recollect, until the measure was brought down this year. The reasons given were sufficient apparently to satisfy him that the question was not pressing, was not so immediately important. I think I can satisfy the House that there were very good reasons why members representing the Northwest Territories should not be anxious to accept the suggestion of provincial autonomy without knowing very well what the terms of that autonomy were to be. I think the events of this debate are sufficient to prove that; and I think what has occurred since the opening of this session and since these Bills were brought down is evidence, if evidence were needed, that western members have been fairly careful as to what they agreed to, and possibly have had some influence in securing provisions which would be to the advantage of the people of the Northwest Territories.

In considering the question of autonomy, we have to consider our peculiar position. We have to consider our position as compared with the condition of other provinces. The revenues that we might expect to receive as compared with those of other provinces, and consider whether our condition would be improved or be made worse by accepting provincial autonomy. We have great needs to meet in that country. Here in this province of Ontario we may make a comparison. The settled part of the province of Ontario is perhaps 400 miles long by 100 miles wide. In that area is contained all there is in Ontario, in the way of agriculture, at any rate. There are the roads, there are the schools, there are all the expenditures practically which the provincial government has to provide for. In these Northwest Territories, in the province of Saskatchewan, we will say, there is an area of 300 by 300 miles of agricultural country, over which agricultural settlement must spread, over which roads must be made, throughout which schools must be provided and municipal institutions taken care of. In Alberta we claim a distance of 800 miles in length by no less than 200 or 300 miles in width of agricultural country, over which settlement will spread, throughout which roads must be built, municipalities organized and schools maintained. If the province of Ontario, upon entering into confederation, found itself with a load of some $45,000,000 of debt incurred because of the necessity for the improvement of the conditions throughout that comparatively small area, we might

very well consider carefully our financial position in undertaking to spread civilization and improvement over these very much vaster areas under our conditions. We knew that we must have the means or we cannot have the success. We must have the means with which to build roads, to provide schools, to take care of all these requirements of civilization which fall to the lot of the provinces; and without those means, without that money, if we cannot go forward as provinces, we had better not undertake the responsibility of it. We find that in the condition in which we are at the present time the Territories receive a matter of nearly a million and a quarter dollars of revenue from this Dominion, or of subsidy, in the place of a provincial subsidy. Outside of that, there are expenditures which, in the provinces, are borne out of the provincial funds, but which, so far, have come out of the Dominion treasury, and which aggregate something like half a million dollars. At the present time, considering the Territories as a province, we are receiving as a subsidy from the Dominion treasury, a matter of a million and three-quarters of money. Now, compare that with the subsidy received by any of the other provinces. We find that Ontario receives a subsidy of a little less than a million and a half, Quebec a little over a million, Nova Scotia under half a million, New Brunswick under half a million, Manitoba a little over half a million, British Columbia $300,000 and Prince Edward Island $200,000, the two larger of these with populations infinitely greater than that of the Northwest Territories. As I said, in the Northwest Territories we are not receiving more money than is necessary for the development and improvement of the country. Out of the money that we are receiving, and which bulks so large, comparatively as current expenditure, has to be provided a great deal of what would ordinarily be considered capital expenditure. Surely it was reasonable on our part to say that, considering the subsidies given to the provinces, considering that these subsidies are based on population very largely, considering the needs of that great western country in the immediate future, considering further that our population was increasing so rapidly and that, with the increase of population, we could claim continually more favourable financial terms, we had everything to gain by waiting for provincial autonomy and nothing to lose. I will not trouble the House to evidence that fact by comparing the terms demanded by the Northwest government itself in 1901 and again in 1903. Because this government did not grant to the Northwest Territories the autonomy that was asked for in 1901, in the space of fourteen months they had made something like a quarter of a million dollars a year. I thought if we could, by waiting a matter of fourteen months, increase our annual revenue by a quarter of a million dollars, we could not make money as quickly in any other way than by waiting a few years longer for provincial autonomy.

Mr. LALOR. Why did you not continue to wait a little longer ?

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend (Mr. Lalor) asks me why we did not continue to wait a little longer.

Mr. LALOR. You are making money so fast, it is a wonder you did not wait a little longer.

Mr. OLIVER. As far as I am concerned, and as far as the majority of the people in the Northwest Territories are concerned, they are prepared to continue to wait for provincial autonomy on those conditions.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. As long as it pays ?

Mr. OLIVER. As long as it pays. The demand for provincial autonomy does not come from the people of the Northwest.

Mr. BOYCE. Does it not come from the government of the Territories ?

Mr. OLIVER. I believe the government of the Territories has made certain demands for provincial autonomy. I have shown the House how wise these demands were by comparing the demand of one year with the demand of the succeeding year. I am not responsible for what the government of the Northwest Territories have done. I represent a section of the people of the Northwest Territories, and I say that the people of the Northwest Territories have never asked for provincial autonomy. However, if it seems good to the parliament of Canada and to the government of this Dominion to organize these Territories into provinces and to give them fair and reasonable financial consideration, certainly we are not the people to refuse that consideration or to refuse those reasonable financial terms. We believe that the terms which have been offered, and which are contained in the Autonomy Bills, are fair and reasonable financial terms, are such as we can conscientiously afford to accept, and such as will be a benefit to the people of those Territories, and will tend to the improvement of the country. We would be doing less than our duty; we would be poor friends of our Dominion, if we willingly accepted anything short of a liberal allowance for provincial purposes in these Territories. As the ex-Minister of the Interior has said, it is on the development of these Territories that the prosperity of this whole Dominion depends. He would be the worst friend the Dominion had, who would prevent the progress of civilization in these provinces by stinting the means whereby that can be obtained. I shall not go into a comparison with the subsidies which are given the other provinces, except to repeat that the conditions in the Territories are so different from those in the other provinces—such a small population occupying such a vast area of agricultural

country, which soon must be full of people, and which will require large expenditure—that the terms which have been accorded the other provinces would not be satisfactory or suitable terms for these new provinces of the Northwest. The conditions are different; the terms must be different; the terms are different, and in so far the terms are satisfactory.

As to the ownership of the lands; it has been urged that these lands are the property of the province, should remain the property of the province and should be administered by the province for the benefit of the revenue of the province. It matters not to me what the legal rights of the province or the Dominion respectively are in that case. The lands belong to Canada whether administered by the province or by the Dominion; the settlement of these lands is for the benefit of all Canada. Whatever method of administration will give us the best results in the way of the settlement of these lands is the policy that is best not only for the Dominion but for the province. As a representative of the west, I believe the idea of using the lands of the west as a source of provincial revenue would be a very great detriment to these new provinces and to the country at large. I am aware that the provinces must have revenue, and failing any other source I would say: Certainly we must have revenue from the lands. But if we can get adequate revenue from other sources than the lands, then we certainly do not want the lands used as a source of revenue. I can easily understand that with a change of policy on the part of the federal government, a change of policy back to what it was say twenty years ago, when it was believed to be the proper policy to take everything that could be taken out of the land in the way of cash payment; then possibly it would be better that the lands should be in the hands of the province rather than in the hands of the Dominion. But, so long as we have a land policy the basic idea of which is the land for the settler, it is certainly better for us and for the Dominion that the lands should be administered by the federal authorities. One hon. gentleman said, that the lands could be better administered by the province than by the Dominion because the people of the province were closer on the ground and the interests of the province he said, were just the same as the interests of the Dominion. I beg to differ; their interests are not the same. The interest of a province in the land is in the revenue it can derive from the sale of the lands; the interest of the Dominion in the lands is in the revenue that it can derive from the settler who makes that land productive. This Dominion of Canada can make millions out of the lands of the Northwest, and never sell an acre; it has made millions out of these lands without selling an acre. The increase in our customs returns, the increase in our trade and commerce, the increase in our manufactures is to a very large extent due to the increase in settlement on the free lands of the Northwest Territories. The prosperity this Dominion is enjoying to-day is to a very large extent due to the fact that the lands of the Northwest Territories have been given away and that people have taken them. I say that the interest of the Dominion is to secure the settlement of the lands, and whether with a price or without a price makes little or no difference. It is worth the while of the Dominion to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars in promoting immigration to that country and to spend thousands and thousands of dollars in surveying and administering these lands, and then to give them away. But the province is not in that position. The province derives no revenue from the customs duties or from the wealth which the settler creates. Every settler who goes on land in the Northwest Territories is a bill of expense to the provincial government. That settler requires a road made, he requires a school supported, he requires the advantages of municipal organization, and these have to be provided for him out of the funds of the provincial government, so that as a matter of fact the tendency of the provincial government is to get such money as it can out of the land and to prevent settlement from spreading any further than can be helped. On the other hand, the interest of the Dominion is to get the settlers on the land, to scatter them far and wide so long as they are good settlers and they get good land. That is the position as it strikes us in the Northwest, and when we have secured a financial arrangement with the Dominion government that gives us adequate consideration for our lands—I mean to say, gives us an adequate revenue as compared with the other provinces at any rate; gives us a revenue that instead of decreasing will increase as our needs increase; gives us a revenue that is proportionate not only to our population as it will be but to the area over which that population will spread—when we have secured an arrangement such as that, we have secured a very satisfactory arrangement; at least as satisfactory as we can expect to secure.

As to the amount we get out of our lands, a word on that point may not be out of place. The province of British Columbia owns all its natural resources; it has timber, it has gold mines and lead mines and coal mines. And I find that last year the province of British Columbia derived from all the resources connected with the ownership of its lands, the sum of $615,000. In the coming year, the country which is now the Northwest Territories will derive a sum of something like $750,000, based on the

calculation that has been made in regard to the land. I find that the province of Ontario with a population of two and a quarter millions in the year 1902, derived from its lands $1,499,000.

We find, by the arrangement that has been made with these Northwest provinces, that when their population reaches that of the province of Ontario, they will be deriving two and a quarter millions in respect of their lands. I have given the total amounts which the provinces referred to derive from their lands as they are to-day. I have deducted nothing for the expense of management, and I have not said, what is the fact, that these provinces are drawing from their capital account while the Territories are taking only their annual revenue. That the provinces, selling their lands, disposing of their natural resources, as they do to-day, and using the proceeds as their annual revenue, must find that revenue decreasing from year to year, while we, with not a cent deducted for expense of management or for any other purpose, find our revenue increasing from period to period according to the increase of population, until we reach a very fair maximum amount and when that is reached, there will be people settled all over these provinces, and they will have the means of revenue from taxation which exist in the older provinces. Our position will be similar, and we shall be able to carry on business as they do. Under these circumstances the objections which I entertained to provincial autonomy, and which were shared by a large majority of the people of the Territories, have been overcome by the financial terms offered to these provinces in the Autonomy Bill. We are just as ready to take upon ourselves all the rights and responsibilities of self-government as the people of any other part of this Dominion, but we want the means wherewith to discharge those responsibilities before we assume them. We are not going into any blind pool—the term seems objectionable to the leader of the opposition. We are giving our sanction to a definite bargain, laid down in dollars and cents, in regard to which there can be no equivocation or misunderstanding.

In regard to the educational clauses of the Bill, I do not know whether I dare venture on a subject which has been so thoroughly threshed out by so many legal gentlemen in this House already. But at the same time the laws are not all made by the lawyers, and they are not all administered upon the lawyers. It is the people at large who suffer from the laws, and it is not any harm for one of the ordinary citizens of the country to attempt to understand them. Now, on this point I differ very radically from some of my friends. I am not a supporter of separate schools because I like the principle of separate schools. I do not agree with everything that was said by our hon. friend the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) last night—said so ably and so well. I am one of those who pin their faith unreservedly to a system of national schools, established for the purpose of educating the people of the country, of imparting to them knowledge in secular subjects. I am one of those who believe that religion can best be taught by those whose special training is the teaching of religion, that geography can be better taught by those whose special training is for the purpose of teaching geography. If I understood the law as some of our friends understand it, I certainly would vote against the educational provisions of this Bill. But I do not understand the law that way, and I am at a loss to see how they can understand it that way. We have been bombarded here for some time with petitions in regard to this educational question; we have seen staring headlines in the papers; there have been indignation meetings held in some parts of the country; there has been trouble, large, long and loud, all around; and what has it all been about? I noticed a heading in a newspaper the other day, a great large heading—I think it has been in several issues of the paper. It read: 'A Free West, a Common School, Provincial Rights, Religious Equality.' I hear some gentlemen laugh sarcastically. I want to to say that I subscribe thoroughly to the sentiments expressed in that headline. I read further: 'Toronto Vigorously Protests Against Throttling the West.' Well, I would like to be understood as protesting against any attempt to throttle the west. 'Meeting emphatically protests against the enactment of section 16 or any other provisions inconsistent with their constitutional freedom in this regard.' And the mass meeting in Massey Hall demanded that the government, first should abandon the clauses, second, should appeal to the country, or third, should defer action—it must do one or other of these three things. I read in one of these petitions which have been sent in:

> At the last regular meeting of the Strathcona Preceptory, Royal Black Knights of Ireland, the following motion was passed:
>
> Moved Sir Knight J. J. Mellon, seconded Sir Knight T. Irving, that this preceptory does utterly disapprove of the school clause in the present Autonomy Bill, and strongly urge that the new provinces do have full control in all matters pertaining to education in the said provinces.

I find in a petition which I had the honour to present:

> We, the undersigned electors of the electoral district of Edmonton do pray that in granting provincial autonomy to the Northwest Territories the Dominion parliament will not by any enactment or otherwise withhold from the newly created provinces full and unrestricted freedom of action in all matters affecting the es-

tablishment, maintenance and administration of schools.

I read the following resolution of the Winnipeg Ministerial Association :

Therefore be it resolved, that the Ministerial Association of Winnipeg respectfully protests against this legislation proposed, and expresses the hope that the educational clauses referred to as objectionable may be expunged from the Bill, thus leaving the new provinces perfectly free to develop their own educational policy.

I read from a newspaper :

Orange protest.—Eastern Ontario Orange Grand Lodge pronounces on the Autonomy Bill. An invasion of provincial rights. The provinces must be absolutely free.

And in a part of this document it says :

We have strong reason to think that this restrictive legislation has been asked for by a certain organization in a province far removed from the Northwest, an organization that has never stopped during nearly the last thousand years grasping for power to curtail the rights of the people.

I read here a document which has been directed to myself. It is from the Grand Orange Lodge of Ontario West and says :

And so we are called upon to-day to enter our earnest protest against the unjustifiable action of the bishops striving to shackle the west for all time in matters of education. We desire to go on record, as citizens of this country, uncontrolled by the Roman Catholic hierarchy, who have been on record for forty years, in favour of a system of non-denominational public schools, where every child shall secure a good secular education at the general expense, and where the religious belief of the pupils will be fully respected.

This right worshipful grand lodge opposes as dangerous to the peace, order and good government of the Dominion the adoption of this principle in the constitution of the proposed new provinces. We stand firmly against the endowment of denominational schools as the worst, because the most subtle form, in which church and state can be united. This is accomplished by the Autonomy Bill providing that 'the public money of the provinces appropriated by the legislature in aid of education and the funds derived from the sale of public lands set apart solely for public school purposes shall hereafter be divided indiscriminately between the public and the separate schools.'

There seems to be some objection on the part of some of these gentlemen who have so petitioned parliament against separate schools. I admit that I, too, hold similar objections, but these gentlemen do not seem to be aware that those separate schools have been in existence in the Northwest Territories for 20 years to my knowledge; that they are in existence because of legislation passed unanimously 30 years ago by this parliament, as the leader of the opposition said, and repeated and reiterated, subject to repeal or amendment by this parliament at any time during the past 30 years, and there never was a word of protest from the Ministerial Association of Winnipeg, from the Orange Grand Lodge of eastern or western Ontario, from the preceptory of the Black Knights of Ireland in Strathcona, nor from any of those other petitioners, during that whole 30 years during which it was in the power of this parliament to do away with this national outrage of separate schools in the Northwest. It is within the power of parliament to-day; it is not too late. But there is not a man here who will move, nor has there been a suggestion made to this House, that separate schools in the Northwest Territories should be abolished, not a word. Do these gentlemen really mean what they say or do they know what they say ? Is this a demonstration of objection to separate schools or is it an attempt to wreck the Liberal government on a second school question ? If this attack is honest, if it is against the separate schools and not against the French premier, it is in order for the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and the gentlemen behind him to introduce a Bill into this parliament as they yet may do to abolish separate schools in the Northwest by repealing the section of the Northwest Act. I am against separate schools but I want some company in my position and I do not seem to be able to find it. It is not the first time I have been alone in this House, but I seem to be just as lonesome now as I ever was, notwithstanding all these petitions on this very interesting subject. These separate schools have been authorized in the Northwest Territories by Act of this parliament for 30 years at least and they have been in actual existence in the Northwest Territories for 20 years by Act or ordinance of the Northwest legislature. There has been no word of protest in parliament or out of parliament, there has been no word of petition in the Northwest legislature, or amongst the people against that provision.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Why do you not ask leave to introduce the Bill ?

Mr. OLIVER. I want to know first whether I would get a seconder.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Try it. Try McCarthy.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. Stick to the tunnel, McLean.

Mr. OLIVER. I say then that in view of the fact that these separate schools have been in existence for 20 years absolutely at the disposal of this parliament, without a word of objection from the legislature of the Northwest Territories or from the people of the Northwest Territories, it is not in order to send into this House such documents as have been sent in within the past month ; to discuss this question as it has been discussed in the newspapers of this country. I say that the men who are doing

this are doing it not in the interests of Protestantism but in the interests of party politics. If there is a wrong, let them take proper means to remedy that wrong. It is open to them, this is the responsible body whereby it can be remedied. These provinces are not yet created, these territories are still under the absolute control of this parliament of Canada. If a wrong has been done let us right that wrong and right it now, and there will be no question about separate schools in these provinces in the future.

Mr. SPROULE. Are the thousands of reformers who signed this petition and have spoken on this question along the same lines doing it in the interests of a political party ?

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. It is the man who asked them.

Mr. SPROULE. They were asked by no person except the instinct of nature.

Mr. CONMEE. Petitions with a printed head were sent out broadcast.

Mr. OLIVER. I think it must be evident from the discussion in this House that many people have been misled as to the facts of this case.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER—or they would not have taken the position they have.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. He did it.

Mr. OLIVER. Now the government, coming to this question, having to provide provincial organization for these territories, considering that there are separate schools there, that there have been separate schools there, that there has never been objection made to these schools until this Bill was introduced, what are they to do ? What should the government do but make provision to carry on the existing conditions. What did the Northwest Territories government do when they proposed provincial autonomy two or three years ago ? If the time of the organization of a province is the time to do away with these separate schools ; is the time to start the province out without any such incubus upon their organization ; then the time to do that was when the Northwest government was applying for provincial powers and preparing their own draft Bill on the subject. But I find that section 2 of this draft Bill which was prepared by the Northwest government in 1901—and these provisions were repeated in 1903—is almost word for word section 2 of the Autonomy Bill which is before the House and as a matter of fact is a reproduction of a similar section in the Act admitting each individual province into the Dominion. It reads :

On, from and after the said first day of January, 1903, the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, except those parts thereof which are in terms made or by reasonable intendment may be held to be specially applicable to or to affect only one or more, but not the whole of the provinces under that Act composing the Dominion, and except so far as the same may be varied by this Act, shall be applicable to the province of in the same way and to the same extent as they apply to the several provinces of Canada, and as if the province of had been one of the provinces originally united by the said Act.

The view of the government of the Northwest Territories was that existing conditions should be continued. And again I find, in section 13 a parallel to the one in the Autonomy Bill and a reproduction of a similar section in the Acts admitting the other provinces :

Except as otherwise provided for by this Act all laws in force in the Northwest Territories on the first day of January, 1903, . . . shall continue as if this Act had not been passed, subject nevertheless (except with respect to such as are enacted by or exist under Acts of parliament of Great Britain or of the parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, to be repealed, abolished or altered by the parliament of Canada or by the legislature of the province, according to the authority of the parliament or the legislature under this Act.

That is to say, in the Bill proposed by the Northwest government for the admission of these Territories into confederation, are these very provisions which are contained in the Autonomy Bill. If I understood the argument of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) it was that if the date of the union was the date of the annexation of the territories to Canada, then the British North America Act did not apply.

Mr. SPROULE. Did apply.

Mr. OLIVER. The subsections of section 93 would not apply ?

Mr. SPROULE. No.

Mr. OLIVER. I understand the leader of the opposition to say that if, the date of union meant the date when these provinces are added to the union, then the restrictive sections do apply. Now, Mr. Haultain and his government in their Bill, make these sections apply. As a matter of fact, I think, it is absurd—I beg pardon for using that word if it is unparliamentary—to argue that the time of union means the time of the annexation of the country to Canada and not the time of the erection of the province.

Mr. SPROULE. So says Mr. Christopher Robinson.

Mr. OLIVER. I am sorry to differ from that eminent and learned gentleman. Let me read the first subsection of section 93 of the British North America Act, in which these words occur :

Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the union.

This does not say that any provincial law may exist at the union. It does not allude in any degree—it carefully refrains from alluding—to the collective powers which may be exercised by legislation. It refers to the individual rights of any class of persons at the union, and defines the rights of those people when they come into the union. That is the purpose of the Act—not the defining of anything about what they were before they came into the union. On the face of it it has no reference whatever to whether a province was organized before or not. If there was a class of persons who had rights at the union, when they came into the union they should continue to have those rights—that is the whole intent and meaning of the section; there is no other explanation. That is as Mr. Haultain understood it; that is as any man, I think, must understand it if he reads it with due care. That being the case, the British North America Act being the constitution of this country, I say that, although I am no lover of separate schools, although I do not believe in separate schools as so many of our people do, this government would certainly be doing very much less than its duty if it undertook, under all the circumstances of the case especially, to deviate from the terms of the British North America Act or took any other course than loyally to carry out its provisions. In regard to the terms of the first clause 16 and the second clause 16, I will take the liberty of saying that for my own part, I would rather not have seen any clause 16 at all. I believe that according to the British North America Act, the separate schools of the Northwest Territories would have exactly the same protection that they have under the provisions of clause 16. I know that all my friends do not agree with me in that view. I take it that clause 16 is merely a declaration on the part of parliament of meaning and intent; the provisions of clause 16 are declaratory and not mandatory. I say that I would prefer that there would not be any clause 16, that there should not be any declaration of the meaning and intent of these provisions of the British North America Act. I say that as a Protestant living in a country where the large majority are Protestants, and as one who does not believe in separate schools; living where the majority do not believe in separate schools. I take the view that, situated as we are we are in a sufficiently strong position to maintain our views without any declaration as to the extent to which the British North America Act goes. But I am bound to say that there are other gentlemen who do not take that view; and I am bound to say also that they have some fairly good reasons for the view they take. I think it is a fairly arguable question. I presume the reason they take the contrary view is this: That if the terms of the British North America Act are contravened in this particular; the remedy lies with parliament. You come back to this parliament for your remedy. And so they say. If parliament in the last resort has to declare what these provisions mean, it is very much better to declare them at first and avoid any question or misunderstanding in the first place.

On second thought I am somewhat inclined to take that view myself, because, while we have a very large Protestant majority in the Dominion of Canada, and while this House seems to be rather strongly against the idea of separate schools, that condition has not always prevailed. We recall a time not so very long ago when an occasion such as might happen in the Northwest Territories actually did happen in regard to the province of Manitoba, and an appeal was made to parliament, and attempt was made to interpret the provision of the British North America Act by parliament. And when we consider the provisions of that Remedial Bill as proposed to be applied to the province of Manitoba. when we consider that such conditions might possibly arise in the Northwest Territories, those of us who do not like the idea of separate schools, and particularly who do not like the idea of clerical control of schools, may very well say that we would rather have a declaration from this parliament at this time as to what the British North America Act means, than trust to some future time when some other government might be in power who would be more ready to sell the rights of the people of the west for clerical support at the polls. We heard something to-day spoken in tones almost of horror as to the control which the advisory board had in the Northwest Territories, because it had two Catholics on it.

An hon. MEMBER. What an outrage!

Mr. OLIVER. Awful to think of! That advisory board is simply an advisory board, and has no other duties than to give expert advice in regard to educational matters. But I find that when our friends opposite were undertaking to legislate for schools in Manitoba, they did not stop at that. They provided the Lieutenant Governor in Council should constitute a separate school board of education for Manitoba, not exceeding nine, all of whom should be Roman Catholics. I find further that this board of education had these powers.

It shall be the duty of the board of education to have under its control and management the separate schools, and to make from time to time such regulations as may be deemed fit for their general government and discipline and the carrying out of the provisions of this Act; to arrange for the proper examination, grading

and licensing of its teachers and for the withdrawing of licenses upon sufficient cause; to make and enforce regulations for the establishment and operation of departments in such of its schools as it may deem suitable for the preparation of candidates for the annual examination of teachers, and for matriculating at the University of Manitoba, and for the doing of general literary work corresponding to the standard required for these examinations, and to give special aid to such schools from the funds of its disposal not exceeding in the aggregate one-twelfth of its appropriation ; provided that no schools shall be entitled to receive such special aid that does not comply fully with the regulations made by the board for its operation.

These are the gentlemen who are objecting, who are holding up both hands in holy horror at the idea of throttling the Northwest by continuing its present system of separate schools. The provisions of section 15 are intended to protect us Protestants of the Northwest against legislation of that kind at some future date. In regard to the distribution of public funds I find this in section 74 :

The right to share proportionate claims, in any grant made out of public funds for the purposes of education having been decided to be and being now one of the rights and privileges of the said Roman Catholic minority of Her Majesty's subjects in the province of Manitoba, any sum granted by the legislature of Manitoba and appropriated for the separate schools shall be placed to the credit of the board of education in accounts to be opened in the books of the treasury department and in the audit office.

No question about that. I find further in section 111 :

The Lieutenant Governor in Council may direct that a sum not exceeding one-tenth of the amount of the grant for educational purposes be allowed for the maintenance of normal school departments as hereby established.

We do not want any legislation of that kind in the Northwest Territories, or for the Northwest. Now I want to make myself clear, for I believe I speak for many people in the Northwest on this subject. We object to separate schools, not on religious grounds at all, but merely on the grounds of efficiency and economy. But we can see that in the Northwest, under present conditions, separate schools conducted as they are to-day, do not seriously affect either efficiency or economy. Therefore we do not seriously object to these schools as they are to-day. But what we do object to, what we did object to in 1891, was the feature embodied in this Remedial Bill, thoroughly embodied in it, and that was the principle of absolute clerical control of schools. That is what we do not want. that is what we would not submit to. We had that clerical control of schools from 1884 to 1891, and as the ex-Minister of the Interior has said to-day with regard to Manitoba. that system was abused. It may be a good system in theory, it may be a good system in practice, in some cases, but we did not find it so. I was a member of the legislature which changed the conditions of the school law of the Northwest and made the schools strictly national. We have separate schools in the Northwest, but we have not a separate school system in the Northwest. We concede, and I am glad to say that we willingly concede, to our Roman Catholic fellow citizens the right to pay their own taxes to their own schools, to elect their own trustees, to hire teachers of their own faith, and to give religious instruction for one-half hour each day in their schools. I believe that is a reasonable provision, and while I cannot say that I approve of it, still I do approve of it to this extent, that it satisfies the religious convictions of a large and important part of the population, whose religious convictions are entitled to the most careful and fullest consideration.

So far I am prepared to go and justify myself here or anywhere else. Beyond that point, to hand our schools, or any section of our schools, over to the control of a body not directly responsible to the people of the country through their votes, I certainly do not approve of and the people of the Northwest Territories would not approve of. We have an efficient school system in the Northwest Territories, a very efficient school system. It is a national school system, essentially national, and because it is national we approve of it. There is no occasion, there has been no occasion and there has been no justification in any way, shape or manner for the attacks that have been made upon this subject of separate schools as a matter of party politics within the last two or three weeks in this country.

It may be a matter of information to the members of this House to say that while the returns show only ten or fifteen separate schools in the Territories, there are, I suppose, upwards of a hundred Catholic schools. Wherever the Catholic people are in the majority, they elect their own trustees, form their own school district, hire their own teachers and direct what form of religion shall be taught in the half hour allotted to religion. These are public schools; they are not separate schools, and yet they are Catholic schools. So, I say that in the Northwest Territories we have the Catholics sharing in the public school system just the same whether they are separated from the original districts or whether they form the original district; we have a national school system and it is not throttling the Northwest Territories and it is not doing an injustice or an injury to the Northwest Territories to provide for a continuation of that system, especially if by so doing you provide against the possibility of such a condition as was attempted to be thrust upon the province of Manitoba not many years ago.

In regard to the other provisions of this

Bill I do not think anything need be said. We have received in the past at the hands of this government very fair consideration. We have received representation in this House and in the upper chamber. We have received reasonable financial consideration, increasing as our needs increased, although possibly not fully up to the mark of our requirements. And now, that it has seemed good to the government of the day and to, I think, the large majority of the people of the country to erect these Territories into provinces, it is certainly something of which we may very well be proud that we enter confederation upon such favourable terms. We only regret that this particular subject should have been the occasion of such a great amount of what I may be justified in calling malicious misrepresentation for the purpose of making party capital. We had hoped that our entrance into confederation as full fledged provinces would be under altogether auspicious circumstances. With this exception they are altogether auspicious and perhaps when we have threshed out this question in parliament we will all understand each other better, we will all know where we severally stand on this important question and perhaps it will be the last we will hear in Canada of this much vexed school question.

Mr. H. BOURASSA moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House. He said: Monday being private members' day, probably this debate will not be continued on that day, but it will be resumed on Tuesday. At the same time I am giving notice to the House that the government intends to move next week to take Mondays as well as other days after private Bills and questions put by members. The calendar is pretty fully charged with orders placed upon it by different members of the House so that I think it would be well that members who intend to move resolutions should do so on Monday next.

Mr. FOSTER. When the debate is resumed on Tuesday I suppose it will go on consecutively?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, from day to day.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 27, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THE OTTAWA ELECTRIC COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 12) respecting the Ottawa Electric Company.—Mr. Galliher.

On section 2—shares in other companies.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Chairman, I wish to read a resolution in regard to this Ottawa Electric Bill which was passed by the municipal council of the city of Toronto. I have received the following letter:

City Clerk's Office, Toronto, Feb. 14, 1905.

Dear Sir,—I have the honour by direction of his worship the mayor to forward herewith a copy of a resolution which was adopted by the city council at its meeting held on the 13th instant, as follows:

Whereas, the city of Ottawa entered into certain agreements with the Metropolitan Railway Company of Ottawa, Limited, and with the Consumers Electric Company, Limited, respectively, in which it was provided that the said companies should not at any time during a period provided in the said agreement, amalgamate or combine with any other company or companies carrying on or which might thereafter carry on in the said city of Ottawa a business for supplying electricity for the purpose of supplying power, light or heat, nor should the said company or companies enter into any contract, agreement or arrangement with any other such company for such purpose, or that should have such effect, nor should the said companies enter into any contract, agreement or arrangement with any such other company for the purpose, or that might have the effect of creating a monopoly for the business of supplying electricity for the purposes aforesaid without the permission of the council of the corporation of the city of Ottawa to be expressed by by-law;

And whereas, the Ottawa Electric Company are by Bill No. 12 seeking legislation at the present session of the Dominion parliament at Ottawa which will enable them to purchase the stock of the said Metropolitan and the said Consumers Companies and thus become the owners thereof, and, by so doing, avoid the said agreements;

And whereas, it is desirable that the agreements, interests and vested rights of municipalities should be respected and preserved, and the passing of the proposed legislation will, in the opinion of this council, vitally affect the vested rights and interests of the city of Ottawa and destroy the purposes of the said agreements;

Be it resolved, that this council does most respectfully petition the parliament of Canada to resist and prevent the passage of the said legislation, and does most respectfully request the members of the city of Toronto to oppose it.

Your obedient servant,
W. A. LITTLEJOHN,
City Clerk.

W. F. Maclean, Esq., M.P.,
Ottawa, Ont.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is the resolution of the city of Toronto, which has a vital interest in maintaining what it calls

the vested interests of muncipalities, because the municipality of Ottawa has a vested interest in a contract with companies incorporated in this city, who, on getting franchises, have given a solemn pledge that they shall not amalgamate. The city of Toronto asks you to-day to protect the vested interests of the city of Ottawa, in that respect; they ask that not only on behalf of Ottawa, but on behalf of every other municipality in this country. The municipalities of Canada are being raided to-day right and left by these franchise holding corporations, who are not content with what they have got, but the moment they get a franchise they are constantly seeking additional legislation which will enable them to avoid their obligations. The experience of all the cities of Canada with these lighting companies is on the line that the company does not carry out its agreement. In the city of Toronto we have two of these companies. These companies gave us a solemn pledge—it is on record in the documents—that they would not amalgamate; and they did what the chief executive of one of these companies called the cleverest thing that could be done—they got the ablest lawyer in Canada to prepare a plan under which they could practically amalgamate and avoid their agreements, so that one person can purchase stock in the two companies, and while they cannot amalgamate in the letter, they do so in fact. It is the same president, the same board of directors, that meet five minutes after the other is through; they do whatever they like with the citizens. Now the same thing is proposed to be done in the city of Ottawa. They propose to allow an amalgamation, and when that is consummated they intend to advance the rates charged to the people of Ottawa. We have heard a great deal in this House about the vested rights of companies and of corporations, but we never hear anything about the vested rights of municipalities, as a matter of fact those rights are not supposed to be protected. I am glad to know that the Postmaster General to-day is championing the cause of the vested rights of municipalities.

Mr. SPROULE. He is not here.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. He ought to be here, that is all I can say. But I am sorry to know that in connection with this legislation—of course I will be charged with introducing partisan ideas—but we were told the other day that this was a free question, parties could divide on it, and that the government was divided. But the government whips are active in having this Bill carried through; the whips of the Liberal party to-day have canvassed their members up and down this House, they have lined them up, and they are bringing the Liberal party as an organization into support of this Bill.

Mr. LOGAN. As the chief whip of the government party does not happen to be in his seat, I desire, as assistant chief whip, to give that statement the most unqualified denial.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I have the honour to be one of the whips of the Liberal party, and I desire to say that I have never asked a member to vote for this Bill, and have never discussed the Bill with any of the members.

Mr. L. LAVERGNE. As one of the Liberal whips I desire also to deny the statement of the hon. member for York (Mr. W. F. Maclean).

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have not been canvassed in connection with this matter.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I knew I would get that statement, and I accept it. Yet I say this is a government proposition, and it is going through the House just as if it was on the order paper as on the government orders.

Mr. CALDWELL. I beg to deny that statement. I have not been canvassed by one side or the other.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I also accept the hon. gentleman's statement, but I still say that this is a government measure, and when the division takes place you will see whether it is or not. I could give a great deal more evidence, but there is no doubt about this fact, that it is being supported by the Liberal party, and that will be seen when the vote comes on.

Mr. LOGAN. Would the hon. gentleman explain to us, if it is a government measure, how it is that the leader of the opposition votes in the same way as the leader of the government?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I cannot explain it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I voted for the preamble of the Bill because there are several clauses in it, to three of which I understood there is no objection. To strike out the preamble would not only destroy the clause about which the controversy has arisen, but it would strike out the three clauses to which there is no objection so far as I understand. I trust I have made myself clear to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. LOGAN. I regret that the hon. gentleman did not make himself clear before, so that nobody would have misunderstood him.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well I cannot supply brains to my hon. friend.

Mr. LOGAN. I am not asking the hon. gentleman to supply me with brains. But

I think it would not have been unreasonable for the hon. gentleman to have supplied the House with the reasons why he voted for the preamble of the Bill, since voting for the preamble adopts the principle.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Rejecting the preamble is equivalent to rejecting every clause of the Bill. I should think my hon. friend had been long enough in parliament to know that.

Mr. LOGAN. I know it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If there are sections of the Bill to which there is no objection and one section to which there is an objection, the proper course is to strike out the objectionable section, and not to vote against the preamble.

Mr. LOGAN. But it is a fair inference I think, that when an hon. gentleman supports the preamble of a Bill he supports the principle.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The test will be when the votes comes. Now I want to come to another phase of this question. The Liberal party has been known before it came into power to go up and down this country appealing to the farmers, and especially the Postmaster General, and I give him credit now for living up to what he did in those days. They went before the farmers and they wept before the farmers over the way that their money was being extravagantly spent at Ottawa. They wept before the farmers about the extravagance of the previous government in connection with the government house, in connection with every department; and most of all they told the farmers that they were being bled white in various ways by the tariff, and by an extravagant administration at Ottawa. Well, those gentleman are in power to-day, and this government is the biggest customer of this Ottawa Electric Light Company, this government pays them more than anybody else, and the farmers of this country are supplying the money. As the law now is, it is the farmers of this country who pay for the electric light, we do not pay for it; the people of Canada pay for the electric light that we use in this building; and we as custodians of the people's money are asked to-day deliberately to remove a clause which protects them from an advance in rates for electricity in this city. Now I leave it to the hon. gentlemen who represent farming constituencies in this House, I do not care on which side of the House they sit, to explain to their constituents how they can vote for this measure which takes away the protection that the people now enjoy in regard to their electric bills. We are bound, if we are honest trustees, to administer the people's money with the greatest economy, we are bound to see that the rates are not unfairly advanced. Most of all we are bound to maintain public rights, municipal rights that are set out in this agreement. The municipality of the city of Ottawa asks us to protect them in this clause which now prohibits amalgamation. These amalgamations are going on every day. Look at the merger that is looming up in the city of Montreal to-day. There is a merger coming in Montreal under the guise of light, heat and power which will monopolize all the electric energy of that city, gas companies, electric railways, and even the suburban companies—they are all to be merged in a way to become a monopoly upon the people. The same thing is happening in Ottawa. The people who own this electric light company own the street railway, and they are gradually bringing a merger into effect in Ottawa, just as they have got a merger ready to develop in Toronto in a short time on the same lines. They propose to enter into a merger with the intention of doing away with competition, of advancing rates and of avoiding the necessity of living up to the agreement which they originally entered into with the municipality. Let me tell hon. members of this House in a few words what these electric companies do and the case of one is the test of them all. A company for the supply of electricity for lighting, makes a contract, such as you will find in connection with this building, at so much per horse-power to go into an arc light. There never yet has been found a private electrical company that will honestly measure the electric energy supplied to the public. They make a contract to put electrical energy to the extent of one horse-power into an arc light per night, when the fact is that they never put in more than half a horse-power and the experience of all cities is the same in this regard. The greatest fight that is taking place in the United States to-day is that which is now in progress in the city of Chicago, where the people are trying to municipalize the traction service. They have succeeded in municipalizing their electric lighting and they propose to municipalize the street car service. The city of Chicago has found the municipalization of its electrical lighting to be a splendid investment. In many of the American cities they have done the same thing and they have not only reduced the cost of their lighting but they are getting honest measure. There never was honest measure given to the public in any known case in which any of these private companies supplied electrical energy to cities. I leave it to hon. gentlemen to say whether it is not fair to let this agreement between the city of Ottawa and the Ottawa Electric Company stand as it is. Why this meddlesomeness on the part of the great parliament of Canada into the domestic affairs of the city of

Ottawa? Why is this parliament meddling in the domestic affairs of this little city of Ottawa? For what reason is it done? Is it for the public benefit? Is it to set a good example to the public that the right hon. the Prime Minister, fifteen members of his cabinet and all his party behind him are——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No. no.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Well, all right. I beg the hon. Postmaster General's pardon and I will wait until the vote is taken.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. You will have to beg more pardons.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. All right, if they are coming around so much the better. We will put it in this way: Here is the parliament of Canada interfering with the domestic affairs of this little city of Ottawa and interfering in the interest of a private corporation. Why this meddlesomeness? Leave them alone. The Conservative party used to be called the party of restriction. This House will become the House of restriction if it interferes with the arrangement between the city of Ottawa and this private company by adopting this Bill. Let Ottawa work out her own solution; let us leave her domestic affairs alone. Let us attend to national affairs. Why devote our time to the domestic affairs of the city of Ottawa? We have a large number of men and women in this city who are the servants of Canada, who are in the civil service. We know that none of them are overpaid, yet, we, as the employers of the civil servants who are resident in Ottawa are willingly turning them over to this Ottawa Electric Company which intends by this legislation to advance the cost of electricity. Why should we subject our own servants to this injustice? Should we not rather protect their interests by refusing to pass this measure which has in view the amalgamation of these companies and an advance in the cost of electric lighting in this city? If parliament wishes to help this company, I would rather see it pay more for the electric lighting of this building than that we should turn over the citizens of Ottawa and especially the civil servants to the mercy of the Ottawa Electric Company and subject them to an advance in the rates which they are called upon to pay for electric lighting. The municipal union of this country, a union made up of all the municipalities, is behind the city of Ottawa in its opposition to this measure. All these municipalities have asked their members to assist the city of Ottawa. The city of Toronto has asked all its members, I believe the same thing has happened in the city of Hamilton and in justice not only to the city of Ottawa, but to all other municipalities which have to deal with similar questions I say: Do not interfere with these things, leave them alone and attend to national affairs.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in his zeal for the cause which he advocates, has managed to bring into the discussion of this Bill almost all classes of the community. I do not know that the farmers at large are very much interested in this measure.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. They pay the Bills here.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. The city of Ottawa is interested in this measure, but I do not know that it interests particularly any other class of the community. My hon. friend referred to a resolution passed by the city of Toronto. That is certainly worthy of credit and of attention, but as far as I am concerned, this Bill was referred to a special committee which after giving it their best attention have made a report upon it. Although this report is assailed, I intend to support it. The position I have always taken has been to support the report of a committee to which has been entrusted by the House with any particular question. In this case, a special committee which was composed of hon. gentlemen in whom the House has confidence has made a report stating that the Bill is satisfactory. Until this report is attacked by the amendment which is to be moved in a few minutes, I think we had better pass the clauses of the Bill and then we will come to the discussion of the amendment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall section 2 be adopted?

Mr. SPROULE. No, because that is the one which is objected to. Section 2 reads as follows:

(d) Of the said Act is amended by striking out all the words after the word 'company' in the third line thereof.

I have the original Act here and this shows what the change proposed is. Paragraph (d) of section 7 of the original Act passed in 1894, reads as follows:

Acquire shares in capital stock, debentures and securities of other electrical companies or of companies possessing powers similar to those of this company.

The proposition is to strike out the balance of the section which is as follows:

As the consideration for goods, wares or merchandise sold to such other companies in the ordinary course of business.

Parliament just gave them power to buy this stock for a certain consideration and now it is proposed to strike out the purpose for which the stock was to be purchased. It was to be purchased for a consideration, for the consideration of 'goods, wares or

merchandise sold to such other companies in the ordinary course of business.' The object of putting that in the original Act was to prevent the company from buying out the stock of another company which was a competitor and which gave competition to the people of Ottawa. If you strike out that provision which forbids them to buy that stock then we allow them to buy it, they can only desire to buy it for one purpose and that is to prevent competition with the other company. As a result of that competiton, the people of Ottawa have benefited very considerably. They are benefiting to-day to the extent of nearly 48 per cent in what they pay for their lighting. The price which they pay is about 48 per cent below the maximum price that the companies are allowed to charge, and if this restriction is taken out of the Act competition will be destroyed, and then the company will raise their rates, no doubt, up to 52-100ths of one per cent per ampere hour which is the maximum that the company can charge. That will be an increase in the cost of lighting of nearly 48 per cent, and it applies to the lights supplied to the Houses of parliament and the government departments as well as to the lights supplied to the citizens. The First Minister has asked where does the interest of the farmers come in. My answer to him is, that the farmers of Canada through the government are paying for the lighting of these government buildings, and if we allow the company to increase the price, the farmers of Canada will have to pay for it. In 1894, when this company obtained legislation, this restriction was put in to prevent the possibility of destroying the competition which then existed, and this electric company has worked under that law for ten years. We are now asked to remove that restriction against the wish of the citizens and against the contract which the company entered into with the citizens in 1894. The company cannot break faith with the city of Ottawa without our assistance, and we should not put it in their power to commit such a breach of faith.

Mr. GALLIHER. I wish to tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) that the Consumers Company and the Metropolitan Company were not in existence until four years after this charter was granted, so that the clause could not have been put in to secure competition.

Mr. STEWART. When this law of 1894 was passed three companies were being amalgamated, and the idea of it was to prevent amalgamation with other companies that might be brought into existence.

Mr. SPROULE. The existing law says that this company shall not acquire shares, debentures or capital stock in any other company, except for commodities that the other companies don't want, so that the provision is general, and if the restriction is allowed to remain they cannot amalgamate with any company in the future.

Mr. GALLIHER. Why has parliament granted to other companies in the city of Ottawa the privilege of doing this very thing ?

Mr. SPROULE. That is a strange argument.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I hope the Prime Minister now sees that the farmers have a vital interest in this matter, because it is they who suppply the money to light these government buildings, and if this restriction in the law is removed the cost of electric light will go up and the farmers will have to pay more. As the custodian of the public purse of Canada the Prime Minister will be doing wrong for which he will be held accountable if he allows this change in the law, which to-day protects the Dominion treasury from the encroachments of the Ottawa Electric Company. If the Finance Minister were here to-day I would tell him the same thing. In the last election the Prime Minister received the confidence of the people of Ottawa who returned two supporters of his, and to-day the citizens of Ottawa through their two representatives in this House, and through two of their newspapers, and through the petitions they have sent here demand that the government shall portect them. I would say to the members for Ottawa that if I were in their place I would offer my resignation and test the feeling of the people on this question. If the two members for the city of Ottawa did that, parliament would soon know whether the people of Ottawa are in earnest or not. I say that every man who votes for this Bill is voting against the interests of the citizens of Ottawa. If this Bill is passed to-day competition will be removed, amalgamation permitted, and other mergers will be allowed to take place in this city.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) would like to know why I oppose this Bill ? I assume that the Ottawa Electric Company has acquired its charter from the Dominion parliament, because it probably carries on business in the two provinces of Ontario and Quebec. That may be technically a justification for its having a Dominion charter, but there is no doubt that practically the functions of the company are chiefly confined to the city of Ottawa. I do not know whether or not it supplies electricity in the city of Hull, but at all events it is in substance a local company, and as a member of the Dominion parliament I hesitate to interfere with a matter that seems to me to be essentially local. This parliament is composed of members representing constituencies from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and they are not in as good a position to deal with a purely local question as would the provincial legis-

lature, or better still the municipal representatives of the people in the Ottawa city council. It is therefore my opinion that we ought not to interfere except with the consent of the people of Ottawa. My hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) is extremely anxious to reform the leader of the government, doubtless with a view to securing the defeat of this Bill. Let me point out to him where he might with greater effect apply his influence. Immediately to the right of him is the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) and a little further on is his own leader the member for Carleton (Mr. R. L. Borden) whose constituency adjoins the city of Ottawa, and many of whose constituents are consumers of electricity supplied by this company. If my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) would bring his influence to bear on his own leader and get him to change his views, there probably would be sufficient change of sentiment on the other side of the House to enable my hon. friend and myself to defeat this Bill. I have not yet heard the hon. gentleman denounce the leader of the opposition for leading his party to support this Bill. Why are not his strong diatribes directed against the leader of the opposition? It is not a party question or a government question and if the leader of the opposition will use his best influence I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) and I with our small forces combined with those the leader of the opposition could bring to our assistance might be successful. I have not yet seen my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) make any bona fide attempt to convert those on his own side of the House who are more or less supposed to be willing to receive his advice. If my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean), instead of trying to make party capital of this would commence his missionary work in his own ranks, I perhaps might do missionary work over here and we might accomplish some good.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If the Postmaster General will succeed in converting his leader it will make it all the easier for me to do some converting on my side of the House. Again I say to the Postmaster General, now that he is joining with me in antagonizing this Bill, that he ought to go to his friends around him, who have made the same speech that he has made, and tell them that in the interest of the farmers of this country there ought to be the most careful expenditure of public money, and that no laws should be passed that would do away with the protection which the people of this country enjoy.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My hon. friend has not touched the point I raised. I want to know what he thinks of the conduct of his leader.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The Postmaster General was not in the House ten minutes ago, when this very question came up, and when the leader of the oppposition asked the House to judge him by his record when the vote comes. I am not going to prejudge him. He has already put himself on record on this question. A man who is too ready to deliver lectures before they are required puts himself out of court, and I do not propose to begin.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The reason I referred to the leader of the opposition was that when the Bill was up on Wednesday night, I observed that the leader of the opposition voted with me against the Bill. I do not know whether his views have changed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought it was bad enough for the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) to have made that mistake, but I would have hardly expected it from the Postmaster General. I voted for the preamble of the Bill, which contains five sections. To three of these there is no objection; but with regard to the other two sections I have thus left myself quite open. I had hardly thought that explanation would have been necessary for the Postmaster General, an old parliamentarian of twenty-five years experience.

Mr. BERGERON. After the remarks of my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean), it seems to be necessary for a man who votes on this Bill to explain his vote. I was a member of the subcommittee which was charged with examining this Bill thoroughly before it was brought to the House. We worked at it for some time, and I think we did our duty, and I may say to the hon. member for South York that I have not seen any one, directly or indirectly, in regard to this measure. I had not known before that the Ottawa Electric Company was furnishing electricity for the parliament buildings. I remember that in the old times we used to make our own electricity. I would like to know why it was that the government decided to buy its electricity from the Ottawa Company instead of manufacturing it. If it was because it was cheaper to buy it, that would have some bearing on this subject. Before I go any further, I would ask the Acting Minister of Public Works if he knows why this was done?

Mr. HYMAN. The change was made some years ago. I understand, that the increased number of lights required for the buildings would have necessitated a considerably larger plant than we had, and I have no doubt that it was felt by the department that it would be cheaper to buy the electricity from the company than to manufacture it. With regard to any effect that this Bill may have on the charges to the government, it must be remembered that if the charges made by this company at any time are beyond what the Department of

Public Works consider to be fair and reasonable, the department can supply their own electric power.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The city of Ottawa can do the same.

Mr. HYMAN. The city of Ottawa can do the same.

Mr. SPROULE. The city of Ottawa cannot start a similar plant without buying out these corporations.

Mr. HYMAN. I am confining myself to answering the hon. gentleman's question. If at any time the charges made by this company or any other appear to be excessive, the Public Works Department will, I presume, take into consideration the question of supplying electricity itself, and, if necessary, ask parliament for an appropriation to put in its own plant.

Mr. BERGERON. I infer that the department find that the company are not charging exorbitant prices. To come to the Bill, my hon. friend from South York, as is his privilege, wants to raise a very big question—the question of municipalizing or nationalizing works of this kind. To my mind this is a very ordinary Bill. Here is a company asking for power to increase its capital. We grant that nearly every day. Various companies come to us and ask for increased privileges ; and these are companies which have been organized by the Dominion parliament. We are asked to increase the capital stock of this company —why should we not do it ? Parliament has already, on Wednesday night, sanctioned the preamble of the Bill. The first clause provides that the capital may be increased to $1,500,000. We agreed to that. The second clause provides for increasing the borrowing power of the company from fifty per cent to seventy-five per cent of the capital. I do not see anything extraordinary in that. By the third clause they want power to buy some stock, and to pay money for it instead of goods, wares, merchandise, and so forth. We have given that power to other companies, and it seems to me that it is better to pay money for stock than to acquire it in these other ways. The last clause, the fourth, which is not before the House, but will be before it in a few minutes, provides for increasing the borrowing power from twenty-five to fifty per cent. My hon. friend from South York says this Bill is going to impose a great hardship on the people of Ottawa. There are three companies here. The Ottawa Electric Company was the first. It made a contract with the city of Ottawa, and it stood by its contract. We have to protect municipalities, but we must also protect those who have invested their money in enterprises of this kind. The city of Ottawa did not stand by its contract, but encouraged the incorporation of other companies—the Consumers' and the Metropolitan. The latter is doing nothing at all ; it stands like a threat in the way. The Consumers' Company has a right to sell light at .52 cents per ampere hour, but it has offered to sell at .36 cents. The Ottawa Company does the same. Neither company is paying a dividend, as this price does not pay them. If we grant this Bill to the Ottawa Electric Company, the worst that could happen would be that the citizens of Ottawa would pay .52 cents per ampere hour. It is not proven that they will ; it is not probable that they will. To show that the people of Ottawa are not crushed by the prices they have to pay for electric lighting, we had produced before the subcommittee many papers which justify the position we have taken. We asked what electricity cost in the different cities of Canada, and we find that in Quebec the price is .60 cents per ampere hour, in Montreal, .60 cents, in Toronto from .60 cents to .40 cents, in Halifax .63 cents, in Winnipeg .85 cents to .60 cents, in Hamilton .75 cents to .50 cents, and in Ottawa .36 cents. In view of all these facts the committee came to the conclusion that it would not be right to prevent these people from coming to parliament and asking for the privileges they desired. I considered it my duty to vote in that sense and intend to do so now, and in the position I take I am a perfectly free agent, perfectly free to vote one way or the other.

Mr. STEWART. I do not know where my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) got the figures he has just given the House. I have not obtained any figures, but I have asked for information from gentlemen in this House who live in Montreal and Toronto, and the figures they give me do not agree with those which my hon. friend has just given. I am afraid, therefore, that whatever source he obtained his information from is not at all to be depended on. Not long ago there were several electric light companies in Montreal, but they became all amalgamated into the one company, and the result has been that the prices for electric light are much higher to-day in that city than they were a few years ago. Those hon. gentlemen who live in Montreal will know whether this be a true statement of fact or not. As regards the city of Toronto, I am informed by a gentleman, who is not at all interested in the measure except in a very general way, and as one who has heard the question debated in this House, that the rate in Toronto is less than what is charged in Ottawa to-day. If that be the case, if it be the case that in Ottawa, where electrical power can be produced very much cheaper than in Toronto, the rate is higher than in the latter city, then the figures just given us by the hon. member for Beauharnois cannot be correct. But we are told by the hon. Minister of Justice that the city of Ottawa has a remedy in its own hands, inasmuch

as it can make its own electricity. The same statement was made the other evening by the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill (Mr. Galliher). But a year ago when the city council of Ottawa were discussing the question of submitting a bylaw to the citizens authorizing the council to borrow money to establish their own electric light system, a letter was written to council by the secretary-treasurer of the Ottawa Electric Company which, in view of this statement by the Minister of Justice and the promoter of the Bill, I would ask permission to read to the House.

Ottawa, Ont., March 29th, 1904.

John Henderson, Esq.,
City Clerk, Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—I am instructed by the directors of this company to call the attention of your council to the fact that they have been advised that your council has no power to lease electric power as it proposes for any purpose. In view of this the directors of this company feel some embarrassment as to whether they should or should not put in a tender in response to your advertisement, and they would respectfully suggest that your council should seriously consider its present position before any further complications arise, as this company may feel it their duty to take steps to prevent the contemplated action of the city.

In this connection the directors of this company would also desire to say that they have been further advised that even if your council had power to lease it could not do anything in the direction of the operation of a municipal lighting plant until it had exercised the provisions of those sections of the Municipal Act commonly called the 'Conmee Act.'

Your council will, of course, appreciate the fact that the directors of this company will consider it their duty to their shareholders to take all proper steps to protect their interests, and they therefore trust that your council may take such steps as may be necessary to avoid further conflict.

As an evidence of the good faith of this protest, I am instructed to say that the present feeling of the directors of this company is that in the event of the city taking proceedings under the Conmee Act, they will recommend their shareholders to permit their property to be sold to the city.

In view of the fact that this company has a perpetual franchise, and that its property is now in the best shape, such a purchase would no doubt be more advantageous to the city than any other plan looking to municipal ownership. The directors of this company trust that the situation will be carefully considered by your council before further steps are taken.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Yours truly,
(Sgd.) D. R. STREET,
Secretary-treasurer.

As shown by this letter the position taken by the company is directly contradictory of the opinion given by the Minister of Justice and the promoter of the Bill, and under the circumstances I would not be inclined to consider it safe to leave the city of Ottawa in the hands of the company.

Mr. STEWART.

There are a couple of other points which I intended making when submitting my amendment, but which I may as well make now. There can be no doubt as to the intention of the company to do away, by the legislation asked for, with competition. The supporters of the Bill do not attempt to deny that. On the other hand, we have had statements submitted to the committee and the House as to the cost of electric light. In the committee the other day we had a statement from the Ottawa Electric Company showing its earnings during the past five years. According to that statement the company was making a little over 5 per cent. But it was not pointed out to the committee that during the five years from 1890 to 1895, covered by that statement, we had had a great conflagration in Ottawa which wiped out a large portion of the Ottawa Electric Company's plant. And it seems to me that if that company was able to make good the large amount of assets then destroyed and still show an earning power over 5 per cent, it is not in any urgent need of relief from this House. I give this information in the hope that it may influence some gentlemen on both sides, who are not particularly interested in this matter, either in the city of Ottawa or the company, and who are consequently perfectly free from bias or prejudice and disposed from every point of view to do what is right. There can be no doubt that the idea underlying this measure is to do away with competition. There can be no doubt that the object of obtaining power to increase the stock of the Ottawa Electric Company is to enable it to purchase the stock of the Consumers Electric Company. Well, Mr. Chairman, this House has legislated in the past with regard to trusts. I am but a young member, but have followed the discussions that took place under previous administrations, and I remember the late Mr. Clarke Wallace, then a member of the Conservative government, brought into this House a measure for the purpose of protecting the people on a similar question. He brought in a Bill to prevent, if possible, the charging to the ordinary consumer more for the goods he purchased from the trust than he was charged by the different firms composing the trust previous to their forming a combine. That Bill was carried through this House. Only last session also the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur) brought down a Bill to prevent the dealers in tobacco from controlling the prices. That measure commended itself to this House, and I believe the hon. minister proposes to see that it is put into operation and the consumers protected. Why, then, should this House stultify itself by allowing a Bill, such as the one before us, to go through?

The citizens of Ottawa are more interested in this question than gentlemen who repre-

sent outside constituencies and they feel very keenly on this question ; they feel that an effort is being made to combine the two companies in order to increase the price charged for electric light. The Ottawa Electric Company submitted to the committee who dealt with this question a statement of their earnings during the last five years in order to convince the committee, if possible, that it was a good thing that we should consent to a combination of the two companies in order to enable them to make better profits than they have made in the last five years, so I think it is established that the evident intention of the Bill is that the Consumers' Company shall be absorbed by the Ottawa Company and that when this is done the price shall be raised. Indeed the argument is being constantly used that the Ottawa Company are not making any money. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) made that statement a moment ago, that the Ottawa Company are not making any money.

Mr. BERGERON. That was said before the sub-committee.

Mr. STEWART. I pointed out that the Ottawa Company submitted a financial statement before the committee and that the argument is that the Ottawa Electric Company is not making any money and that therefore this House should put them in a position to make more money at the expense of the consumers of electric light in Ottawa, and I ask members on both sides not to give them that power. It is not a fair thing to the ratepayers of the city of Ottawa. There is another point which I wish to make rather as a warning than as an argument. The same gentlemen who have capital in the Ottawa Electric Company also control the Ottawa Electric Street Railway Company. The Ottawa Street Railway Company is a splendidly managed institution and it is a good investment for those who have their capital invested in it. A short time ago there was a discussion between the Ottawa Street Railway and the corporation of the city of Ottawa as to whether it would be advisable for the city of Ottawa to buy the Ottawa Railway Company and manage the railway themselves. The Ottawa Street Railway Company fixed as a price of their stock $250 per share, the shares having cost them $100. I am not blaming them for that, but the warning I wish to give is that if parliament is going to legislate to-day for the relief of the Ottawa Electric Company the citizens of Ottawa may some day come to this House and ask for legislation to enable them to lessen the profits which the Ottawa Street Railway makes for the capitalists who are in both companies. I understand that a new clause, No. 5 has been added by the committee. When we come to that clause, I have an amendment which I propose to submit to the House.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Stewart) challenged the figures which I put before the House. I want to tell him very plainly that they were produced before the subcommittee.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. From whom ?

Mr. BERGERON. I do not remember from whom, but they were placed on the table. Other members may have them because they were typewritten, they were difficult to read and I asked somebody there, whom, I do not know, to put them more plainly, and they were written in lead pencil. I have now compared them with this typewritten copy which was placed on the table of the subcommittee and they are the same. My hon. friend (Mr. Stewart) knows that we have asked all the explanations that we could get. The hon. member from Ottawa (Mr. Stewart) should not have spoken as he did about members from other parts of the country, in view of the fact that the members have been very generous to the city of Ottawa. We do not begrudge this generous treatment, but at the same time we should not be told that we have nothing to do with a Bill which deals with the city of Ottawa because we come from a distance from this city ; this is a public measure in a way. They are asking parliament for some privileges and we are entitled to grant them if we see fit, and I am surprised and sorry to hear my hon. friend say that we should not pass such legislation because we come from a distance.

Mr. HYMAN. Statements have been made more than once to the effect that the city of Ottawa has broken faith with this company in regard to some contracts. I think the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Hagggart) referred to the matter and it seeems to me that the hon. member for Ottawa should make some explanation in regard to it.

Mr. HAGGART. He did.

Mr. FOSTER. There seems to be a general desire to have every member on record with reference to this question and I do not hesitate to put myself on record. I do not propose to argue it very much. I look at it this way ; it is a matter in which the city of Ottawa is primarily interested ; it is they who have to give the profits to both of these companies, the Consumers and the Metropolitan. They gave a franchise to this company upon a certain charter and it is this charter which it is now proposed to change. It is a matter which I think may fairly be put on the ground of good faith, that if the city of Ottawa gave a franchise upon a charter the conditions of which were well known to it, and if it is now proposed to change that charter and so relieve the company to which it gave the franchise, there ought to be practically an agreement between the city of Ottawa which

gave the franchise and the people who have that charter, in order that good faith may be kept.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. But the city of Ottawa had another purpose in view ; they gave a charter to the Consumers, in order to induce competition and obtain cheaper rates for light. That was entirely within their rights. The city of Ottawa when it chartered the Consumers' Company did two things ; it chartered a company and said : Go in and compete, and we will get the advantage of the competition ; we give you a franchise but we forbid you to amalgamate. The city set the maximum price which the company could charge for light, a maximum price which was satisfactory to the city. The city therefore had two strings to its bow and it seems to me that both of these strings are being pulled out ; the city is losing its competitive company and therefore the advantages which it got from competition. That being the state of the case I think that we can well afford to let the two companies fight out the question of the low rates at present existing, between them. If the two companies cannot come to a conclusion and agree upon a price that will give a fair profit, that is not the fault of the city, and I do not think that parliament ought to intervene in order to get them out of that difficulty.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is a great deal in what the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has said with respect to the position now occupied by the city of Ottawa in view of the fact that they granted the franchise upon a charter which the company had, but my hon. friend must remember that there is nothing in this amendment which can in any way affect the franchise granted to the company by the city of Ottawa. As I understand, the franchise granted by the city of Ottawa limits the rates which this company can charge. This amendment will not affect them ; they cannot violate that. I do not think there is very much to be said in so far as the contract is concerned, but with respect to the other protection, with respect to the competition of which my hon. friend speaks, when he says that the Consumers' Company was incorporated especially for the purpose of competing with this Company, and in order to make that competition effective it was provided in the franchise that they would not have the power to amalgamate with another corporation, allow me to point out that this is a provision of the Consumers' charter. We are not dealing with the Consumers' Company, we are dealing with another which is entirely distinct and separate. If the corporation of Ottawa has accomplished its purpose, in so far as getting competition is concerned, or securing competition——

Mr. FOSTER. It has.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Clearly it has not, because it has not made sufficient provision in the franchise to protect them but they have another protection.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What my hon. friend means is this, that they have accomplished their purpose if you leave the charter as it was passed, upon which they received their franchise.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They have accomplished their purpose if we deprive this corporation of these privileges which every other corporation is granted, if we deprive this corporation of those rights which it would have under the general law of the country ; that is to say, they accomplish their purpose if we help them to do it. But they have had in view this contingency, because they have made provision for what may occur with respect to the consequences resulting from amalgamation, they have made provision for an opportunity to compete themselves with this company, and no one wants to deprive them of that. They have that power under the Act of 1894, and my hon. friend read a moment ago a letter emanating from this corporation to the effect that the corporation of Ottawa has no power to enter into competition with them unless under a provision of the Conmee Act. My hon. friend was careful not to tell us that the corporation's solicitor stated before the subcommittee that undoubtedly the corporation had the power to do so. But independently of that altogether, let me draw the attention of the committee to this fact, that under the franchise the corporation of Ottawa has reserved to themselves the right to use the poles of this Consumers' Company if they want to string their wires upon them ; they have effectively protected themselves by reserving the right to put their own wires on the poles of this company. It seems to me we are here to do justice to corporations. I quite understand there is a desire in certain parts of the country to encourage corporations to enter into works of this sort. Now, I say it would be a calamity to this country for municipalities to take up the business now done by private corporations ; it would be a calamity, and my hon. friend cannot point to a single instance in which any municipality has ever taken up work of that sort and carried it out succesfully.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I can give him dozens of instances. Now that he has challenged me, let me give him one. The towns of Port Arthur and Fort William to-day are doing their own municipal telephone business at one half what the Bell Telephone Company used to charge. The city of Guelph to-day is doing its own street railway business, its own electric lighting, and giving facilities for the establishment of industries in a way that is adding to the welfare of the people and promoting their interests. The town of Bracebridge, the town of St. Thomas, town after town I can

mention, that are doing their own municipal lighting. Two great examples are the city of Detroit and the city of Chicago, and nearly every city of England is doing successfully its municipal trading. I know that the hon. gentleman is going to deny the case of England; but every day instance after instance is reported showing the success of municipal ownership of electric lighting. The only case where it has ever failed is where the insidious operation of these private corporations has intervened, chiefly in the city of Philadelphia, where private companies have stood in the way of municipal operation of public utilities. The enemies of public operation of these utilities have been these private corporations themselves.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I cannot spend my time making a long speech in answer to these vague statements. I repeat the assertion that the one attempt that was made in this way was in Glasgow, and we all know the result of that. The result was absolute disaster, as everybody knows who is acquainted with the circumstances. My hon. friend talks about Port Arthur and Fort William. Where are their telephone systems to-day? They are so far unsuccessful that they cannot even get into the railway station.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Why? Because you will not give them relief.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is idle to discuss the question with my hon. friend. These are things that he talks about, he does not argue about them, he does not reason about them, he merely talks about them. I may be wrong, but I believe myself in private corporations doing this sort of work. I believe these corporations have tended towards the development of this country, and that neither the telephone system, nor electric lighting, nor the street railway systems, in this country, or any other country, would ever amount to anything were it not for private enterprise. I contend that when a private individual has the enterprise to put his money into works of this kind, it is the duty of this parliament to protect him. I do not believe in expropriation, either for the benefit of a municipality or the benefit of a politician.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I come from a town where they have municipal lighting—the town of Neepawa. We have our own electric light plant and our own telephone system, and they are both successful, and are both paying.

Mr. BERGERON. How long in operation?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Our 'phone system has been in operation four or five years and our electric light about four years.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The people of Ottawa had an opportunity to expropriate the street railway system, why did they not take advantage of it?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. We have had a confession here to-day that it is well the country should make a note of. The Minister of Justice says he opposes public ownership of public utilities. He says his experience and his reading go to show that it is a failure, and when I instanced the case of Port Arthur and Fort William, he said that they cannot even get their telephones into the railway station. When his colleague, the late Minister of Railways, introduced the Railway Act two years ago he pledged himself that there was a clause in that Bill which would compel these railway companies to give these private telephone systems access to their stations for the benefit of the municipality and private telephone companies. If that law was enforced to-day, if the Minister of Justice did his duty in enforcing that law, he would put the Grand Trunk Railway Company, he would put the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and he would put the Bell Telephone Company into the criminal court for breaking the law against combinations of this kind. I make that declaration knowing the facts, and I challenge him now, Why does he not do his duty and enforce the criminal law against these combinations? We were told in the Telephone Committee to-day that an effort was made in the county of York within a year to have a combination of that kind declared to be against the public interest, and we have not succeeded; and the reason is because we have in this country public men like the Minister of Justice, we have great law officers of the Crown, we have attorney generals in all the provinces, we have Crown attorneys everywhere, and none of them can be induced to move in the interests of the people. But across the line you see the President of the United States, you see the Attorney General of the United States, you see a new department created called the Department of Corporations, and all the officers of that department are to-day engaged in an active warfare against these corporations to compel them to do their duty towards the people. We don't see that in this country; on the contrary, we see the Minister of Justice getting up——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that section 2 of this Bill is under discussion.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I think I am within my rights in replying to the Minister of Justice; it was he who strayed from the question in the first place. But I will come back to the proposition. The proposition is one to allow an amalgamation to take place between these two companies. One of the members for Ottawa says that this company has pleaded poverty in asking for this legislation. He tells us that the companies desire to amalgamate because their profits are not large. It has been shown that their profits are only five per cent. The men who own this electric light company and the street

railway know whether they are making money or not. Everybody knows that these men manipulate their own accounts. They have large supply accounts between themselves and other companies with which they are associated, and they pay a big profit in that way. How have the street cars been built in Ottawa? They have been built by a subsidiary company, which has been paid large amounts for the cars which they have supplied for the street railway. What is the Dominion of Canada paying this company to-day? At page 49 of the estimates it will be found that we propose to vote $75,000 to be paid to the company for the lighting of these buildings and $8,000 for the energy to drive the elevators. This is the game that is to be worked; once they raise their rates on the citizens of Ottawa, they will come to the Minister of Public Works and say: We are not getting enough money, we have been losing money, we have had to advance our rates in the city and we are going to advance them here. This proposition is to enable these companies to amalgamate, to do away with the competing clause, to advance rates on the people of Ottawa and then to put up the rates on the people of Canada, when to-day, under two items of the estimates, we are voting $83,000 to this company.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I was very much surprised indeed at the wild and exaggerated statements made by the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I wish simply to say that in the town that I come from we run an electric lighting plant and water works system and make it pay. I am not familiar with the method of measuring light by the ampere hour but I am acquainted with what some of the people of Ottawa are paying for their light and I want to say that they are paying in Ottawa 75 per cent more than we are making the people pay in the town from which I come.

Mr. STEWART. I do not rise for the purpose of continuing the argument, but I simply wish to answer the statement that was made to the committee by the hon. Acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman). He said that it had been stated that the city of Ottawa had violated its agreement with the Ottawa Electric Company. I do not know why such a statement should be made and as a representative of the city of Ottawa I wish to give it the most emphatic denial. The corporation have violated no agreement made with the Ottawa Electric Company.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was very much interested in that portion of this discussion which took place between my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The difficulty that I have in following what was advanced by the Minister of Justice is this; he says that we can pass this measure although it is not in accordance with what virtually was the agreement between the city of Ottawa and the company, and he says that we should alter that legislation because it is a usual thing to embody legislation of this amending character in charters granted to other companies. Well, I am free to admit that such is the case. There is no doubt of the fact that a great many of the charters that have been granted by this parliament and by provincial legislation throughout Canada have contained exactly the provision which this company now seeks to embody in its charter by way of amendment. I would like to know from the hon. Minister of Justice, because my mind is open in regard to the argument he has advanced, whether if we have a charter issued to the Ottawa Electric Company and a franchise granted upon that particular charter by the city of Ottawa and if we have the fact established, as I think it is established, that without that franchise so granted this company could not have carried on its undertaking in the city of Ottawa at all, having regard to vested rights, to rights established under contract by agreement of parties, we are now justified, without the consent of the city of Ottawa, to alter that charter which seems to have been an essential element in the agreement entered into between the city and the company? That is the difficulty I have in regard to this. I know there is something to be said on the other side. I know what the hon. Minister of Justice has said. The circumstance adverted to in the debate a few nights ago that the city of Ottawa last year was perfectly willing to accept that which it is not now willing to accept is a circumstance to which weight may be given, but after all does it not come back to this that there was a distinct agreement between the city and the corporation, embodied in the franchise granted by the city upon the charter which the company is now asking to have amended, and how is it possible for us in the face of that to alter that charter in any material or essential element without the consent of the city of Ottawa?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Would my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) be good enough to apprise me in what respect we are altering the charter in such a way as to effect the franchise, the franchise being the agreement of course?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems to me, with all deference to my hon. friend, that the franchise was granted upon this very charter and it may have been granted for the very reason that subsection (d) of section 7 was embodied in the original charter. That may have been a material part of the inducement on account of which the city of Ottawa granted the franchise to this company and if we are at liberty to believe that such is the case, if we are not now bound to believe that such is the case, how can we

alter the terms of the charter which was the inducement to the city of Ottawa in granting the franchise ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is no alteration of the charter in principle. The charter provides practically for the general principle governing all corporations of this sort. The general principle of law is that corporations of this sort shall have the right to acquire the shares of any other company doing business in a like manner. That is the general principle of the Companies' Clauses Act and of the Joint Stock Companies' Act and that is the principle which applies to nine out of ten charters granted by this parliament. This charter merely provides for an extension of that principle. It provides for acquiring stock in another company for a cash consideration instead of for a consideration in goods, wares and merchandise. What is the difference in principle whether you acquire stock for goods, wares and merchandise or whether you acquire it for cash ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. However, true it is that the principle to which he refers may have been consecrated in the Companies' Clauses Act or in private legislation we find that it was not consecrated in this charter, but that there was an express departure from it in this charter. My hon. friend says there is no difference in principle but when you get down to the question of a bargain between individuals or between corporations it is not a question of principle but details are all important. For example, the price agreed upon between two contracting parties one whom undertakes to do a particular kind of work for a certain sum is only a detail. There is nothing touching principle in it but after all it is the essential part of the contract and it is a very important detail of substance. Are we at liberty to alter that detail of substance without the consent of one of the contracting parties? I am bound to say, that being the case, and in view of the discussion which has taken place it is a very serious difficulty as far as I am concerned.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. So far as we are dealing with the corporation in respect to the franchise which was granted we have gone to the limit in respect to the vested rights that we are asked to protect. We have gone to the extreme limit and we are not attempting to deal with this question, as I understand it, by virtue of the franchise or to infringe in any way upon the franchise granted by the corporation to the company. We restrict the powers of the company to the limits of the franchise. It seems to me, that is all the corporation should expect us to do; I do not believe in paternalism in any form.

Mr. SPROULE. Does not this restriction in the original Act prevent amalgamation ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not at all.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Justice said : I am in favour of corporations, I support corporations. Well, there are a great many people who think that the whole government are more in favour of supporting corporations than they are of protecting the interests of the public. I notice that whenever a contract is made between the government and a private individual or a corporation we always hear a good deal of talk here about holding it sacred ; we are told that we cannot interfere with the contract made with the Canadian Pacific Railway with regard to its privileges in the Northwest Territories, and we never interfere with a contract unless the other party consents. If a contract is sacred as between the government and an individual it ought to be held equally sacred between the Ottawa Electric Company and the city of Ottawa. The Electric Company wants to violate its contract with the city of Ottawa, and if we permit them to do so we will have very little respect for the sacredness of contracts.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not want my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Stewart) to be under the impression that I submitted to the House figures which were not correct. My hon. friend (Mr. Stewart) asked me where I got the figures I have placed before the House, and I told him they were submitted to the subcommittee, and were not disputed by any one opposed to the Bill. My hon. friend from Ottawa was present at that subcommittee himself and he no doubt heard these figures read. I have just received the following statement from the manager of the Toronto Electric Light Company, and as it corroborates the statement I have made to the House, I shall read it :

Our rates for incandescent lighting are twenty cents per thousand watts with a discount of forty per cent for small stores and offices and sixty per cent for dwelling houses, churches and similar services. Large consumers get special rates. City arc light, $74.80 per year. commercial inclosed arcs, twenty cents per thousand, fifty per cent discount. Power rates vary according to consumption from two cents per horse-power hour to eight cents per kilowatt hour for elevators and intermittent service.

Mr. STEWART. I accept the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) and I may say that although I was present at the committee I did not hear the figures read. I thought that these figures were placed in the hands of the hon. gentleman since he came to the House.

Mr. BERGERON. They were read in the committee.

Mr. STEWART. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me when he stated that I said that some of the gentlemen who were supporting the Bill were not welcome here. I did not say that. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) was absent from the city of Ottawa for a few years, but I think I can say that we are all glad that he is back again, because we like to meet him on the streets of our city as well as in the House.

Mr. BERGERON. Thank you.

Mr. CHISHOLM. It seems to me that if by any means any particular company should get possession of all the water-power in the neighbourhood of this city, that company would have a monopoly that could not be competed against. Nothing would be left then but steam-power, and if the city of Ottawa or the government were to offer opposition to such a company the cost of the steam-power as compared with the water-power would effectually prevent them. It would seem that the Ottawa Electric Company can, if they so wish, raise their rates from .36 per ampere hour to .52 per ampere hour, and if they did increase them to the maximum it would mean that the government would have to pay about $40,000 a year more for its lighting. In view of this the representatives of the people here have a very considerable interest in this matter. I would like to know whether or not it is possible that this company can secure all the water-powers in the vicinity, because if so, they can produce electricity at one-third the cost of its production by steam and there would be very little chance for any competition.

Mr. BELCOURT. I am opposed to section 2, but as my hon. colleague (Mr. Stewart) has given notice of an amendment which if adopted, will have the effect of removing our objection, I shall not divide the House on that section.

Mr. SPROULE. In my long experience in this House I have frequently seen figures submitted by corporations interested in legislation, and I frankly confess that I attach little importance to any ex-parte statements of that kind unless they are corroborated by independent evidence and unless we know what the actual facts are. These figures are as a general rule not reliable, and they should not be allowed to influence the House unless they are verified by independent testimony or a careful analysis by a competent expert. There is a good deal in what has been said by the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Chisholm). The statement is very generally made that this electric company is endeavouring to get control of all the water-power in the neighbourhood as well as the control of all the companies supplying heat, light and power, and that being the case we should be very careful. What is the object of the company doing that? As far as we know their only object can be to enable them to charge whatever price they like.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT. How can you prevent that while they control the water power?

Mr. SPROULE. We are trying to prevent it in another way. Now, we apply this principle in other directions. For years we refused to allow railway companies to amalgamate, because we desired to maintain competition; but we found that they could overcome this provision by pooling receipts, which would enable them to put up their rates. Of late years we have required any railway company seeking power to amalgamate with another to name the company it wishes to amalgamate with, and then parliament would decide whether it would grant the power to amalgamate or not. We are carrying out that same principle here. The city of Otawa has endeavoured to secure competition in electric lighting. The city opposed the charter to this company in 1894 unless this provision was inserted, and the company accepted that restriction rather than incur the opposition of the city. Now, the company ask us to do away with that safeguard of Ottawa's interests. Should we do so? The parliament of the country should be the last to interfere with any contract which secures the rights of the people. The Minister of Justice says that he is in favour of protecting the rights of corporations. The opinion of the country is that the government are too much inclined in that direction, and the voice of the country is saying in thunder tones that they should change their policy, and protect the people, who are unable to protect themselves. These corporations are wealthy; they control newspapers. I asked one of the aldermen of Ottawa the other day why the Ottawa 'Free Press' supported this Bill, and he said: 'This corporation practically controls the "Free Press." These corporations are able to bring influences to bear to gain their ends, but the consumers cannot do that. They are at the mercy of these corporations, and they look to parliament to protect them. Is parliament going to refuse that protection which the citizens of Ottawa secured a few years ago? If we do not protect them, we shall fail in our duty to the public.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to express myself as against the part of this Bill which will create a monopoly and interfere with the right of the citizens of Ottawa to get cheaper light. When this matter was up last year, the hon. gentleman then representing the city of Ottawa protested against the Bill in very strong terms; and now the gentlemen representing the city of Ottawa in this new parliament both express themselves in opposition to the clauses of the Bill which will take away from the citizens of Ottawa the right to get cheaper light. There has been some reference this after-

noon to the amount of money these companies are earning. Last session the member for Ottawa placed a statement before the House showing that in 1903 the gross revenue of this company was $217,386.83, and the cost of management, operating and maintenance was $118,890.14, showing a gross profit for the year of $98,496.39, and after the expenses were deducted there was left a net profit for the year of $72,116.44. He further pointed out that the capital stock of the company was $1,000,000, on which, in 1903, they had paid a dividend of 7 per cent, besides carrying a large sum to rest account. He pointed out that the amount of money the company had already carried to rest account prior to 1903, added to the amount they were then carrying to that account, namely, $25,000, would make a total rest account of $150,000. Now, when the citizens of Ottawa, through their representatives, are protesting so strongly against this amalgamation, I do not think it is the duty of this parliament to assist this corporation against the best interests of the citizens. I object to it because it will postpone the day when the citizens of Ottawa shall have the opportunity of purchasing, if they see fit, the electric plant in order to do their own lighting. The Minister of Justice states that the municipal ownership of electric lighting and waterworks is not a success in this country ; but I hold an entirely different opinion, and we have illustrations of its success in almost every part of the province of Ontario. In my own town we have a very profitable waterworks system that was constructed by the municipal corporation many years ago, and that has been operated by it ever since ; and to-day we regard it as the most valuable asset owned by the town. The citizens are obtaining very cheap water, there is no complaint whatever, and there would be a very strong protest against any man who would propose that the town should give up its ownership and control of that system. If we put this clause in force, it will postpone the day for many years when the citizens of Ottawa will have an opportunity to purchase this electric system.

Mr. GRANT. Why ?

Mr. BLAIN. For the reason that it will take away the rights that were given to the citizens by the former charter.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This amendment cannot in any way affect the right of the corporation to purchase.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend is trying to bring forward a legal point, and I do not wish to debate it with him ; but what I say is that it will postpone the day when the municipal corporation, if it should desire to purchase this plant and operate it in the interests of the citizens of Ottawa, will have the right to do so. Furthermore, it will increase the cost of that plant to the municipal corporation, because the result of the amalgamation will be that the stock will go up. I am opposed to it for these reasons and some others that are important. This Bill I consider is an interference with the rights of the city, and is opposed by those hon. members who particularly represent the city in this House. One of them pointed out that a petition was presented against it containing 2,000 signatures. I do not think that a petition of 2,000 signatures gives all who are opposed to this proposed amalgamation. I am quite sure that if the question were submitted to the citizens on its individual merits, we would have almost a unanimous vote against the amalgamation.

Mr. WHITE. I do not wish to prolong this discussion to any extent, but I consider it my duty to define the position I take. Let me say, in the first place, that I sympathize to a considerable extent with the views expressed by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice. Like him, I am not very enthusiastic about the great results expected to flow from the ownership of public utilities by municipal corporations. That is not however, the question we are now called upon to consider. What we really have to consider at this moment is whether the amendments proposed by this Bill are going to place the city of Ottawa in a worse position than it is in now. From the best consideration I have been able to give the question, I have come to the conclusion that if this Bill should pass with these amendments the city will be in a worse position as regards its lighting facilities than it is at present. Should we adopt the proposed amendments, the Ottawa Electric Company will be in a position to purchase the stock of the Consumers' Company which, under existing circumstances, it is not able to do, and the result will be a destruction of the competition now existing. I do not think we are called upon here to consider whether the Ottawa Electric Company, or any other company, is making money out of its business. What we are called to consider is whether we are by the legislation proposed, going to place one of the contracting parties in a worse position than it now occupies. Having considered the whole question from every point of view, I have come to the conclusion that if this Bill should pass, the city will be in a worse position and shall therefore vote against it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has any suggestion ever been made to leave the question to the determination of the Board of Railway Commissioners ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. As to regulating rates ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, as to whether or not the company should be given the power to acquire this stock. Of course the Railway Commission has no such jurisdiction at present, but it has in an analogous matter, namely, the amalgamation ar-

rangements between railway companies. It has also a jurisdiction over certain telephone and telegraph companies and companies formed for the purpose of transmitting light and heat by means of electricity. I do not know whether it has jurisdiction over all such companies, but it has over some of them, and it has occurred to me that some basis of agreement might be arrived at if the matter were submitted to the Railway Commission. I feel some difficulty in arriving at a conclusion because we have not here the franchise which was granted by the city of Ottawa to this corporation.

Mr. GALLIHER. We had it before the special committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am aware of that, but I am not aware that they took into consideration the exact point about which I have some difficulty. There is a great deal of matter to be considered by any one who wants to form a conclusion on this subject, and possibly the promoters on the one hand and the city on the other might consider whether or not they could arrive at a basis of agreement by a reference to the Railway Commission.

Mr. BELCOURT. I have never heard the suggestion made, but if it were adopted, I do not think there is any machinery to carry it out.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was just drafting, more for my own satisfaction than for the purpose of submitting it to the House, an amendment; and as my hon. friend has some difficulty in seeing how my suggestion could be carried out, I shall read the amendment, which may possibly provoke some discussion and lead to some satisfactory conclusion. By the amendment before the committee, everything is struck out of section 7, subsection D, after the word 'company.' I would suggest an addition after the word 'company' as follows:

Whenever thereunto authorized by order of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada upon application by the company, upon which application the city of Ottawa and any ratepayers of the said city shall have the right to be heard. The said board, upon such aplication, is authorized to make the said order or any order to the like effect upon such terms as it may see fit to impose or it may refuse to make any order thereon. And for the purpose aforesaid the board shall possess all the general powers conferred by the Railway Act, 1903.

I am not reading that as a perfect production, but merely to give the idea of what line the legislation might take, if the proposal should commend itself to the two bodies.

Mr. KENNEDY. When I saw the Bill first, I felt inclined to give it my support; but the more I have looked at it since and the more I have heard about it, the greater reason I see for opposing it. It would be impossible for me to support it without going back on the stand I took some years ago in my own town when a somewhat similar proposition was before it. I cannot agree with the Minister of Justice in his statement that in all cases where corporations have attempted to take charge of public utilities, the experiment was disastrous. Let me inform the hon. gentleman that in the town where I live, the town of New Westminster, British Columbia, we own our own waterworks and our own electric light. When our corporation took hold of these utilities, I was a member of the city council, and we had a very stiff fight with the gas company. They did their best to keep the city from entering on any such line of business, but without success, and to-day we have a cheaper light than they have either in Vancouver or Victoria. The city corporation owns the plant and runs it to our satisfaction in every way.

I believe there are many instances of the same kind, and I therefore think that the hon. gentlemen would be more careful in making assertions of this character. I was somewhat amused at the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) trying to make a party question of this as he has done twice, but we must remember that he has the burden of all the oppressed communities on his shoulders. I can vote with him conscientiously on this question, because I think, with some other gentlemen on that side of the House with whom I do not often agree, that these two companies should be allowed to fight this question out themselves, and that the people should be protected from both of them. The people of this city deserve a good deal of consideration, and I think the best thing we can do is to throw this Bill out. As far as I am concerned I intend to vote against it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I add one word in support of what my hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. Kennedy) and other hon. gentlemen have said. In the city of Halifax we have had a system of waterworks owned by the city for a great many years which has been carried on very successfully. That is a common thing all over the country, but besides that Dartmouth owns as a public utility the ferry between Halifax and Dartmouth, having taken it over some 10 years ago, and I am sure the citizens of Halifax and Dartmouth will bear me out in saying that a much better service is now given by that ferry between Halifax and Dartmouth, than was given under the ownership of the private company which owned it for many years before that date.

Section agreed to, yeas, 67; nays, 37.

On section 5,

Mr. STEWART moved

That section five be struck out and the following substituted therefor :

Provided, that the power to acquire shares in the capital stock, debentures or securities of other electric companies, or of companies possessing powers similar to those of this company, will not apply to the capital stock, debentures or securities of the Consumers Electric Company, Limited, or of the Metropolitan Electrical Company, Limited, or their or either of their successors or assigns.

He said: I only wish to say that when this matter was first introduced into the House a number of those in favour of the Bill disclaimed the idea of doing anything or of authorizing anything that would mean the amalgamation of the Consumers with the Ottawa Electric Company. It was stated then and has been stated many times since that the evident intention was that the Consumers and the Metropolitan companies should be absorbed by the Ottawa Electric Company. If there are any gentlemen who have any doubt or suspicion that that is the meaning of the Bill they have now an opportunity of voting with us on my amendment which will prevent the company from absorbing the Consumers or Metropolitan Companies.

Amendment negatived, yeas, 30; nays, 61.

Section agreed to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN moved to add the following as a new section :

6. Nothing in this Act contained shall be construed as prejudicially affecting any of the rights of the municipal corporation of the city of Ottawa under its existing franchise agreements with the company and the Metropolitan Electric Company, Limited, and the Consumers Electric Company, Limited, or either or any of them.

He said: This clause does not go as far as I think it should go, but possibly it may preserve some of the rights of the corporation of the city of Ottawa which otherwise might be affected. It is a clause to which it seems to me there could be no possible objection because the very reason put forward by those who are supporting the Bill as it stands at present is that nothing contained in the Bill does affect the company's franchises, and in order to make that perfectly plain I think we should at least embody this provision as clause 6 of the Bill.

Mr. GALLIHER. Of course I like to understand the meaning of any amendment but it seems to me there can be no objection to this. I think all of that is contained in clause 5, but if it makes it any clearer I am satisfied as promoter of the Bill to accept it.

Amendment (Mr. R. L. Borden) agreed to.

Bill as amended reported.

QUESTIONS.

PUBLIC WORKS, PARISH OF CHATEAU-RICHER.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

Referring to the return brought down on the 17th of February, 1905, Sessional Paper No. 63, in compliance with a motion made by Mr. Morin, what are the dates of the first payment made on account of the said sum mentioned in the said return, $6,215.82, and of the last payment thereof ?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). The first payment was made on the 7th of October ; the second and last payment was made on the 13th of October of last year.

LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER AT BICQUET.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. What is the name of the lighthouse keeper at Bicquet, in the county of Rimouski ?
2. What is his salary ?
3. How much did the department pay to send for him at the close of navigation ?
4. Has he an engineer's certificate qualifying him to take charge of the engines that work the alarm whistle ?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Louis Pineault.
2. $700 per annum.
3. Nothing.
4. The department does not exact such certificates from those officers.

TIMBER ON THE DUKIS RESERVE.

Mr. BENNETT—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has the Department of Indian Affairs decided to offer for sale the timber on what is known as the Dukis Reserve ?
2. Have the Indians entitled thereto agreed to a sale of the said timber ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). It is not the intention of the government to offer for sale the timber on what is known as the Dukis reserve.

POSTMASTER AT THESSALON.

Mr. FOSTER—for Mr. Boyce—moved :

For copies of all correspondence, documents and rulings relating to the dismissal or resignation of W. J. B. Dobie, as postmaster of Thessalon ; and all the papers relating to any application for rehearing of complaints or the re-appointment of Mr. Dobie.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). I would ask that that motion stand.

Mr. FOSTER. Then it cannot come up again, as this is the last day.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Then let it drop.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. member for Algoma West (Mr. Boyce) may be here this evening.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

RAILWAY BETWEEN CAPLIN AND PASPEBIAC.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Foster—moved :

For a return of the following documents in respect of payments made on account of the subsidy voted in 1901 for a line of railway between Caplin and Paspebiac :

1. Copy of authority to act, together with full instructions issued to Commissioner Mothersill.

2. Report and findings of Commissioner Mothersill.

3. Sworn evidence of claimants who appeared before Commissioner Mothersill, as taken down by stenographer Roy.

4. Copy of authority to act, and full instructions to Commissioner Langelier.

5. Report and findings of Commissioner Langelier.

6. Sworn evidence, if any, of claimants appearing before Commissioner Langelier.

7. Affidavits presented to Commissioner Langelier and subsequently.

8. Copy of resolution or Order in Council adopting report of Commissioner Langelier.

9. A statement giving each of the several payments made by the government since July 1st, 1904, on account of the subsidy voted in 1901, for a line of railway between Caplin and Paspebiac ; showing in respect of every such payment to whom, by whom, on what date, in connection with part of the road, the date of original filing of claim, and on whose recommendation each payment was made.

10. All correspondence which may have passed between the Department of Railways and Canals, or any person connected therewith, and Commissioner Langelier, in respect of the investigation and payment of said claims. Also all correspondence between the member for the county of Bonaventure and the department, and between said member and Commissioner Langelier on this subject.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Inland Revenue). There is no objection to this motion passing, but I would like to make two amendments. First, in paragraph 9, instead of saying 'since July 1, 1904' say 'since July 1, 1901.' Also I would like to add to the end of paragraph 10 :

As well as by the trustees of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway, C. N. Armstrong, T. C. Casgrain, K.C., J. Galindez, or any other person in their behalf, and the department.

Motion agreed to.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

Mr. CLEMENTS moved:

For a return showing the imports into Canada for home consumption from the United States ; and the exports of the same from Canada to the United States ; and the duty on the same, giving Canadian duty and the United States duty, for the years 1903 and 1904, on the following articles : Pork, all kinds ; apples ; corn ; beans, raw, canned and otherwise ; tobacco, raw leaf ; cattle ; horses ; wool ; hides ; sugar beets ; hay ; eggs ; butter ; fowls.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Inland Revenue). I suppose the hon. gentleman would have no objection to putting in, after the word 'imports' in the second line, the words 'by provinces' in order to put before the House the imports by provinces instead of putting them before the House in the form in which they are called for in the resolution. I think it is very important that we should know the volume of our imports into each province as well as the volume of imports into the country generally. The idea of the amendment is to show the imports by provinces.

Mr. BERGERON. Would that not show any way ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, that would not show because the resolution simply calls for a general statement.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

MOTINS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For copies of all correspondence between the government or any member thereof, or any person or persons, in reference to the encouragement of the beet sugar industry of Canada.—Mr. Clements—by Mr. Foster.

For copies of all correspondence, telegrams, papers, memoranda, &c., between the government and the War Office, and between the government and members of the Canadian militia, in regard to the granting of the King's South Africa medal to Canadians doing eighteen months South Africa war service.—Mr. Worthington—by Mr. Fowler.

For copies of all correspondence between the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or any officer of his department, and Mr. George S. Greene, junior, of New York, regarding the steel freight sheds of the harbour of Montreal ; together with the report of the said George S. Greene, junior, upon the plans submitted to him for an opinion.—Mr. Ames—by Mr. Foster.

Return showing : 1. The total amount of funds of all life insurance companies within the legislative power of this parliament, invested by way of purchase or loan, respectively, pursuant to the Insurance Act, and the par value, and also the estimated actual value, of securities upon which such investments are made.

2. The portions of such funds invested in purchase pursuant to section 50 (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f) respectively, of the Insurance Act ; and the portions invested on loan pursuant to section 50, subclause 2 (a) and (b) respectively.

3. The portions, if any, of such funds invested in purchase of or loan upon securities named in said section 50 (b) not in accordance with the provisions and restrictions set forth in said section 50 (b).

4. The portions of such funds invested in purchase of or loan upon, respectively, and any security or thing mentioned in said section 50, subclauses 3 and 4 respectively; and stating whether and to what extent any portion thereof was so invested not in accordance with the provisions and restrictions set forth in said section 50, subclauses 3 and 4.

5. All reports, if any, by the Deputy Minister of Insurance as to non-compliance with the provisions of the Insurance Act with regard to investments so made.—Mr. Macdonell—by Mr. Henderson.

Copies of all correspondence, telegrams, letters, memoranda, Orders in Council, reports, &c., in possession of the government, or any member or official thereof, in connection with the granting of an additional subsidy to the province of Prince Edward Island, in 1901, of $30,000 a year, and the basis on which the said subsidy was agreed to be paid to the province. —Mr. A. Martin.

Copies of all Orders in Council and of all correspondence between the Canadian and imperial governments, and of all papers relating to the relief of the Earl of Dundonald from the position of General Officer Commanding the Canadian militia.—Mr. Belcourt—by Mr. Logan.

EXCHEQUER COURT—RAILWAY DEBTS.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 59) to amend the Act respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to railway debts. --Mr. Geoffrion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall I report the Bill ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. For what reason did it stand ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. For the purpose of amending it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is proposed to add to subsection 3 after the word 'sheriff' the words 'according to the laws of the province.

Mr. HAGGART. Will not the effect of that be that a sale ordered by the Exchequer Court will cut out all securities ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The effect of the amendment would be to declare that in respect to a line of railway situated entirely within the limits of the province of Quebec, a sale made under the order of the Exchequer Court would have the same effect as a sale made by a sheriff in our province. I am not very enthusiastic about the Bill, but I do not see any objection to it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The difficulty I would have about making this amendment which may be a very desirable one, without knowing anything about it, is that it makes a certain provision as to the effect of a sale by the Exchequer Court in one province only. Why is it not equally necessary in the other provinces ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am not familiar with the effect of this sale in the other provinces. With us a sale made by the sheriff relieves the property sold of all claims. The property becomes replaced by money and any demands that are made upon the property are to be a charge against the money.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not familiar with the provisions of the Exchequer Court Act at the present moment as I did not anticipate this Bill was coming up. Is there any provision to the effect that a sale shall have generally so that we may have the law definite and certain as to the effect of a sale by the Exchequer Court in every province ? If we have not that, certainly it seems to me extremely obvious that we cannot restrict ourselves to legislating for the province of Quebec alone, but that if an amendment is necessary it might be made to extend to the other provinces.

Mr. GEOFFRION. I cannot state offhand whether there is such a provision. In 1903 we passed a law giving authority to the Exchequer Court, when a road was insolvent and could not be operated properly, to put it under a receivership and proceed with the sale of it. When that Act came to be applied in the province of Quebec we found that the court could not proceed with the sale and give a clear title, as could be done under a sheriff's sale. We wanted to sell a railway and nobody would buy it, because we could not give a clear title. In the Insolvency Act and the Winding-up Act, we had to provide in these Acts that a sale under them should have the same effect as a sheriff's sale. We were asked what would we do if the railway was partly in the province of Quebec and partly in another province, and the Bill was amended so as to apply only to a road situated wholly in the province of Quebec. By this amendment we could give a clear title in the province of Quebec just as under a sheriff's sale, and as to the other provinces the matter will remain under the English law as before.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not criticise the Bill so far as it applies to the province of Quebec ; I leave that to those who are familiar with the law of that province. My objection is that if there is no provision which applies generally throughout Canada as to a sale by the Exchequer Court, the way to deal with that is, not for a private member, even of my hon. friend's eminence, to bring in legislation dealing with a single province, but for the Department of Justice to bring in a Bill dealing generally with the effect of a sale by the Exchequer Court in all the provinces of Canada.

Mr. GEOFFRION. The general Act applies all over Canada, and every one is satisfied with it. but when we come to the province of Quebec it is necessary to do as has

been done in the case of the Insolvency Act, which contains a special stipulation for the province of Quebec. It is really an oversight in the general Act, and we are trying to remedy it by this amendment. The Act as it is at present is unworkable in the province of Quebec.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Does the hon. gentleman provide for any advertisements ?

Mr. GEOFFRION. No. That point was raised by my hon. friend from Iberville (Mr. Demers), and it was thought better to leave that matter entirely in the hands of the judge of the Exchequer Court.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There appears to be an oversight, but does not that oversight exist with regard to every province of Canada ?

Mr. GEOFFRION. I do not think so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understood from the Minister of Justice that it did. It must exist in regard to the other provinces unless you can show that there is some general provision in the Exchequer Court Act declaring what the effect of a sale by that court shall be. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Geoffrion) finds a defect in the law and he asks us to remedy it in respect only to one province, whereas the remedy should apply to all provinces.

Mr. GEOFFRION. The Act is in operation in the other provinces, and they do not complain.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They do not complain, because I suppose the law has never been invoked in any of these provinces, and they have never found out that the defect exists. A particular case in the province of Quebec should not induce us to remedy the law only in respect to that province, but it is a very good reason for applying the remedy all over Canada. The practice in Nova Scotia is to have sales of real estate by the sheriff under an order of the court, but there is no provincial law which would apply to a sale by authority of the Exchequer Court. Therefore, this law should not be confined to the province of Quebec, but a general law should be framed which would have effect throughout Canada. That seems to be an elementary principle on which this parliament should act. I venture to submit, therefore, that the Act should not pass in its present form.

Mr. BRODEUR. For my part I do not see any objection to the Bill applying to all the provinces. I do not know the effect of a sheriff's sale in other provinces ; but in our province, a sheriff's sale wipes out with a few exceptions all the hypothecs and liens granted on the property prior to the time of the sale, and gives clear title to the property.

Mr. GEOFFRION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then you apply the proceeds to the hypothecs in the order of their priority ?

Mr. BRODEUR. When a property is sold by the sheriff, all the hypothecs are purged at the same time, and the purchaser receives a clear title in all respects. I may add that under the insolvency law of 1875, and I think also in the law of 1863, there was a special provision with regard to the sale of property in the provinces of Quebec, and the purpose of this Bill is to apply to sales made under the authority of the Exchequer Court the same principle. For my part, I do not see any objection to apply the Bill to the whole country.

Mr. LANCASTER. A sale by the sheriff in the province of Ontario has not the same effect as a sale in the province of Quebec. It will only give whatever right or title the person against whom the execution issues had in the property. It will not necessarily give a clear title at all, or any guarantee that there is a good title. Therefore, I think, the objection of the hon. leader of the opposition is a very serious one, and ought to be considered. After the statement of the Minister of Inland Revenue, I do not think this law would have the same effect in the other provinces that it would have in the province of Quebec ; and, if so, we ought not to pass it.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not say that it would have the same effect in the other provinces ; on the contrary, I am not sufficiently versed in the laws of the other provinces to know whether a sheriff's sale would have the same effect in them as it has in the province of Quebec. At the same time, so far as my province is concerned, I think it desirable that this Bill should pass. I see no objection to declaring that such a sale will have the same effect as a sheriff's sale, without mentioning the province of Quebec. We might perhaps amend the Bill in that way.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MONK. I have received a memorandum from some lawyers in the province of Quebec in regard to this Bill. I am afraid that if we pass the Bill in its present form it may do considerable injury to bondholders of railways situated in the province of Quebec, being calculated to injure the credit of railway companies in our province. I have not gone very fully into the matter but I see that the object of the Bill is to assimilate a sale ordered by the Exchequer Court in the matter of debts due by rail-

way companies, to a sale by the sheriff in our province. The effect of the sheriff's sale in Quebec, as members are aware, is extremely sweeping. Article 781 of our Code of Civil Procedure, under the title 'Effect of Sheriff's Sale' enacts :

781. A sheriff's sale discharges property from all other real rights not mentioned in the conditions of sale except :

1. Servitudes with which the immovable is charged.

2. Hypothecs resulting from the commutation of seignorial rights except as to arrears accrued previously to the sale.

3. Rights of emphyteusis, of substitution not yet opened, or of customary dower not yet opened, except when it appears on the face of the proceedings that there exists a prior or preferable claim.

These are the only claims that the sheriff's sale in our province does not wipe out. With the exception of these special claims which I have just enumerated the purchaser at the sheriff's sale takes the property free from any lien, privilege, mortgage or encumbrance whatever.

The contention in the memorandum which has been sent to me is that the object of this legislation is, by obtaining from the Exchequer Court an order for the sale of the railway by assimilating that sale to a sheriff's sale, as the committee will see, you purge all the claims of the bondholders so that if the Exchequer Court ordered a sale, unless that sale was ordered with special conditions, it would wipe out the bondholders. Take the case of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway, a case in point. The company made default to pay the interest on the bonds. The trustees for the bondholders, in virtue of their deed of trust, entered into the property of the company as far back as July 2, 1900, and are still in possession of and operating the road. Their rights are not obliterated. What the parties interested fear is that other creditors of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Company,—I am giving that as an example —might obtain such an order as is contemplated in this Bill from the Exchequer Court, and under this proposed legislation sell the railway. The party selling would give a title equivalent to a sheriff's title, and he would wipe out the title of the trustees and leave the bondholders to pay themselves out of the price of adjudication and that price of adjudication would scarcely be sufficient to bring the property to sale. That appears to me to be a strong argument. Moreover the Bill is uncalled for. Why ? Because subsection 2 of section 1 of chapter 21, III Edward VII, in the first volume of 1903—I have just looked for this statute in the library, but there is not a copy there.—Subsection 2 of section 1, chapter 21, of III Edward VII, gives concurrent jurisdiction to the provincial court, over railways situated entirely or wholly in the province. If our own provincial courts have jurisdiction under the statute which I have just cited, concurrent jurisdiction upon railways altogether situated within the province, why should this legislation be asked for. I am afraid that if this Bill was passed it might, under certain circumstances, greatly interfere with the recourse of the bondholders and therefore it appears to be a dangerous measure.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Does the hon. gentleman think that this legislation will change the law so as to prevent the sale by the sheriff if the present legislation does not change the law, and these properties altogether situated in the province of Quebec are allowed to be sold by a sheriff what difference would it make whether they are sold by an order of the Exchequer Court after certain advertising to be given according to the best judgment of the Exchequer Court, or whether it is sold under an order of the sheriff of the district in the province of Quebec ? I think the hon. gentleman has lost sight of that point. At the present moment these railways can be sold —I do not think it is possible to contest that point—by the sheriff of the district in which the chief office of the railway is situated. Therefore, if the railway is sold by the sheriff the mortgages are purged or wiped out, except that every mortgagee has the right to claim on the price of sale, and it is generally the case that the property is not sacrificed, that the mortgagee goes to the sale and sees that the property is sold for the proper amount. So if it does not change the position in any way except that action may be taken through proceeding in the Exchequer Court, there will be less cost, less complication and less delay in realizing. I understand that the legislation cannot apply to the Atlantic and Lake Superior. On the contrary I think the Atlantic and Lake Superior was exempted from the effect of this law in the original Bill, because it said that it did not apply to a railway in the hands of trustees. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the law passed in 1903 he will see that the Atlantic and Lake Superior, although not mentioned by name, was actually exempted from the effect of law. In this case, the Bill. I am quite aware, is presented in view of the state of affairs as regards the South Shore Railway and the Quebec Southern. The South Shore has been joined with the Quebec Southern and made all one railway in the province of Quebec. There are different classes of creditors and difficulty arose as to the proceeds of the sale of the railway. At the present time all counties interested are suffering because of the railway being in the hands of the receiver, and what is most serious to the mortgagees is the fact that they do not know the amount of the cost incurred by the receiver. If it remains any longer in

the hands of the receiver the creditors would fear that their mortgages will be wiped out entirely—and the railway too.

Unless we can have a sale made as provided in this Bill, I am afraid there will be such an amount of expenditure with the administration by the receiver that the first mortgage will be in danger. It is in the interests of the creditor and the public generally that this measure should become law and the railway put into the hands of parties able to run it as it should be run. The principle of this Bill is not a new one. It is one that was applied in the Insolvent Acts of 1863 and 1875; and lately, in the Act providing for the liquidation of the estates of insolvent creditors, a special exception has been made that the sale by a liquidator in the province of Quebec, whether under the Insolvency Act or the Liquidation Act, shall confer just as good a title as a sale by the sheriff. I can, therefore, see no harm whatever in our passing this Bill. The creditors will be regularly notified of the sale and they will be all on the same footing. If we do not pass this Bill, no doubt they will proceed by way of execution and sale by the sheriff, which will undoubtedly cause more costs and endless litigation. I do not think the creditors are anxious to have more costs incurred and would rather have the property sold under the authority of the Exchequer Court and the proceeds of the sale distributed according to the rank of the different creditors.

Mr. MONK. I have not had time to look into the matter very carefully, but there is one thing strikes me. No doubt a sale by the sheriff would destroy in almost every case the recourse of the bondholders. Where a railway property is sold by the sheriff in the province of Quebec, the bondholders have very little to expect.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Unless they go to the sale and bid up the property. Why should they be put in a different position from the ordinary mortgagee?

Mr. MONK. Well, the ordinary bondholder is not in a position to do what a mortgagee can do unless there should be an agreement among the bondholders. If we assimilate the title given by the Exchequer Court to a sheriff's title, we shall add to the risk of the bondholders losing their recourse. In the next place, is there not a Dominion law which provides for the sequestration of the property of railway companies where a railway is unable to meet the interest on its bonds. Either in the Winding Up Act or the Railway Act, I think there is a provision which permits the bondholders, when the company is in default to pay the interest on its bonds, to take the railway into their own hands and administer it. Would not that provision be nullified by this legislation?

Mr. PREFONTAINE.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The hon. gentleman is altogether in error on that point. A judgment creditor can always have the property sold by the sheriff if it is situated entirely within the limits of the province.

Mr. BARKER. When this Bill was before the House on the last occasion, I asked the Minister of Justice whether he had considered the possible effect of a sale such as this in cases where a Dominion railway company, whose railway was wholly within the province of Quebec, had, under the authority of a Dominion statute, entered into an agreement for running powers over a railway in another province. Let us suppose that a railway terminating at the boundary of Ontario and another terminating at the bounday of Quebec, both being Dominion railways, entered into an agreement, under section 281 of the General Railway Act, with regard to the operation of each by the other. Such an agreement between individuals would be called a partnership. Then suppose the bonds of those respective companies are afterwards sold, the bondholders relying upon this agreement being carried out. If an officer of the province of Quebec is able to sell outright the railway within that province, or say one-half the partnership property, we can quite easily see that the consequences might be very serious to the companies which had entered into the agreement and to those who had purchased the bonds on the faith of that agreement.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Surely there must be some way by which a creditor may realize on the property which is the security for his debt. It would not do to allow an agreement between two corporations to take away that recourse. Otherwise, in the case mentioned by my hon. friend, the making of an agreement between a railway company, whose property is wholly situated within the limits of the province of Quebec, and another railway company whose property is wholly situated within the limits of Ontario, would make it impossible for either railway to be sold, and a creditor would have no recourse.

Mr. BARKER. It seems to me that before you authorize an official like the sheriff in one province to sell interests that run over two provinces, it would be better to provide some method of disposing of these effects which would not be peculiar to any one of the provinces.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I regret that I have not given to this matter more consideration than I have been able to give it recently. But it seems to me that that which is within the limits of a province and is nothing more or less than a piece of immovable property within that province, any claims on that property ought to be dealt with according to the laws of the particular province in which it is situated. If a line of railway ex-

tends beyond the limits of a province, then a difficulty would arise, because you have to take into account the fact that this line would be one continuous road in operation between two provinces, and you can deal with it in one province under one system and in another province under another system. But if the railway is entirely within one province, you cannot distinguish it from a house or any other piece of immovable property.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman seems to overlook the fact that parliament controls companies holding both properties, a property in one province owned by one company and a property in another province owned by the other company. Parliament has authorized that these two properties shall be thrown into a partnership, and after authorizing it, and an agreement having been entered into by these two corporations owning properties in two provinces, you authorize a sale of a part of the partnership property under the civil laws of one province. Now, the hon. gentleman says: how are you going to deal with it? Why, the Dominion controls both, provide a remedy that will apply to the whole, not a remedy that is peculiar to one part.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. A running arrangement or an operating agreement made between two companies ought not to defeat the claims of creditors. It is not because a company has made a running arrangement with another company that it should defeat the claims of its creditors.

Mr. BARKER. I did not say that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is the result of the hon. gentleman's argument.

Mr. BARKER. I would provide a remedy that will do justice to both, provide a Dominion remedy, not applying the peculiar laws of one province to the sale of part of the partnership property.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The procedure under which the property is brought to sale is a procedure created by the Dominion parliament. I think the object of this Bill is merely to provide for the effect of that sale after it has taken place, subject to the arrangements that we make here.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I object under Dominion legislation, under legislation with respect to the Exchequer Court, to provisions of this kind made for one province with no provision whatever made for any other province. I do not see any reason or justification for it. I am going to insist that this Bill shall not go through until I have looked at the statutes of 1903. The Minister of Justice says: Of course, you can deal with an immovable property and make it subject to the claims of creditors. Certainly you can. The Minister of Justice will remember that a railway is a piece of immovable property of a peculiar character, it is a piece of property in the hands of a private corporation for the purpose of performing a public function. The mortgages, the liens upon it are usually of a somewhat peculiar character. It is not a mortgage to one man, it is a mortgage to perhaps 500 or 1,000 men, who are bondholders, and who may be represented by a trustee. It strikes me as peculiar to have a railroad sold by the sheriff at the instance of a creditor in such a way as to wipe out altogether the lien of a prior mortgage. Where bondholders are represented by a trustee, it would have extraordinary consequences. I do not know how it is in the province of Quebec, but under the English law, to which I am accustomed, and I think the principle is a very good one, that persons at whose instance a sale is made and who are chiefly benefited by that sale, have a right to the conduct of the sale, and they may protect themselves under the order of the court, which always fixes a reserve bid. But —I am speaking with great diffidence about the practice in the province of Quebec— there, if I understand it rightly, a sheriff, at the suit of a creditor for $500 can get an execution against a railway worth $1,000,000, upon which there are outstanding $1,000,000 worth of bonds; at the suit of that creditor for $500 you wipe out that mortgage. Well, is that right?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not understand that is the practice. Speaking subject to correction, I think the sale has to take place under the direction of the court, and then we are dealing merely with the effect that is produced by that sale.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The interpretation of the Minister of Justice may be right. Where hon. gentlemen from that province differ as to the effect of this proposed amendment, it would be presumptuous for me to offer any suggestions. But if it might possibly have that effect, we should not be in a hurry to pass this Bill before we are absolutely sure what we are doing. The worst thing that could happen to the province of Quebec would be to have the law put in that condition; it would discourage capital from investment there. Would any one of us put $1,000 or $10,000 in the bonds of a railway in the province of Quebec, knowing that a lien created by the mortgage securing these bonds could be wiped out in that way?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is allowed at the present moment under the civil code. A railway can be sold by a sheriff, and some have been sold by the sheriff.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as the civil code of the province of Quebec is concerned, this parliament has nothing to do with it. But when you come to this parliament asking for a statute to provide that this shall be done under Dominion legislation, then this parliament has something to say

about it, something to say as to whether we shall pass legislation of that kind. I am not offering any factious opposition at all. I would like to understand a little better what we are doing, and I venture to think the Minister of Justice should look into this Bill a little more carefully.

Mr. BRODEUR. I was quoting this afternoon the Insolvency law of 1875, and I find that a law similar to the one which is now engaging the consideration of this House has been embodied in the Insolvency law, section 76 :

All sales of real estate so made by the assignee shall vest in the purchasers all the legal and equitable estate of the insolvent therein, and the conveyance may be in the form 'N'; but in the province of Quebec such sale shall in all respects have the same effect as to mortgages, hypothecs, or privileges then existing thereupon, as if the same had been made by a sheriff, under a writ of execution.

So in the present legislation we are simply perpetuating the principle which was embodied in the legislation of 1875. Now, coming to the point which has just been discussed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden), supposing in Quebec to-day an execution to be issued addressed to the sheriff for the sale of a railway, I am not very sure whether the provincial law would apply to that. We constitute, in the federal parliament, a railway corporation, we give to that railway corporation the right to issue bonds ; but when the time comes for the payment of those bonds to be made, how is it going to be enforced ? Cannot a creditor take action under our provincial laws and have the property sold like any ordinary property, so long as the property is within the limits of the province ? I know very well you could not sell a movable property outside of the province, but in the province itself, cannot the sheriff sell the property ; and if so, what will be the effect of the decree ? Will not the provincial law apply ? Will not the property become free of all mortgages ? It will not affect at all the situation of the mortgagors, because they will have the right to buy the property at auction ; in fact, I think this law will give them a large amount of protection, because it wipes out some other mortgages which might have been made on the property after the first mortgage.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not speak about the effect of the sale by the provincial courts. That is a matter for the legislature of the province of Quebec. But, when you come to sell a railway in the province of Quebec under the legislation of this parliament and by means of the Exchequer Court of Canada, I did not suppose that it would be open to doubt that this parliament, directing that sale would have absolute power to determine the conditions of the sale, prescribe how the sale should be conducted and how the proceeds should be distributed. I would not have supposed that that was open to doubt at all if my hon. friend had not suggested it and I still think that no such doubt exists. If this parliament can provide for the sale of a railway in the province of Quebec subject to the jurisdiction of parliament by means of the Exchequer Court, surely this parliament can direct how that sale shall be conducted and can even give to the Exchequer Court judge himself power to make regulations stating how the sale shall be conducted and how the proceeds shall be distributed. I am only asking that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice will look into this Bill—he generally succeeds in making these matters pretty clear—so that we can understand what the effect of the legislation is. Further, I want to impress upon him the desirability of having one general law applicable to all such sales by the Exchequer Court whether they be in the province of Quebec or elsewhere.

Mr. GEOFFRION. The point made by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is right to a certain extent. There is a concurrent jurisdiction between the Exchequer Court and the Superior Court of any province. Section 2 of chapter 21 of the statutes 3 Edward VII is as follows :

Nothing herein contained shall affect the present jurisdiction of any court of a province in any such matters as aforesaid affecting railways, or sections thereof, wholly within the province, and the superior courts of a province now possessing such jurisdiction shall continue as regards such railways and sections of railways to have concurrent jurisdiction with the Exchequer Court in all matters within the purview of this Act.

Certainly we have this other remedy in Quebec.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not objecting to it.

Mr. GEOFFRION. But it is a very much more costly remedy and this one is a more rapid remedy. We can take the other remedy if you refuse this one. We passed this Act so as to reduce the cost. The Act says that action may be taken 'at the instance of the Minister of Railways and Canals ;' that is that if we prove to the Minister of Railways and Canals that a railway is insolvent, that it is unable to meet its indebtedness or that it cannot be operated properly, we can at his instance immediately commence proceedings in the Exchequer Court. That is a great deal less costly and a more rapid procedure than the other. If we cannot have this remedy we will take the other, but we prefer to take this because it is less costly and when we proceed to sell under this Act, we want the sale to have the same effect as a sale would have under the other. I do not think the point made by my hon. friend for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) can apply. He says suppose two railways, one wholly situated in one province and another in another pro-

vince make an alliance. Surely my hon. friend does not mean to say that we cannot recover against a railway because it may have made an alliance with another railway ?

Mr. BARKER. I did not say that. I only suggested what my hon. friend the leader of the opposition said, that there should be a general law providing for that and not a special law for the province of Quebec. I would ask the hon. gentleman what he would do if he had a judgment against the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway ? Would he sell a section of the railway in the province of Quebec by the sheriff ?

Mr. GEOFFRION. This Act says that it applies only to a railway wholly situated in Quebec.

Mr. BARKER. No, it does not. Read section 1 of chapter 21 of the statutes of 1903.

Mr. GEOFFRION. What does the hon. gentleman refer to ?

Mr. BARKER. I mean section 2 of the statute.

Mr. GEOFFRION. Oh, well.

Mr. BARKER. It is the same Act :

Nothing herein contained shall affect the present jurisdiction of any court of a province in any such matters as aforesaid affecting railways, or sections thereof, wholly within the province.

Mr. GEOFFRION. We have the two remedies. If we cannot adopt this remedy we will adopt the other one in the provincial court, we will proceed to the sale by the sheriff and we will obtain what we want, but it is a great deal more costly than the remedy which we have here. What we want is to proceed to the sale which remedy would have the same effect as that which we have in the province. If you force us to abandon this remedy we will proceed with the other, but it will be much more costly and less rapid. That is the only reason why we passed this Act in 1903 giving the Exchequer Court jurisdiction in this matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the hon. gentleman permit me to ask why this is more costly in the provincial courts than in the Exchequer Court ?

Mr. GEOFFRION. I am not going to give a course of procedure to my hon. friend, but the procedure in the Superior Courts is a very lengthy and very costly one in regard to notices, &c., and it is therefore desirable that we should be able to avail ourselves of the remedy provided by this Act. If we can prove to the Minister of Railways and Canals that a road is insolvent and cannot be operated at his instance we can immediately commence proceedings in the Exchequer Court. If we proceed to the sale as we have done in one instance we want that sale to have the same effect as the other sale would have ; otherwise the Act is unworkable. Nobody would buy the road under the Act unless this remedy is provided.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would hardly suppose that under the law of the province of Quebec anything more than reasonable notice is to be given the bondholders and others interested, nor would the Exchequer Court in ordering a sale direct anything less than a reasonable notice. My hon. friend (Mr. Geoffrion) and the Minister of Marine (Mr. Prefontaine) seem to be more disturbed about the cost of these sales than I have usually found members of the profession to be, under similar conditions. It is very touching, indeed, to find two such eminent members of the profession so greatly disturbed about the costs which will be attendant on a sale under the provincial jurisdiction. I venture to think that their apprehensions are a little unfounded, and that they will find the costs of the Exchequer Court sale will amount to about the same thing.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The Act of 1903 provided that the Exchequer Court could order the sale in the public interest, but it did not provide what kind of title the court could give.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In any province?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It may be different in the other provinces, but we are sure of it from our own experience in the province of Quebec. The intending purchasers of this railway refused to bid because they had doubts as to the title and under these circumstances we would have had to put the railway in the hands of the sheriff, who would have had no right to operate it. The creditors saw it would destroy the value of the property, and that the railway had better be left in the hands of the receiver who would operate it until an amendment to the law was obtained by which the Exchequer Court could grant a sound title. The railway could be sold under the provincial law, but it would be suspended for three or four months, its value deteriorated and the inhabitants of the country through which it runs greatly inconvenienced. There is no violation of principle in passing this amendment because the same principle was involved in the Dominion Insolvency Acts 1863 and 1875, in which a special exemption was made as regards the province of Quebec, making the title given by the liquidator equal to the title given by the sheriff. There is not a single creditor opposing this Bill, which is in the interest of the creditors as well as in the interest

of the public, and I cannot understand whence this objection comes.

Mr. MONK. I think I can understand where the objection lies. My hon. friend (Mr. Geoffrion) wants, in a particular case, to avoid the costs of a sheriff's sale, and these costs are incurred because of the sweeping effects of the sheriff's sale, which purges all mortgage rights, and very extensive and costly notices have to be given. These notices are prescribed by the law in order to bring to the knowledge of the mortgage creditors the fact that the property on which they have a lien is to be sold. My hon. friend wants by this law to give to a sale ordered by the Exchequer Court, with or without notice, or with limited notice, exactly the same effect as a sheriff's sale. That is probably why parties in Montreal who are interested in this railroad do not want this Bill to become law. Under it one would obtain a sheriff's title without the formalities which surround a sheriff's sale.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There was no provision in the Dominion Insolvency Act by which special notices were to be given.

Mr. GEOFFRION. There is no objection to providing for notices. The sale of this railway was left in the hands of the Exchequer Court to provide notices and the judge had it advertised much better than would have been the case under a sheriff's sale. Under a sheriff's sale the notices would have been given at the church door in all the parishes where there is not a single buyer, but in this instance the judge ordered advertisements to be inserted in newspapers in New York, Quebec, Montreal and all the large cities where buyers would be reached. We have no objection to say that the notices shall be the same as in the case of a sheriff's sale, but I think it is better otherwise.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend wishes to provide for such notices as the Exchequer Court would order and not the notices prescribed by the code of civil procedure. That is a serious question, and I think the Minister of Justice had better examine it. Is not this railway taken out of the jurisdiction of the provincial courts now; is it not brought under the provisions of the Dominion Winding Up Act?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Does my hon. friend pretend that this piece of railway is not under the jurisdiction of the courts of the province of Quebec?

Mr. MONK. I pretend that if it is today brought under the provisions of the Winding-Up Act it is an insolvent company and is now entirely under Dominion jurisdiction. If it is under the Winding Up Act now, it is under the provincial courts, but it cannot be sold by the sheriff.

Mr. PREFONTAINE.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think my hon. friend is mistaken. The Winding-Up Act does not apply to these railways.

Mr. MONK. There is a provision of the Winding-Up Act, or of the Railway Act, which applies to railways in a state of insolvency, and which enables the bondholders to get possession of that railway; and that law would be rendered nugatory, I think, if this Bill passed. I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice to section 1, which surrounds the sale under an order of the Exchequer Court with great precautions.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If my memory serves me rightly, that does not apply to a railway company at all. If a railway company becomes insolvent, by section 285 of the Railway Act, certain proceedings are provided under which application is made to the Exchequer Court. However, in view of the position taken by the hon. leader of the opposition, I think this is a matter which ought to be dealt with by a law of general application to the whole Dominion. I think a very slight amendment to section 3 of the Act applicable to the winding-up of railways will meet the difficulty pointed out by my hon. friend. There is of course considerable difficulty in dealing with a property in the hands of trustees for bondholders. There is a vast difference between this and a property subject to ordinary mortgages. There are a great number of bondholders all over the country who have to be considered. I understand all that, and I will see if we can draft an amendment which will meet the case and do justice to all parties.

Mr. GEOFFRION. Is it the intention of the committee to rise without reporting on the Bill? I want the Minister of Justice to tell me what he intends to do about it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am not going to tell my hon. friend now what I am going to do, because I am not in the habit of saying what I am going to do until I understand it. When I have thought it out, I will attempt to assist my hon. friend in doing what he has in view which I think is a very desirable object. But I must consider in what way it can be done without being contrary to the interests of the parties who have invested in the road. This is only a suggestion, and my hon. friend will take what course he thinks best.

Mr. GEOFFRION. I think the Bill is a proper Bill, it has been discussed by a good many of my colleagues, and I intend to proceed with it.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I would like to point out to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that when he is citing the Winding-Up Act he should refer to clause

3, which says that the Act does not apply to railway or telegraph companies. That is why special legislation is necessary in this case.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am disposed to admit that the Winding-Up Act does not apply except so far as it is made applicable by the statute to which this is an amendment. But that is not the point. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries asks if there is anything wrong in making good the title conferred by the sale. Nothing whatever; I will support legislation of that kind. But I ask, is it good legislation that provides for one province and leaves the other provinces unprovided for? Is the hon. gentleman not a member of a government which has the oversight of all legislation of this kind? I admit that further legislation is necessary, but I ask that it shall be general legislation applicable to all the provinces of Canada. If it is desired by hon. gentlemen from the province of Quebec that some different mode of sale shall be provided for that province, I shall have no objection; but I want some scheme provided by a General Bill which will enable us to know what kind of title the Exchequer Court is going to give whenever it directs a sale in any part of Canada. That is all I want, and I think it is very reasonable.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Under former legislation by the Dominion parliament, it has been decided three times that when a sale should be held by an assignee under the insolvency law, the title given by the assignee in the province of Quebec should be equivalent to a title from the sheriff. That was good legislation, because nobody ever complained of it. The same thing has been decided under the Winding-Up Act, and that has been considered up to the present time to be good legislation. How this has become bad legislation, I fail to understand. No objection was made to it in the case of the Insolvency Acts of 1873 and 1875, and I do not see why any objection should be made to it when you want to apply it to a railway. Under the law in the province of Quebec at present you can have these properties sold by the sheriff, but that is not in the public interest, because when a railway is taken possession of by the sheriff, its operation ceases. Just imagine a railway being seized at the beginning of December, when snowstorms are occurring, the whole system would be stopped, everything would go to ruin and the creditors would suffer?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We have heard a great deal of the legislation of 1875, but I do not think it offers the slightest precedent for this measure. If my hon. friend could show me that in the Act of 1875 there is special provision for the province of Quebec and none for the other provinces, then he would have an illustration but he has not done so. But even supposing there was some analogy between the two, that Act was passed 30 years ago and was repealed 20 years ago, and I do not propose to be bound by what was done in 1875 and repealed in 1885.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Then take the Winding-up Act, which makes exception to the province of Quebec.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not read the Winding-up Act in that way. At all events, if it did make particular provisions for the province of Quebec and have the other six unprovided for, it is an example of bad legislation.

Mr. GEOFFRION. I am not ready to admit that the Act of 1875 was bad legislation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not say it was.

Mr. GEOFFRION. My hon. friend was not in the House then, but I am not ready to say that it was bad legislation. This Bill may not be perfect legislation, but I think it is fair and in the interest of the public, and I intend to push it as far as I can.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not say that the legislation of 1875 was bad, but I said that it did not make provision for one province and leave the other six unprovided for. But this Bill does that, and that is why I object to it. Neither did the Winding-up Act make a provision for one province which did not apply to the others. What I ask is that in declaring what title shall pass under a sale by the Exchequer Court, you should not leave that question undetermined as regards six provinces and simply make provision as to the effect of that sale in the province of Quebec.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In the Winding-up Act provision is made for the sale of the property of an insolvent by the assignee, but the sale by an assignee in the province of Quebec would produce no effect whatever. In the other provinces, the assignee is an officer of the court and his sale would produce the same effect as that made by an officer of the court, but in our province it would produce no more effect than the sale by a notary public or myself. Therefore it was necessary in that Act to provide that the sale by the assignee in the province of Quebec should have the same effect as a sale by the sheriff. In the Insolvent Act also my hon. friend will find that there were special provisions for notices in the province of Quebec so that the assignee had to proceed in absolutely the same way as the sheriff. This was in order that the public should have the same protection in the case of a sale by an assignee as in a sale by the sheriff. All that has been omitted here.

The committee divided on the amendment: Yeas, 38; nays, 24.

Amendment agreed to,

Bill reported as amended.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have no objection to the amendments being considered now but I consider this legislation absolutely impossible of application.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 2) to amend the Railway Act.—Mr. Lancaster.

On section 1,

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This Bill was up for consideration some time ago and it was then decided by the House that the Bill should be referred to the Railway Committee for consideration. The Bill was referred to the Railway Committee and reported against by that committee. I have nothing to add to what I have already said about the Bill. The legislation is, I think, bad and inadvisable in principle and not the sort of legislation that ought to commend itself to this House. I cannot do more than ask this House to reject it and to give effect to the conclusion to which the Railway Committee came.

Mr. LANCASTER. We have a little more from the Minister of Justice to-night than we have been able to get before. The House knows very well the principles on which this Bill is formulated, and it would be unjust and unfair to the patience of the House to relate them at any length again. I have discussed this Bill twice in this House, and in the Railway Committee. The last time we were in committee here on it for a half hour before six o'clock we began to find out from the government that they had no reason why this Bill should not be passed. All I succeeded in obtaining from the government when six o'clock came was a statement from the Minister of Justice that we had sent the Bill to the Railway Committee, that the committee had reported against it, and on my appeal to the Prime Minister he said that the committee had dealt with the merits of the Bill. I was asking him about the merits of the Bill and we were in this position that a public Bill of this House, affecting the rights of the people throughout the whole country, a measure that, as the Minister of Justice admitted at an earlier stage of the session, dealt with a matter in regard to which some remedy is required, a measure aimed at remedying an evil that he admitted exists, was to be thrown out of this House without any suggestion from the government, without any alternative or any better remedy notwithstanding that the evil still exists, simply for the reason that the Railway Committee of this House have seen fit to reject the measure. It is right for me to draw the attention of the House to the fact that this Bill did not go to the Railway Committee with the unanimous consent of this House. There was a division as to whether this was or was not the proper thing to do with it. I am bound to say that having had experience with sending public Bills to the Railway Committee during five sessions, I have never yet seen a public Bill dealt with on its merits in the Railway Committee. This one was no exception to the rule. This Bill has been rejected by 61 members of this House, less than 29 per cent of the membership, and the minister is satisfied that because a majority of the Railway Committee rejected it, nothing should be done. I wish every member to notice that the Minister of Justice says that 61 members are to decide on a matter of this kind. Where does the minister stop? On what principle does the Minister of Justice intend to govern the actions of this House? Is it to be minority or majority government? What is the rule? Who is to decide questions in this House on large public matters such as that to which this Bill relates? 61 members of this House and 61 only have rejected this measure and the Minister of Justice wants us now to reject it and not see whether or not a majority of the 214 members will reject it. This House is to sit silent and no more discussion is to be allowed on this Bill because a majority of the Railway Committee have rejected it. The Minister of Justice has this time gone a little further than the government has hitherto gone by saying that in his opinion this is bad legislation. I think it is due to the people of this country, to those in the House other than myself who are supporting this measure, to those in the country who are suffering under the evil, that the Minister of Justice shall tell us more than the few words that this is absolutely bad legislation and shall assist us, if it is bad legislation, to provide a remedy, for the Minister of Justice knows very well what the evil is. Each year, the trains run faster than before, and the railways give as a reason that the public demands that higher rate of speed. The Minister of Justice knows also that more trains are crossing the highways of cities, towns and villages, than used to cross, 8, 10, 20 and 30 years ago. The Minister of Justice also knows that the same legislation which I am trying to make perfect, to make so that it will operate practically for the benefit of the people, has been on the statute-books since 1857, and which by the decision of the Supreme Court given nearly two years ago has been held to be of practically no effect, the court having decided that no protection was required at highways as long as the track was fenced against adjoining owners, which of course is no protection. This is the section which I am seeking to amend here. I have been

trying to do so for years and shall keep on trying to amend it until we get some remedy as long as Providence spares me and the people of my constituency allow me to represent them. This section that I have been seeking and shall keep on seeking to amend with what power and ability I have is section 227 of the Consolidated Railway Act, 1903. It has in effect been the law since 1857. It deals with a special class of cases, the thickly settled portions of cities, towns and villages where the track is crossed by highways at rail level, and where the train exceeds six miles an hour in speed. The argument advanced by the railways in the Railway Committee which the Minister of Justice did not hear—and with all deference to him that is another reason why he should not be so quick to pronounce in favour of the judgment of the Railway Committee, and say it is absolutely correct—was that you should go to the Railway Commission in regard to every one of these crossings. To-day there are thousands of these crossings in this country, sometimes half a dozen in a municipality, sometimes half a hundred. They claim that you should go to the Railway Commission in regard to every one of these crossings because no two cases are alike. The legislature since 1857 has thought that there was a certain special class of cases sufficiently alike to be grouped together and dealt with in a special way and that is the only reason for this section. If the Minister of Justice wishes to be consistent, he should strike out clause 227 of the Railway Act so that there will be no special legislation. He would have to do that to be consistent with his statement that my amendment is absolutely bad, because without my amendment, that section is idle, and I do not think the Minister of Justice should allow even seven lines of a statute to remain on the statute-book which is of absolutely no effect.

The Supreme Court in the same case McKay and the Grand Trunk Railway, that we have often discussed in this House, have decided that it does not make any liability upon a company unless you get a special order from the Railway Commission. Now as the Minister of Justice pointed out in the early part of the session, you can get that special order under other sections of the Act which give the Railway Commission the fullest powers to regulate speed, and order protection, and everything of that kind. Now I appeal to the Minister of Justice, let us be consistent at all events, even if we are not just to the people. I wish to be both, but if we are to be unjust to the people let us be consistent. This section as it reads to-day is of no benefit at all, it accomplishes nothing, it brings about no protection to anybody. All that can be done outside of this House, according to the decision in the McKay case. My amendment says that we will make this legislation practical, we will say that since the courts have decided that no protection here is required by this section unless you get a special order, we will add :

> Wherever in any such portion of a city, town or village, a railway crosses a highway at rail level, the said speed of ten miles an hour shall in no event be exceeded, unless the company provides, by a watchman or gates at such crossing, protection against approaching trains for persons using the highway.

Now I have had this Bill discussed and attacked from all sides by all the force the railways can bring against it, and I have not yet heard one person say that that language is not reasonable ; the most that has been said against it is that you can already get an order of that kind from the Railway Commission in each particular case. Now the Minister of Justice concedes that it is not bad legislation on the merits, and if he opposes it, it must be on some other ground than that it is bad legislation, it must be on the ground of the manner in which I propose to bring a remedy. Is it not fair that the same procedure should prevail throughout the whole country, and that we should not, as regards every little highway crossing, be obliged to come to the Railway Commission and make special application ? It amounts to a lawsuit. Why is the necessity of all that expense ? The legislatures since 1857 have recognized a certain class of cases as of particular jurisdiction, and has reserved other cases for general legislation, and it has dealt with them and grouped them in this section. Ever since 1857 this section has existed, dealing with thickly peopled portions of cities, towns and villages on the rail level, and these three conditions have to exist in order to bring the cases within that particular class. It must be that the highway is crossed on the rail level, that it is within a thickly peopled portion of a city, town or village, and then the train can run as fast as it likes if it protects, and it cannot run faster than ten miles an hour unless it does protect. Now in all these cases I am free to admit the Railway Commission is very likely to make an order that there shall be some protection. But what does the Minister of Justice gain for the country?—because I apprehend he is trying to help me to legislate to help the people and not the railways—by insisting on their going to expense in regard to every little highway crossing, going to what is practically a lawsuit against a railway corporation. It was suggested in the Railway Committee that a letter could be written to the commission and they would attend to it. Well, it is astonishing what railway counsel will say when they think you can't contradict them. Here are the rules of the Railway Commission passed in October, 1904. The commission did not do much work

in 1904, but they did pass some rules to govern people who should approach them. These rules are like those in every other court of superior jurisdiction, and you cannot come near them without going through the preliminaries set down in these rules passed by themselves. You cannot come near them in regard to any crossing when you want to get what I propose to give here. This is the proceeding regarding an application or complaint :

> Every proceeding before the board under this Act shall be commenced by an application made to it, which shall be in writing and signed by the applicant or his solicitor ; or in the case of a corporate body or company being the applicants, shall be signed by their manager, secretary or solicitor. It shall contain a clear and concise statement of the facts.

And so on. It goes on to describe how the complaint shall be made, just as it did in the old procedure in Ontario under a Bill of complaint in chancery, or as you would now in any action in the high court. The writ has to be served and proved in a certain way, the defence has to be put in as in a high court suit ; and application has to be made to the commission to hear the case, then the other side has to be heard when it will suit them, witnesses have to be brought to Ottawa, and the case is tried in regard to every little crossing. It is all very well for the railways which can stand these things. But every little village and town, even most cities, are not anxious to have lawsuits with railways about every level crossing.

But there was another thing that came out in the Railway Committee ; it was not intended perhaps to come out, but by a little cross examination a counsel can sometimes find out things. When you make a counsel get into the witness box and answer our questions, he sometimes has to let things out, and Mr. Chrysler, counsel for the Grand Trunk Railway, having been asked some questions by me a little more rapidly perhaps that he had been used to ask questions himself, did say—and I think this is where the cat was let out of the bag—that the commission would perhaps order the municipality to pay part of the expense. Now I think that is what is the trouble here, and I ask this committee to reject that as an unfair proposition, to tell me if there is any reason for refusing this legislation of mine ? Why should a municipality pay part of the expenses of protecting what is nothing but the result of the railway corporation running its trains through a city, town or village for its own benefit ? By the common law of England, and I think by the civil law of the province of Quebec, the principle is that when a man or a company brings a dangerous thing upon the premises of another person he is responsible for what happens. Now the railway company brings their dangerous machinery through a peaceable locality in a city, town or village. No one objects to that. We want the railways to run through to develop the country. But they run there for their own gain. They do not hand over to the corporation a portion of their receipts, they do not give a discount on the tickets they sell. They sell as many tickets and charge as much fare as the law will allow them and hand none of the proceeds back to the municipality. They run their trains upon the level through the thickly peopled portions of cities, towns and villages for their own gain, and because it would cost them a little to put that track on a bridge over a highway or to bridge the highway over the track by grading down, they object to this legislation.

So I say this to the Minister of Justice, that if you are going to obstruct this legislation because it may not be fair to the railway companies, you should be able to show on what ground and in what way it is unfair. It is certainly unfair to the people that a dangerous condition of affairs should be created for them where they live, where they control their own highways as they have a right to do because the highways belong to the people, the liege subjects of His Majesty, and not to the railway companies in any sense. Yet, the railway companies are only allowed to cross the highway as a licensee not paying toll or rent for their own benefit because the country is good natured enough to allow them to cross the highways on the level without forcing them to build a bridge overhead or a tunnel underneath. As protection is absolutely necessary we have the section which was placed in the Railway Act in 1857 providing that if a railway crosses at rail level it shall take special precautions for protecting the people. I appeal to the hon. Minister of Justice on the question of vested rights which we have been hearing so much about to-day. The people are always giving way to the railway companies on the ground of vested rights. Let us have some vested rights the other way. These railways were built with this understanding by the people. They were built on the understanding that in thickly peopled portions of cities, towns and villages where the tracks cross at rail level they should be protected if the train went at a faster speed than six miles an hour. We increased that speed from 6 miles an hour to ten miles an hour in 1903, but we want that protection still. The people have a right to this protection because when these railways were built they were built on that understanding, and the people would probably have opposed the building of these railways if they had not been built on that understanding. I think it would be better all around if the hon. Minister of Justice would do something similar to the course which he has adopted in relation to the Bill

that we have just been dealing with. It relates to the province of Quebec only, but I think the hon. Minister of Justice should take hold of this legislation and help me to put it into practical shape. I brought in this Bill last year in a little different form than that in which it is now drawn. It was then a little more drastic. I wanted some protection for the people at these dangerous places. We thought we had that protection until the case of McKay vs. the Grand Trunk was decided in the Supreme Court about two years ago. I said last year and I think so still but I gave way to the majority opinion against me that a watchman was the best protection. Some hon. gentlemen in this House said that they must oppose the Bill because I limited the protection to watchmen whereas gates might be better protection than watchmen. Nobody suggested amending it, but some of them took that as a reason for voting against it. Some of them, and I am afraid nearly all of them, were looking for an excuse to oppose the Bill, because although I have put in the word 'gates' as well as watchmen, none of these gentlemen who said that the word 'gates' ought to be in last year have manifested a desire to support the Bill, this year. Last year it was also attacked by the Minister of Railways and Canals—not the Minister of Justice—because it was not limited to thickly peopled portions of cities, towns and villages. I thought then and I still think that the incorporated limits of a town, village or city would be the proper place to draw the line within which the railway companies shall be obliged to keep their speed down or provide protection at these crossings. We all recognize that in the open country you can see and hear the trains approaching whereas in towns and cities the view is obstructed by buildings and you cannot hear the trains approaching. As soon as you get out into the open country you do not need this protection. This law was never intended to apply except in cities, towns and villages, but, because it has been suggested that it was hard to know what was meant by thickly peopled portions of cities, towns and villages and that it would be better to define that so that there will be no question and no necessity for lawsuits between people who are injured or between the descendants of people who are killed and the railway companies on account of the question as to whether the place where the accident happened was thickly peopled or not thickly peopled I suggested last year that it should be limited to the corporate limits. Then, I was opposed because it was said that I was extending the law. Hon. gentlemen said : You must be awfully careful ; you are going to hurt the railway companies and it is not right to extend the law. So, they said that they would oppose it because it was not limited to thickly peopled portions. They said that you should have it limited to thickly peopled portions and I have done so, and not limited to watchmen, and therefore an alteration was made so that it should read 'watchmen or gates.' If the railway companies place watchmen or gates at these crossings they may go as fast as they like, but if they do not, they must reduce their speed. Under these circumstances, I say again to the Minister of Justice, that I think he ought to take hold of this legislation and help me if he can to draw a Bill that will meet the requirements better than I have done and if he will do that he will have my hearty support. But, up to the present time, he has not shown any disposition to do that, and in the absence of any other remedy, I think the House ought to adopt this one. There is one thing certain and that is that the people want some remedy for the existing state of affairs. It is all very well for one to bring a Bill into the House and make out a strong case on its merits. The government call upon the majority behind them to vote down the measure thinking that it does not matter what happens, that it is not of any importance to the country, but I want to tell hon. gentlemen opposite that the people are stroner than any government and that the people will get, if not through myself, then through somebody representing them in this parliament the redress that they require. Some members of the House will take a keen interest in any piece of legislation that affects by one per cent the dividends of some company. There is a much more active interest taken in private Bills by hon. members of this House and in questions of legislation that might affect the income by one per cent of a private company or any piece of legislation that might reduce dividend earning power of a company from five per cent to four and a half per cent. There will be greater care taken about that and about the question of the vested rights of private companies than about a question affecting the rights of the people. To a question involving the ability of a private company to earn a little more money a hundred times more attention is paid than to a legislation which is in the interest of saving human life. The immigration department of this country is always talking about increasing the population of the Northwest Territories. Keep your own Canadians and keep them alive. You do not want to bury them as they are being buried in Ontario now. People going to school, to church, to market, sober and industrious people, many of them very young people, are hurled into eternity by railway trains travelling at the rate of 40 and 45 miles an hour through thickly peopled portions of cities, towns and villages. The railway companies do not care how many people they kill and they will not take care until you make them pay some hundreds of thousands of dollars to the heirs of the people whom they kill or else

refrain from killing them. They will not do anything about it unless you reach them through their pockets. They want to make all the money they can and they do not care how many people they kill unless you make them pay for it. If you make them pay for these accidents they will begin to see that it is time they were stopped. I say, with all due respect to the Minister of Justice, that he should take this thing a little more seriously than he and the government do. The Minister of Railways said in the committee, that if I could show him a crossing that was not properly protected he would see that the Railway Commission attended to it. Well, the Minister of Railways has undertaken a big contract. Between now and next session, I will see that he is deluged with letters complaining of railway crossings, and if the Railway Commission attends to one-tenth of the complaints I will apologize here publicly next session.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. member who says 'hear, hear,' is like the Minister of Justice, in that he does not seem to care for the rights of the people. He is one of those gentlemen who will vote for the railways irrespective of the merits of the case, and I am sorry to say that we have some of them in this House, but they do not come back to parliament a second time ; the people leave them at home. After all, the railway companies do not mark the ballots, and the hon. gentleman over there who is so facetious will find that the people have more power than the railway companies, and that he will not come back to give an ironical 'hear, hear,' when the member for Lincoln is endeavouring to advocate the rights of the people in this House.

Mr. McINTYRE. I congratulate the member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) on the able manner in which he presented his Bill to the House. I was not at first aware that the Bill had been introduced in the last parliament and that the arguments advanced by the hon. member had been then advanced in its support ; but, at all events, I was struck, not only by the force of the presentation, but with the eloquence of the hon. member (Mr. Lancaster), who advocated its passage with such ability. As I listened to the hon. gentleman, I found myself compelled to assent to the propositions he set forth. It was with a good deal of interest I awaited the arguments that would be offered against him, but when these arguments came I was rather surprised to find that such arguments had been deemed sufficient by a previous parliament to cause the defeat of the Bill. There did not appear to be any real opposition to the principle contended for, namely, the necessity for greater protection, but there were various criticisms, such as the amount of trouble the amendment would involve, the expense it would entail on the railways to provide proper protection at crossings, and the fact that we had established a Railway Commision to attend to all these matters. We were told that it was an extremely simple matter to go before this commission and to get everything you desired. These arguments did not fully satisfy me, but the suggestion of the Minister of Justice that the Bill should be referred to the Railway Committee for further action struck me favourably. I noticed that the hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) protested vigorously against that suggestion, but in the vote that followed I favoured the reference to the committee, and I am not sorry I did so. Several advantages followed from that reference, and although the member for Lincoln did not like it, I think there was a distinct gain for him. The necessity for this amendment arises from the fact that the decision which has been repeatedly quoted in Mackay versus the Grand Trunk Railway, shows the necessity for greater definiteness with regard to the character of the protection that should be given. In that connection, as a layman, I may perhaps be allowed to say that it is one of the reasons why the ordinary layman receives with a good deal of incredulity what is so frequently told him by the legal fraternity : that it is necessary to have a legal training in order to give judicial interpretation to laws. Perhaps it is, and yet after all these laws are made largely by ordinary laymen who have not a legal training, but who endeavour to couch the law in ordinary English. In this case the first decision given was along the line that an ordinary layman, with as much common sense as he could bring to bear on the subject, would have thought correct ; and it was then the law, because a judge of the land had given a decision on the point. The case was appealed, and the second court upheld the judgment of the first court, and it was still the law, and good law. But a further appeal came and, strange to say, this third court reversed the decision of the other two, and virtually told the judges below that, with all their legal training, they were not competent to properly interpret the law. Is it any wonder that, under such circumstances, the ordinary layman will at times endeavour to interpret the law for himself, and perhaps come to the conclusion that his interpretation is just as likely to be correct as that of the legal gentlemen ? The actual result of the final decision is that the Act refers to the rate of speed on railways crossing a highway ; and yet the decision states virtually that you may run at any rate you desire over a highway so long as you afford protection to some other portion of the railroad—not the highway at all. It would seem to me that that is either a ridiculous interpretation of the law, or else the law itself has been drawn in a ridiculously loose manner. The actual result of all this is that the protection which was assumed for many years to exist at a highway crossing, and which two courts of the land had declared to exist, does not exist as a matter of law. The re-

sult also is that the burden of getting protection is thrown on the individual or the municipality. The individual or the municipality is told that he has redress, but he must go to the Railway Commission for it. The promoter of this amendment desires protection, but he desires to get it in a prompter and different way. His first proposition is a very simple one in form: that you erase the word 'or' and insert the word 'and,' so that the Act shall read 'fencing and protection' instead of fencing or protection.' It was just in this connection that I thought the reference to the Railway Committee proved of some advantage. We had the advantage, not only of the member for Lincoln giving his views, but we had also the advantage of the presence of a representative of the railways, and during the discussion it so happened that the representative of the railways, on being pressed a little, stated that the railways would not object to substituting the word 'and' for the word 'or.' I know that a concession on the part of a railway company does not in the least bind the committee to do as the member for Lincoln desires, but it seems to me that when the railways conceded this the committee might very well have accepted it. However, the committee threw out the whole Bill, and in my opinion the committee acted hastily and without mature judgment in doing so. Perhaps there is some reason to doubt whether the change of the word 'or' to 'and' would have any practical value, and my suspicion arises largely from the fact that the railway companies were willing to concede it. The variance in decisions between various courts naturally make one hesitate to say that that change would have had the desired effect, and I notice that there was a considerable amount of opposition in any case to the proposal of my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster). In view of that, and seeing that the railways were willing to have that change made, I would be inclined to urge the promoter of this Bill to limit his amendment to this change of the word 'or' to 'and.' If he did that it is possible his amendment might meet with greater favour, although it may be that it would not accomplish all he desires. Possibly, in addition to that, he would add the words 'on the highway,' as that addition might prevent that peculiar misconstruction of the meaning of this clause, which the public have so much reason to complain of. I would urge upon him the wisdom of carrying at least part of his amendment in this way. I think, however, that he has made out a good case for the other amendment, which is that a speed of ten miles an hour should not be exceeded in thickly-settled portions of cities, towns or villages, unless the company provides watchmen or gates at the crossings. This does not supercede the action of the commission, but it does bind both the railway and the commission to see that that is carried out. It does not prevent the commission from demanding a greater limitation of speed or greater protection; but the railway in any case can avoid in any doubtful case the risk of involving itself in damages by running at a less rate than ten miles an hour, unless it gets permission from the Railway Commission. However, my main object in speaking is to express my willingness to vote for the amendment, but to urge on the promoter the advisability of limiting it to the first part.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not think the hon. gentleman who has just sat down would on reflection ask me to strike out all my amendment except the part which changes the word 'or' to 'and,' although he is quite right in saying that it would accomplish something to have that passed. He is also right in saying that the committee paid no attention whatever to that matter, although the counsel for the railways when pressed hard had to admit that the law was not sensible as it is. This was not a voluntary statement by him, but was dragged out of him because he realized that the rest of his case would fall if he admitted that the public were not entitled to both gates and fences. But the latter part of the clause is absolutely necessary to bring about any change in the general law and to override the decision of the Supreme Court which the hon. gentleman has repeated, because the Supreme Court has decided that the only protection you can get under the Act as it is now is such protection as the Railway Commission will order. So that I am asking that in all cases of this class we shall have at least this much; and, of course, as the hon. gentleman says, we will get as much more in any special case as the Railway Commission will order. The Railway Commission may order that the railway should not run on the level at all, but shall either go under or over the highway. They do that in some large cities and dangerous places. My hon. friend suggests that I should insert the words 'at the highway' after the word 'protection.' It is my intention to protect the highway, and I think he will see that I have practically accomplished that. The protection is limited to persons using the highway. If I inserted the words 'protection at the highway', I do not think the case would be met so well, for the protection is required for the person lawfully using the highway at the time the injury might happen. Under these circumstances, and backed up by the hon. member for South Perth, I again ask the Minister of Justice to help us to put this Bill into practical shape for the benefit of the people.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I would like to say to the hon. member for South Perth that the reason that I opposed this legislation last year and the reason I oppose it again now, is that I think a more effective and more complete remedy is provided by the Railway Act. My recollection is that this

legislation was first introduced by way of an amendment to the Railway Act of 1903. It is a sort of hardy annual that comes up periodically. We have discussed it already three times, and I see no reason to depart from the opinion already formed by the House on three different occasions.

Mr. LANCASTER. In support of the hon. member for South Perth. I would say that this hardy annual will continue to be hardy every year so long as nothing is done by the Railway Commission.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Why does not my hon. friend go to the Railway Commisssion?

Mr. LANCASTER. The Railway Commission was appointed in 1903, and at that time I had the temerity to suggest to Mr. Blair, then the Minister of Railways, that he had better make the law plainer than it then was, and I was voted down by Mr. Blair and the other members of the government and their supporters when I tried to get this amendment inserted in the Consolidated Railway Act of 1903. The language of this law ought to be so plain that there would be no chance of the judges differing about it. It is part of our duty here to make laws so plain and distinct that laymen will understand them. We have had this Railway Commission since 1903, and it has not done anything with regard to this matter. I am not finding any fault with the Railway Commission as an institution. I am in favour of it, but this is not one of the matters that was ever intended to go to the Railway Commission. If it was, we should have struck out this section. The Minister of Justice ignores the fact that section 227 ought not to be in the Railway Act at all if the Railway Commission is the proper place to settle this matter, because in the earlier parts of the Acts, as the Minister of Justice pointed out on former occasions, the Railway Commission are given the fullest power to settle the rate of speed and to regulate the protection of crossings both by railways now being constructed and railways that were constructed before this legislation came into force. Unless we are going to carry out in effect what is said in the section, we ought to repeal it. If we ought to get the remedy from the Railway Commission, I cannot see any necessity for this section, because the commission can act under the wider sections of the Act. But this section is intended to be a direction to the Railway Commission that a different condition should prevail in the cases mentioned in this section than is allowed in others. I want to make the thing practical, and I think the Minister of Justice should assist me to carry out this section unless he does not think there ought to be any other protection in the thickly settled districts than you have in other parts of the country. That is not my opinion, and I think that this hardy annual ought to prevail and it will continue to be brought before this House as long as I am here.

Mr. BARKER. I am very sorry to have to differ in this matter from my hon. friend the member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster). In 1903, again in 1904, and now in 1905, we have heard the hon. gentleman most eloquently lay this matter before the House, and he assures us that he will continue to do so again and again. If this were not a matter of great consequence, rather than have it brought up year after year, I would be inclined to support my hon. friend, but it is a matter of considerable importance and therefore I cannot support his Bill. For years the question of the appointment of a Railway Commission was agitated. We were told that we should have practical business men on that commission. It was conceded, I believe, that there should be one lawyer, but it was understood always that there should be a majority on the board of what are called men of common sense. That agitation went on until 1903, when, after many months of debate and hard work in this House, we did constitute a Railway Commission, and gave it full power to deal with not only this question which the hon. gentleman has been agitating ever since, but others of great importance, perhaps, apart from the question of life, of far greater importance that these crossings. I do not want to be understood as at all belittling the importance of the question of public safety at railway crossings. That Railway Commission cost us last year nearly $70,000, and probably will cost us in the neighbourhood of $70,000 every year of its existence. And it does seem to me absurd to continue so expensive a tribunal and give it full power to deal with this and all other questions within the Railway Act, and then have gentlemen in this House getting up session after session and asking us to legislate concerning matters with which that commission has ample and full power to deal, without any limitation whatever. I am quite prepared to admit the great ability of my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster); but I do think that when the government selected three men to act upon such a commission, and when these men are from month to month and year to year acquiring experience in these matters, it is absurd that we should undertake to withdraw from that board one of the most important matters that has been left to its jurisdiction and deal with it ourselves. What is it that was said by the hon. gentleman in 1903? He told us what a monstrous thing it was that a poor man should have to employ counsel and come to Ottawa to argue his case before this Railway Commission. We have not heard so much on that point this session. My hon. friend must know well enough there is nothing in it. He must

know that any individual who has any grievance with regard to a railway crossing or the speed of trains or anything at all in connection with railways, need employ no counsel, need go to no expense. All he need do is write a letter to the commission and that commission will send an engineer to the spot to inquire into all the circumstances. And if necessary the commission, instead of making this man come to Ottawa, will go to the scene of the trouble and there deal with it. For a time there was a little trouble in that court owing to the withdrawal of Mr. Blair, but since the court has been reconstituted by the appointment of Judge Killam, what have we seen ? Instead of the complaints having to come to Ottawa, we find the court going to them. The commissioners go to the spot, they view the premises, they hear the charges, and give their decision, and the man interested need not spend a five cent piece. Instead of the litigants going to the court the court goes to the litigants, and thus one of the great grievances is removed about which we heard so much. Section 25 of the Act of 1903, gives this commission power to deal in the broadest and most ample manner with all questions. It says 'The board may make orders and regulations' then the section which relates to this matter says :

> With respect to the rolling stock, apparatus, cattle-guards, plans, signals, methods, devices, structures and works, to be used upon the railway so as to provide means for the due protection of the property, the employees, of the company, and the public.

There is the broadest authority given the commission. They can do whatever is necessary in their judgment. We have on that board, commissioners who, with their two or three years experience, will know probably a great deal more on the subject than the members of this House, and they will go on from year to year gaining experience on all these matters. It has been said that they must decide every little question. They need not do that. They may decide one question or decide the matter at once for a whole city, village or county. There is no restriction whatever upon their authority. It is all very well to make these appeals and speak of the unfortunate people who meet their deaths on railways, but there is also a little common sense to be applied to this thing ; and when we have appointed at great expense competent men to deal with these questions, men who are not limited or restricted, men who may allow ten miles an hour or three or five or fifteen, who are not obliged to make one law for the whole Dominion from the Atlantic to the Pacific, but may regulate the particular rate of speed for Toronto on the Esplanade, for St. Catharines and all the different parts of the country according to the circumstances. Why should we interfere ? When the commission can do that, why is it not a better provision ? The hon. gentleman would allow ten miles, but at some places 10 miles an hour would be dangerous and the committee can say five miles if they please. At some places the ten miles might be too little, might be an unreasonable restriction. For example a railway sometimes runs through an excavation, through rock, where although it is in a thickly settled part of a city or town there is no more danger in running fifty miles an hour than if there were no people within fifty miles, and so in this way high embankments on each side of the railway may render the railway so safe that trains may run at any speed without danger to the public and yet at the top of the embankments there may be a large population. All these circumstances are considered by the commission. They go to the spot and look at all the circumstances. Under section 25 they may say to the company : You shall run at only five miles an hour. They may say : You shall put up gates or watchmen or both gates and watchmen. The hon. gentleman says in his wisdom that there must be either a watchman or a gate ; the Railway Commission in a particular case may say : we will have neither, we will have an overhead footway. Then the railway must construct that footway and that would be far safer in many many places, than a watchman or a gate.

Mr. LANCASTER. That would be so under my Act.

Mr. BARKER. You say : watchmen or gates. For years I have seen in Montreal crossings where watchmen and gates are provided, but yet I venture to say that as many people are maimed and killed at these crossings in Montreal, where there are both gates and watchmen, as there are in any city, town or village throughout the land.

Mr. LANCASTER. Are there as many as would be killed if there were no gates or watchman ?

Mr. BARKER. I do not think in such a place as Montreal in the district where the Grand Trunk runs, the gates have the slightest effect.

Mr. LANCASTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman says, 'hear, hear.' I wonder how often he has been there. I have crossed these crossings hundreds and hundreds of times, and I know that people, especially young people will go under the gates, run through the trains and cross between the cars. I have seen workmen a score at a time passing between the freight cars, over the couplings, having gone under the railway gate and so across the railway. You cannot stop these men, the only way to avoid danger in such a place would be to stop the crossing alto-

gether and make them pass over the railway by an overhead bridge or under it by a subway. The hon. gentleman lays down the two ways in which he would like to have these crossings guarded. Some other gentleman next year may come with some fancy device and I may come the year after and say that there must be an overhead crossing, and take up the time for two or three sessions discussing overhead crossings. Another gentleman may ask for electric bells. All this is left to the Railway Commission and in my humble judgment, with all respect to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) the experienced Railway Commission, having the responsibility on their shoulders for what they do in each particular case, should be held to that responsibility and should be allowed to exercise their judgment.

Mr. LANCASTER. I want to say a word to the hon. gentleman because he is under an entire misapprehension, and I want to put him right. I said a few moments ago that I do not think this was one of the questions that the Railway Commission is called upon to deal with entirely and I say it again. We have a general law here with regard to protection of the lives of the public and the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat seems to think this commission was appointed to see in what places the general laws should be carried out and in what places they should not be carried out. We all know that the principal object in appointing the commission,—and the hon. gentleman from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) I think spent a good deal of time in this House in 1903 getting very fine distinction made between dividends, stock sheets, and a hundred other things that he thought ought to be looked into carefully, and the hon. gentleman was particular to see that all matters of rates and traffic were to be referred to the Railway Commission, and we all supported him —we all agree that the principal object in having a Railway Commission was to secure uniformity in rates and to have traffic arrangements adjusted so that the trouble that existed and would exist and I am afraid still exists to a certain extent notwithstanding the appointment of the Railway Commisison in regard to freight discrimination and refusal to exchange traffic and similar matters should be adjusted. And I think that I am in the judgment of the House when I say that the subject of my Bill is not one of the things that the Railway Commission was appointed for, and we would not have appointed a Railway Commission for this purpose. But because there is a Railway Commission some hon. members seem to think it is just like a general post office and all of these things may be taken to it just as letters would be dropped in the post office boxes. The hon. gentleman has taken his cue from the statement made by the counsel for the railways in the committee last year. He forgets that the counsel in the Railway Committee this year took it all back. He says that a letter to the Railway Commission will cause them to attend to all this. I have the regulations here, and as the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) will not accept my statement I shall read this.

Mr. BARKER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me ?

Mr. LANCASTER. I have the floor and I want to speak, and be done with this, because I have another engagement. I am not going to allow him to do as he likes just because he comes from Hamilton, where they have protection which is not enjoyed in other places. He can come from Hamilton and still learn something.

The heading of this document is, 'The Board of Railway Commissioners, for Canada, Rules and Regulations, October 18, 1904.'

The board, in virtue of the provisions of the Railway Act, 1903, hereby makes the following rules and regulations :—

. . . . . .

3. Every proceeding before the board under this Act shall be commenced by an application made to it, which shall be in writing and signed by the applicant or his solicitor, or in the case of a corporate body or company being the applicants, shall be signed by their manager, secretary or solicitor.

If the applicant is a lawyer himself he would not have to go to a solicitor to have the papers drawn, but the hon. gentleman will find, if he reads these rules, that he must go to a lawyer because no layman could undertake to correctly fill out the forms as they are given in these regulations. Section 4 deals with the answer that the railway company has to put in in all cases, and then there are about 15 lines of description as to the technical requirements that this answer has to comply with. That has to be filed and served like a writ in any other proceeding for the poor man that the hon. member for Hamilton sneers at, and the reply has to be put in by the poor man within four days and he has to have a lawyer to draft it for him. If the poor man wants to fail in his application he will go sitting around the town or village whatever it may be and will wait until he starves for the Railway Commission to come, but he will never see it. If he wants to succeed he will have a collection taken up for him and get some one to come down here and have these things done in Ottawa as they have always had to be done. The hon. member, in his sneering way, goes on further and says that he knows cases where these things have been attended to and instances St. Thomas. He cannot point out any place which is not a railway centre where the Railway Commission have attended since 1903. Three days before Christmas a couple of years ago three people were

hurled to eternity at Grimsby by a train going fifty miles an hour, where there was no watchman, no gate, no protection, and the track was not even fenced. The relatives of these people have got a remedy, and their case is in the Supreme Court to-day because that track was not fenced against the adjoining owners, not because the railway did not protect the highway, but because the track was not fenced. On account of those people being killed letters have been written to the Secretary of the Railway Commission. The Minister of Railways suggested in the Railway Committee the other day that if we sent letters to him he would see that all cases were attended to.

He will get letters as soon as he can get them from the corporation. But the commission has received these letters, or their Secretary, letters sent them over a year ago, and none of them answered yet. I think three letters have gone from there. There is a case that is practical, there is a statement the member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) had better think over. What sane person in this country or in this House would suppose that this commission is answering every letter that is sent to them from the village of Grimsby, or the village of Prescott, or the town of Napanee, where a letter asks them to come? Why, they could not go to every place where these level crossings require to be inspected, they could not go over the whole of them in fifty years. The proposition is ridiculous. Now here are the rules of the commission showing what you have to do to approach them, and the word 'letter' cannot be found in them. I am sorry to have to trouble the committee in going into these details, but they must blame the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) and not me, when he says that a letter will do it. Now in all cases a notice has to be given. I have already read rule 3 setting forth at great length the procedure to be followed in an application or complaint. Then in regard to the answer:

> Within ten days from the service of the application, the respondent or respondents shall mail or deliver to the applicant or his solicitor, a written statement containing in a clear and concise form their answer to the secretary of the board at its office, together with any documents that may be useful or explaining or supporting it. The answer may admit the whole or in part of the facts in the application. It shall be divided into paragraphs which shall be numbered consecutively, and it shall be signed by the person making the same, or his solicitor.

And so on. Then the mode of the reply is set forth with equal multiplicity of details. Where notice is required, a copy or copies of said proceeding or proceedings for the purpose of service, shall be endorsed with notice to the parties in the forms of endorsement set forth in schedules 1 and 2; the board may enlarge or abridge the period of putting in the answer or reply or for hearing the application; except in any case where it is otherwise provided, ten days notice of any application to the board, of any hearing by the board, shall be sufficient; unless, in any case, the board directs longer notice. Then there is a section dealing with consent cases; another stating power to direct and settle issues:

> If it appears to the board at any time that the statements in the application, or answer, or reply do not sufficiently raise or disclose the issues of fact in dispute between the parties, it may direct them to prepare issues, and such issues shall, if the parties differ, be settled by the board.

Then there are sections with regard to preliminary questions of law, preliminary meetings, preliminary examination with the parties, production and inspection of documents, notice to produce, notice to admit, witnesses, the hearing and so on. After hearing the case the board may dismiss the application, or make an order thereon in favour of the respondents, or reserve its decision.

Then there is a section with regard to affidavits. Schedule No. 1 contains forms of application. This has to be filled in by the secretary:

> AB of CD hereby applies to the board for an order under section 198 of the Railway Act, 1903, directing the railway company to provide and construct a suitable farm crossing where the company's railway intersects his farm in lot , concession , township , county of .

The application must state that he is the owner of the land, that by reason of the construction of the said railway he is deprived and so forth; and that it is necessary for the proper enjoyment of his said land, and so forth.

If it is a mere matter of getting a farm crossing, a man has to take all the proceedings under these regulations as if he were bringing a lawsuit in the Exchequer Court againt the King. You have to describe that he is the owner of the land, that by reason of the construction of the railway he is deprived of the practical enjoyment of his land. Then you have to describe what he thinks his claim is, and there are forms for affidavits, notices to be given, and these rules make no exception, every application to the board must follow the rules and regulations there laid down.

Now the hon. member for Hamilton says that I want one law all over the Dominion. Well, I do want one law for every citizen in the Dominion living in a place where the railway is crossing on a rail level. Is not every Canadian citizen entitled to exactly the same protection as every other, no more and no less? One law for the railway, another for the people; one law for the rich

man who can afford to bring a lawsuit against the railway, and another law for the poor man who has not got the money to do it with—is that what the hon. gentleman wants? is that the way to build up Canada? I say at the risk of having the undying disapproval of the hon. member for Hamilton that I do want the same law to prevail in every city, town and village, in every part of Canada where the conditions are exactly the same. I say more than that, that he ought to join with me and assist me in simplifying this legislation, and in pressing upon the Minister of Justice the need of making it a practical section, because this section in this Act does deal with all thickly peopled portions of cities, towns and villages. According to the view of the hon. member for Hamilton it is bad legislation and ought not to be there; I think it is good legislation and ought to be made practical. The hon. member for Hamilton says that ten miles an hour is not always a proper speed. Well, the hon. member for Hamilton has not introduced any Bill to regulate the speed of railways. He can sneer at the member for Lincoln for trying to do his duty in this House; at all events the member for Lincoln is backing up what he thinks is right by practical legislation to remedy what he thinks is wrong. But the member for Hamilton thinks that the speed should not be ten miles an hour; yet he was here when that section was consolidated in 1903, he has been in this House ever since, and we have heard from him once in a while on railway matters, but he has not made any attempt to amend this Act, he has not said by practical legislation that he thinks section 227 is bad legislation. So there it stands upon the statute-book in all cases, making the speed ten miles an hour in every thickly peopled portion of every city, town and village. I will not trouble the committee any longer in regard to this matter. It is manifest from the action of the Minister of Justice, with the majority he has in this House and with the support he is getting on this side of the House, supplemented even as I am by the assistance of the hon. member for South Peel (Mr. McIntyre), that he is determined to defeat this Bill.

Mr. BARKER. If the hon. gentleman would have allowed me one moment in the course of his speech, he would have given me an opportunity to say what I wished to say. What I was going to say when I asked him to allow me a word of explanation was this: That when the hon. gentlemen in the Railway Committee referred to these rules as binding on every person throughout the Dominion so that no man could take the ordinary proceedings of laying a complaint before this Railway Commission without acting upon all these rules, employing counsel, drawing pleadings and doing everything within a certain number of days, I asked him what the procedure was, and were these rules intended for such cases. I went to the chairman of the Railway Commission and asked him what the procedure was, and whether these rules were intended for such cases. The chairman of the Railway Commission informed me, as he would inform my hon. friend from Lincoln if he thought fit to ask him, that the commission will act upon a letter from any person making such complaints as he is referring to here; that they will, when a complaint is made, send an engineer to examine, and in a proper case the commission will personally visit the spot. That is all I wish to say to the hon. gentleman. I do not know how he knew what I was going to say, but it is usual to allow a person who has spoken and who thinks he has been misrepresented to give a word of explanation. I did not get that courtesy from the hon. gentleman. These rules are intended for very large and important cases, where parties are opposed and represented by counsel. For example, there has been going on for a considerable time a very important dispute in the city of Toronto, where two or three railway companies and the city are interested, and where they have three or four counsel on each side. There would be confusion if there were not rules to apply to such cases, and necessarily with such a body as this commission is, formal rules for such matters must be laid down for the guidance of the procedure. But to say that these rules are intended to be applied to a gentleman who is writing to the Railway Commission, or making a complaint as to the speed of trains, or as to a crossing, or that he is being deprived of anything else—there is nothing at all in it, and the hon. gentleman has only to go to Mr. Killam, or to any member of the commission, and he will find that the very contrary of what he asserts is the fact. That is all I desire to say in answer to what the hon. gentleman has just said. I would like to add that I was not aware I was sneering at him. I was telling why I differed from him, and I think I have the same right to express my opinion as opposed to him as he has to introduce and advocate this Bill.

Mr. INGRAM. The proposed amendment which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) has introduced contains in the second line from the last the words 'by a watchman or gates.' It strikes me that the amendment, as it appears here, would hardly fill the bill. It would require to be: by a watchman or a watchman and gates,' because you could not have gates unless you had a watchman to operate them, and therefore it would be necessary to move an amendment of that kind. There is no doubt a very strong difference of opinion between those who believe that the Railway Commission has power to deal with these dangerous crossings and those who think that some greater provision should be made in this regard.

There is a good deal to be said in favour of the contention of my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), because it is a well-known fact that we have a large number of railway crossings in this country, not alone in the thickly-peopled portions of cities, towns and villages, but in the rural sections as well, which are very dangerous, and there is no doubt that there are very great risks and much loss of life throughout the Dominion by reason of these dangerous crossings. I take it that every hon. gentleman in this House is in favour of properly protecting the public. I also believe that the railway companies are careful, or, at all events, that they think they are, in protecting their property and the lives of the travelling public on their trains. If people by carelessness in passing over the railway tracks are injured the property of the company is liable to be damaged and loss of life is liable to occur on the railway trains. Therefore, I take it that the companies all agree that there shall be proper protection provided for these crossings, and I believe that they will not unnecessarily cause loss of life. But we all recognize that in a sparsely settled country like this, with the railway mileage we have, it is a very serious problem for the railway companies to meet. It is an expensive problem, and the parliament of Canada have seen fit to place in the power of the Railway Commissioners the right to deal with these dangerous crossings as they are brought to their notice from time to time. The only weakness I can see in this proposition is that in view of the large number of dangerous crossings in this country in thickly-settled parts of cities, towns and villages, it will take the Railway Commission such a long time to protect these dangerous crossings that I fear much loss of life will occur in the meantime. That is the weak spot in the argument in favour of the commissioners. I think something ought to be done whereby the attention of the commissioners would be immediately drawn to these very dangerous crossings, so that they may issue orders to have them protected at the earliest possible moment. If something could be done in that line, we ought to take it in hand. I do not wish to see my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) condemned for his energy. I think he is rather to be congratulated on his energy in pressing this proposed measure before the House. I think it will have the tendency of drawing the attention of the Railway Commission to the importance of this very serious question, and it will also lead the railway companies to believe that greater energy must be put forward by them in order to have these serious complaints attended to and these dangerous crossings examined. It does strike me that we are in rather a dangerous position in dealing with this proposed legislation, because it is the last private members' day, and supposing that we carried this amendment, we do not know whether the Bill will be hung up or not: but I am afraid, from the treatment received to-night, that there is not much chance of my hon. friend succeeding in having this Bill carried through.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall the section be adopted ?

Mr. INGRAM. Before the vote is taken, if it is understood that this Bill is amended in the way I suggested, I would be very glad to vote for it.

Mr. U. WILSON. Before the vote is taken I would like you, Mr. Chairman, to read the amendment to the clause.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is no amendment.

Mr. INGRAM. I beg to move that the words 'watchman and' be inserted between the words 'or' and 'gates' in the second line.

Mr. LANCASTER. The section would then read 'watchman or watchman and gates' ?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. I will accept the amendment. I do not think it makes any difference.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I wish to ask the promoter of this Bill if application has been made to the Railway Commission.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The Postmaster General is out of order, we are proceeding to take the vote.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Am I out of order, Mr. Chairman ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The question has been put, and we are now asking for the yeas and nays.

Section negatived : Yeas 12, nays 49.

The committee rose.

ADJOURNMENT—RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Hold on. I have the next Bill on the order paper. We were told to-night that this would be the last opportunity to discuss public Bills, and I will only consent to the adjournment if the Minister of Justice will assure me that I will be allowed to discuss this Bill of mine in connection with his Bill to amend the Railway Act. We were given to understand by the Minister of Agriculture that the government were prepared to accept practically the first clause of my Bill which refers to the control of express rates by the Railway Commission. Is it the intention of the government to do that this session ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I would like to say for myself at any rate, that there is much to be said in favour of the proposition to

bring express companies under the control of the Railway Commission, but, I say it with all respect. I do not think the Bill of the hon. gentleman will accomplish the object he has in view. There are a great many difficulties connected with the control of express companies, and the question would have to be considered more fully than my hon. friend seems to have considered it.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Do I understand that the government has no intention of dealing with the matter this session ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is quite right.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Then I am prepared to go on with my Bill to-night, and leave it to the Postmaster General to say what we shall do.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There are a number of Bills on the order paper and I suppose the gentleman in charge would like to have them discussed, but that would be impossible to-night. Whether or not there will be another day for private members depends on what action the House will take on the motion of the Prime Minister. On that motion my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) will have an opportunity of pressing his views, and perhaps he can convince the House that the subject he is interested in is of such importance that at least one more day should be given for its consideration. It is not to be expected that at this late hour we should reach a conclusion on this very important Bill—what is the Bill about ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. To bring express companies under the Railway Act.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is a very important subject and although a quarter to eleven is not very late, it is not very early and probably the House will be sitting somewhat late for the rest of the week. I leave it to the good sense of my hon. friend whether he thinks anything would be accomplished by prolonging the sitting to-night.

Mr. BARKER. This Bill is a very important one, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) wishes to proceed he should be allowed to do so unless he has an assurance that he will have another day to discuss it. I agree with the Minister of Justice that the Bill requires a great deal of careful consideration, and in my belief it ought be presented by the government. However, it is not quite fair that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) should be prevented from going on.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I should be extremely sorry to prevent the hon. gentleman from proceeding with his measure, but I hardly think he has any grievance because we have several times this session gone through the whole order paper and the hon. gentleman has not moved his Bill.

I have no feeling in the matter, and if the House desires to sit until to-morrow morning I have no objection.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I admit that the Bill was called several times this session, but I intended doing as I did last year, namely, to discuss my Bill when the government proposed its Bill dealing with the Railway Act. For the first time in my experience I was prevented from doing that, because I was told that it was bad procedure to do so and in a way I was cut out.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. How ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Because when the government Bill was being discussed I asked that my Bill should be discussed also, and for the first time I was told that was not good parliamentary procedure. I protested strongly against the idea that there should be one law in this House with respect to a public Bill introduced by the government, and another procedure for private members introducing a Bill to amend the same public Act. The member for Lincoln was sent to the Railway Committee, and I suppose it is the intention to do the same thing with me, but if the government has a Bill amending the Railway Act any member ought to have the right to have his amendments to the same Act tacked on to the government Bill. I was cut out of my opportunity to proceed.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman was never cut out; he has had many opportunities of proceeding. The government Bill would not be moved on private members day, and the hon. member as well as all other members had full right of way to proceed on the day set apart for that purpose. He has had opportunity after opportunity of doing so, but never once, until this moment, did I hear the hon. gentleman express any anxiety to go on with his measure. Because the hon. gentleman has been neglectful of his interests, he now pretends that he was letting the matter stand over on some theory of his own that he could move it as an amendment to some government measure.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I moved it in connection with the government measure, but was stopped by a new procedure in this House.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for South York did attempt to get his Bill before the House. He moved along the same line that was allowed last year. Up to that time he had not made a strenuous effort to press the Bill, because he intended to bring it up in connection with the government Bill, but by a ruling of the Chair he was deprived of that opportunity.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am not asking what he may have attempted to do in some irregular way, but did the hon. gentle-

man ever move the second reading of his Bill until to-night?

Mr. SPROULE. He attempted to do it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There was nothing to prevent his attempting to move the second reading on any Monday before to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. The Postmaster General is a little facetious, but it seems to me it is not necessary. Since the hon. member for South York attempted to move his measure and was shut off by the ruling of the chair, he has not had an opportunity of moving it. But what I was going to suggest is that it might be well for the Postmaster General to consult the premier and see if we cannot have another day allowed for private members, because there are some other important Bills on the paper.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I would like that one point cleared up. I am not asking whether or not the hon. member for South York endeavoured in some way that was really out of order to make progress. I ask whether at any time when he had a right to do it, he has moved the second reading of his Bill. To attempt to advance his Bill in a way which the Speaker rules out of order is not an honest attempt to move it.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought I made it plain enough that he did not move the second reading of his Bill, and I gave the reasons why he did not—that he intended to follow the same procedure that he had followed last year and have it discussed at the same time that the Bill of the Minister of Justice was up for discussion.

Mr. LANCASTER. If this is going to be the last private member's day, I wish to say a word in regard to my Bill No 44, to amend the Act respecting certificates to Master and Mates of Ships. The Minister of Justice and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will, I think, concede that I am justified in asking that a special day be fixed for the discussion of that measure, or else that we be allowed another private members' day. On one Monday on which this Bill was called, I was obliged to leave on account of illness, as I was suffering from a violent headache. With that exception I was here on every occasion ready to press the Bill, and on three occasions I allowed it to stand at the request of the First Minister, who on one of these occasions promised that if I did it would not suffer, because a special day would be given for it if private members' day should be taken by the government. I would, therefore, urge on the government that private members be allowed next Monday, when we shall probably be all able to get through with the matters on the order paper. Otherwise I shall have to urge on the Prime Minister that he give a special day for the discussion of my Bill.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The argument my hon. friend is advancing might be in order on motion of the premier to take Monday. If the premier has any understanding with the hon. gentleman, the hon. gentleman has only to call his attention to it and it will be observed. I question whether any good purpose would be served by entering on a discussion of any measure at 11 o'clock at night, but I am willing to go on for three or four hours if hon. gentlemen desire.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Of course, discussion is not shut off by these tactics of the government. We are going into supply on four days in the week, when all these questions can be discussed and will be discussed in one way or another, but I would like the Postmaster General to recommend to the premier, after the discussion that has been had here to-night, that private members be given at least another day.

SIR WILLIAM MULOCK. I can only say that the hon. gentleman is so well able to plead his own cause that he does not require any assistance on my part, and I do not wish to put the premier under any pledge in the matter. My hon. friend speaks of these tactics. I am quite willing, if the House wishes it, to withdraw the motion for adjournment.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it woulld be quite in order for the Postmaster General to communicate with the premier the request that has been made.

Motion agreed to, House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 28, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE — SENSATIONAL REPORTS IN SOME NEWSPAPERS.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice, the part played by some newspaper reporters whose duty it is to acquaint the public with murder cases and other sensational crimes which unfortunately occur now and then in this country. Thus, we see in 'La Presse' of the 18th instant that a reporter of that newspaper boasts of his having extorted confessions from an unfortunate man charged with murder. I do not think the reporters have the right, nor that it is their duty, to play the part of a detective, and such acts are calculated to harm a person who is

presumed to be innocent until found guilty. It seems to me they are also designed to injure the community by baffling the aims of the law.

This report has in large types, among others, the following heading : 'A Visit to the Dungeon.' The reporter says that having asked the prisoner several questions he added :

I went on : Yes, that woman Sclater has made a clean breast of it, and this very day 'La Presse' shall inform its readers that you are really the murderer, that there is no more doubt about that.

I understand that this is a matter more particularly within the province of the local government, but it seems to me that such conduct is inconsistent with our criminal law and that the hon. Minister of Justice should take some steps in order to put a stop to it. It is with that end in view that I bring this matter to his attention.

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, my attention had not been drawn to the newspaper report which my hon. friend has just read to this House. But I can tell him I am fully in accord with him to blame such an unjustifiable interference by newspaper men in murder cases. On the other hand, I must remind the hon. member that the administration of criminal law is not within the jurisdiction of this parliament, which has no other right than to define what constitutes criminal offences. A prisoner does not come under the control of the Department of Justice until the jury have found him guilty and sentence has been passed upon him by the court.

VACANCY.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to refer to the issue of Mr. Speaker's writ with respect to the vacancy in Centre Toronto, and to ask the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether any steps have been taken by the government to give effect to that writ ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The matter has been referred to the Secretary of State, who informs me that registration will need to take place. I believe he has attended to that ; but if my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will call attention to the matter to-morrow, I will be able to give a more definite answer.

Mr. E. B. OSLER. Do I understand the Prime Minister to say that a new list must be prepared ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Registration must take place for manhood suffrage voters, I understand.

Mr. OSLER. Is that usual ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I believe so.

Mr. OSLER. I understood the election was to be held on the lists of the last election that had taken place.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand not. The last lists may be used, I believe, if they are not more than a year old. But, in any case, I believe there must be a registration of manhood suffrage voters.

Mr. OSLER. Is not that an unusual course to take ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think not.

Mr. OSLER. I understand that that is not the course taken as a rule. I may be misinformed, but I believe——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am pretty sure my hon. friend is misinformed. In any case to-morrow we will be able to give a final answer.

VACANCY IN THE CABINET.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) might condescend to add a word as to when the government intend to fill the present vacancy in the cabinet by taking in a representative from the Northwest Territories. There are constituencies out there where there is no necessity for registration before an election takes place.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That does not occur there.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 69) to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta, and the amendment of Mr. R. L. Borden thereto.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Mr. Speaker, in resuming the debate upon what I hold to be the most important piece of legislation that has been discussed by the Canadian parliament since confederation, I feel deeply the responsibility resting upon me both for the vote I shall give as a member of this House and for the opinions I shall express to-day. In the course of the very remarkable speech in which the Prime Minister introduced this legislation over a month ago, I was especially struck with one sentence, and that sentence has remained in my memory ever since. Having reviewed the legislation through which these Territories had passed since their entrance into confederation, the Prime Minister said : 'Now the time has come to put upon these Territories the stamp of Canadian nationality.' It is under the light of that principle that I intend to carry on this discussion. It seems to be that, through the turmoil, passions and prejudices that have been aroused, in sincerity perhaps on the part of people, but surely with no other purpose on

the part of others than to snatch at popular favour at the expense of the better judgment of the country—I say that perhaps through the turmoil, passions and prejudices we have been passing through for the last month, too many Canadian citizens and Canadian representatives have unfortunately forgotten the important duty they have to perform, and what will be the result of that duty. Sir, we should not forget that those Territories for which we are now legislating will probably contain within half a century or a century, one-half the population of Canada; therefore if we have any interest in what is going to be the future of our common land, we should be very careful of all the articles of this piece of legislation, as well as of the comments we make upon them.

It is not my intention to discuss at any length, or even to discuss at all, the other features of this Bill, but this one clause so much commented upon—I mean the school question. However, I may say in passing that I thoroughly agree with the position that was taken by the government on the land question. Starting from the same point of view I have just stated, namely, that we must put the stamp of Canadian nationality on these Territories, I think it was the duty of the federal government to retain within their powers the right to legislate over the granting of the lands upon which one half of the population of Canada will be called upon at no distant period to live and to prosper. Although I have the greatest confidence in the public spirit and patriotism of the men who are now at the head of public affairs in the Northwest Territories, I say that before long the time may come when they will not be powerful enough to resist the pressure of the newcomers into that country, men that have perhaps no interest in the unity of Canada, who are not attached to the soil of Canada, who have had no part in the past history of Canada, and who, therefore, by numerical strength, may try to force some obnoxious legislation on the government of these Territories. I say, therefore, that for the protection of the Northwest, for the protection of the present representatives of the Northwest, for the protection of the statesmanship of the men who are now at the head of affairs there, it was good policy on the part of the government to retain the control and administration of the public lands in the Northwest.

Now, coming to the question that has occupied the field of discussion for the last month, I may say that I intend to discuss it from a threefold point of view: from the constitutional point of view, from the religious point of view and from the national point of view. In doing so I shall, as it is my custom, express frankly and clearly what I believe to be true, and in doing so I hope that I shall not offend any man in this House, because every man who is attached to his convictions will understand that in this free parliament of ours every true conviction should be frankly and sincerely expressed. I may say at once that if there is a regrettable feature in all this discussion, it is not that passions have been aroused, it is not that prejudices have been raised. I entirely agree with the Prime Minister when he says that many of the passions that are now aroused spring from one of the noblest feelings in humanity, they come from an exaggeration, or from a perversion, of that which constitutes the most stable basis of a nation, namely, attachment to religious creed and attachment to national feeling. The men who are committing a crime against this nation are those who, having opinions of their own, are trying to shelter themselves under a constitutional pretense. The great argument which is being used by the opponents of this measure is, I may say, the shibboleth of provincial rights. Now, Sir, there is no man in this parliament who is more attached to provincial rights than I am. I am the descendant of a race that has claimed provincial rights for many years, and just because I am a sincere adherent of provincial rights, I say that if provincial rights are going to be maintained in this country, they cannot be maintained on any sham basis, they can only be maintained on a basis of equal justice to every part of our population and every section, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. What are provincial rights as they relate to the school question? I am not going into an acute analysis of every word and every letter in the text of the law, though I am not afraid to take up the study of the constitutional question with any man. But I think that once in a while when lawyers get into a muddle about small points of law, sometimes a cool and common sense outsider may throw a little light upon common truths that are too much forgotten by lawyers.

A few days ago the Prime Minister gave to this House a short history of one clause contained in our national constitution, that clause relating to school matters. But to my mind, if I may be permitted to say so, when a motion was made in this House in 1893 by the late Minister of Public Works, then the member for L'Islet, the Prime Minister gave a still clearer and more complete history of the educational policy of Canada, he gave us the true origin of clause 93 of the British North America Act. What was that origin? That although for a century the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec had been treated, not only in the most just, but also in the most generous manner, still that minority was averse to joining the confederation compact unless their privileges and rights in the province of Quebec were made absolutely secure. Thereupon it was proposed that the same measure of guarantee which was asked by the Protestant minority of Quebec should be given to the Catholic minority in the province of Ontario and the other provinces. Now, Sir, I am bound to say that there was at that

time something of the same feeling that exists now, but that feeling was frank enough not to take refuge in legal quibbles. It was stated then, as it is now outside of this parliament, that there should be one rule of justice for the Catholics and another rule of justice for Protestants; that there should not be one law for both the Catholics and Protestants, but that the Catholics should have one law requiring them to respect the Protestant rights in the province of Quebec, while in the province of Ontario the Catholics should rely upon the generosity of the majority. Indeed, the Hon. A. T. Galt, then the accredited representative of the Protestant minority in Quebec, went to England to secure the adoption of clause 93. Now, eminent legal men in this House, eminent jurists, have tried to make out a case that this clause 93 in the British North America Act should be cut in two, and that wherever a Protestant province outside of Ontario is concerned you should read only the first paragraph of it, thereby giving an absolute freedom to the majority to do whatever they like. I will not give you my own authority, I will not give you the authority of any man of my creed and nationality in opposing the proposition laid down by the leader of the opposition and by Mr. Haultain; I will go to the highest authority in this empire to prove that this argument is but a sham pretense, because the opposition in this parliament is afraid on the one hand to grant justice to the minority in the west and is afraid on the other hand to state it frankly before the people of Quebec.

When the British North America Act was presented to the British parliament, Lord Carnarvon was Secretary of State for the Colonies and was responsible for the legislation as such, and Lord Carnarvon has given a definition of what were the respective powers of the federal and provincial authority. I respectfully beg the liberty of commending that opinion of Lord Carnarvon to the leader of the opposition in this House. That hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) has charged the government with trying to confuse the federal and the provincial powers in this Bill, and throughout the country the press has stated that education belonged to the provinces, and that there was no interference of the federal parliament possible in educational matters, unless in Ontario and Quebec. It has been stated that the powers of the British North America Act are divided into three classes; those that belong exclusively to the federal government in clause 91; those that belong exclusively to the provinces in clause 92; and those questions on which both the federal and provincial parliaments have concurrent jurisdiction. A clearer definition was given in the British parliament when the Bill was introduced there, and I suppose we will all accept the good British theory that if there is a division of opinion as to the effect of a law, we must go to the real thought of the enacting legislature in order to properly understand it. Lord Carnarvon said in the House of Lords on the 19th of February, 1867, when moving the second reading of the British North America Act:

> In this Bill the division of powers has been mainly effected by a distinct classification.

Does he say that the classification is threefold? No, sir.

> That classification is fourfold: First, those subjects of legislation which are attributed to the central parliament exclusively. Secondly, those which belong to the provincial legislature exclusively. Third, those which are the subject of concurrent legislation, and fourth, a particular clause which is dealt with exceptionally.

He then enumerates the powers that belong to the provinces and the powers that belong to the federal parliament, none of which includes education; and he continues:

> Lastly, in the 93rd clause which contains the exceptional provisions to which I refer, your lordships will observe some rather complicated arrangement in reference to education. I need hardly say that that great question gives rise to nearly as much earnestness and division of opinion on that as on this side of the Atlantic. This clause has been framed after long and anxious controversy in which all parties have been represented and on conditions to which all have given their consent. The object of the clause is to secure——

Complete autonomy to the provinces? No, Sir.

> The object of the clause is to secure to the religious minority of one province the same rights, privileges and protection which the religious minority of another province may enjoy. The Roman Catholic minority of Upper Canada, the Protestant minority of Lower Canada, and the Roman Catholic minority of the maritime provinces will thus stand on a footing of entire equality.

It is true that the origin of that clause was a compact between the delegates from Upper Canada and the delegates from Lower Canada, but fortunately at that time there were at the head of both parties in this country men who had enough sense of justice to understand that in laying the basis of our confederation the result of a compact between the provinces should be crystallized under law into a triumphant principle, and it was that principle which was embodied in this clause—not to furnish arguments to legal quibblers who might come thirty years later, but on the contrary, to lay down as the basis of justice in this Dominion, that a man, in whatever province of Canada he may choose his abode, can rest assured that justice and equality will reign and that no matter what the majority may attempt to do they cannot persecute the minority.

Later on an interpretation was put upon that clause of the British North America

Act, or to be more correct perhaps I should say upon the spirit of that clause, by the highest tribunal of the empire. When the matter was argued by the counsel representing it was argued as it has been argued here during this debate that the exceptions—or rather that the subsections to clause 93—applied only to the provinces then existing, and even only to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. It was therefore contended that the power of interference that the Catholics of Manitoba were claiming from this parliament, was inconsistent with provincial autonomy in matters of education. What was Lord Herschel's answer to that contention in his judgment? I shall read it:

'Before leaving this part of the case it may be well to notice the arguments urged by the respondent, that the construction which their lordships have put upon the 2nd and 3rd subsections of section 22 of the Manitoba Act is inconsistent with the power conferred upon the legislature of the province to exclusively make laws in relation to education. The argument is fallacious. The power conferred is not absolute, but limited. It is exercisable only 'subject and 'according to the following provisions.' The subsections which follow, therefore, whatever be their true construction, define the conditions under which alone provincial legislatures may legislate in relation to education, and indicate the limitations imposed on, and the exceptions from, their power of exclusive legislation. Their right to legislate is not indeed, properly speaking, exclusive, for in the case specified in subsection 3 the parliament of Canada is authorized to legislate on the same subject. There is, therefore, no such inconsistency as was suggested.

I am just as ready to take my legal authority on this question from Lord Herschel and Lord Carnarvon as from Mr. Haultain or the leader of the opposition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, education is not the only subject upon which federal and provincial jurisdiction come in conflict once in a while. The provinces have the exclusive right to legislate on civil matters, but every day we are passing laws here in relation to railways and in relation to banking and commerce which interfere with the provincial powers. Where are these upholders of provincial rights? A province in this fair Dominion, some three or four years ago, passed laws in relation to labour by which it endeavoured to exclude a certain class of people from their territory. The federal government disallowed that law because it was against the interest of the British government. Where were the apostles of provincial rights then? If I may say it, I was the only man to stand up in this House and proclaim that the province of British Columbia had a right to exclude Asiatic labour. Those gentlemen who seem to be so sincere when they claim that provincial rights should be the basis of our constitution, should not do as was done in the United States when state rights were invoked by men who wanted to retain on the fair flag of the United States the abominable stain of slavery. I say to these gentlemen—they want to have peace and harmony in this country; if they desire that every citizen of Canada shall feel that Canada is his country, then let not these gentlemen come here and speak of provincial rights if their object is to make provincial rights an instrument of tyranny and injustice.

Mr. Haultain, in his letter to the Prime Minister, has admitted frankly that section 93 applied evidently to the Northwest Territories—in fact, that the moment the Northwest Territories became a province, that section applied mechanically from the day they were admitted into confederation, that is, in the month of July, 1870. Here again I find shelter for my dissent from the opinion of Mr. Haultain in the opinion of another man learned in the law—I mean Lord Watson, of the Privy Council. When the argument in the Manitoba case was proceeding before the Privy Council, Lord Watson interrupted Mr. Cozens Hardy, one of the counsels in that case, and what did he say about the very clause so frequently discussed in this House—clause 146, which authorizes the federal government to admit into the union the Northwest Territories, and to carve provinces out of them? He said:

The Imperial legislature in the Act of 1867 left niches to be filled by other provinces. As soon as those other provinces came in they were within the terms of section 93, but I quite admit, in this case, the terms upon which Manitoba came into the federation were settled by the Dominion parliament, otherwise they could not have exempted Manitoba from the provisions of section 93.

We have here the opinion of Lord Watson that the federal parliament acted within its jurisdiction when it exempted Manitoba from all the provisions of section 93, that is, when it claimed for Manitoba the rights under section 22 of the Manitoba Act as opposed to section 93 of the British North America Act which departed materially from it. Therefore we have here the dissent of Lord Watson from the opinion laid down by Mr. Haultain and the leader of the opposition that we must accept section 93 without modification as applicable to these provinces.

But, Sir, I suppose that when the Northwest Territories were admitted into confederation, the Canadian parliament meant what it said. I take also for granted that when the Imperial Order in Council was adopted, the imperial government knew what it did. Upon what terms were those Territories admitted? I will again read section 146 to show the point I want to make. That section says:

It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, on addresses from the Houses of parliament of Canada, and from the Houses of the respective Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, to admit those colonies or provinces, or any of them, into the union, and on address from the houses of the parliament of Canada to admit Rupert's Land and the Northwestern Territory, or either of them, into the union, on such terms and conditions in each case as are in the addresses expressed and as the Queen thinks fit to approve, subject to the provisions of this Act; and the provisions of any Order in Council in that behalf shall have effect as if they had been enacted by the parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

Moreover, what were the terms of the address that was voted by the federal parliament on the 12th of December, 1867, to admit Rupert's Land and the Northwest Territories? I will just read the two paragraphs which are of interest:

That the welfare of a sparse and widely scattered population of British subjects of European origin, already inhabiting these remote and unorganized Territories would be materially enhanced by the formation therein of political institutions——

—and I ask the House to weigh these words:

—bearing analogy, as far as circumstances will admit, to those which exist in the several provinces of this Dominion.

That we do therefore most humbly pray, that Your Majesty will be graciously pleased, by and with the advice of Your Most Honourable Privy Council to unite Rupert's Land and the Northwestern Territory with this Dominion, and to grant to the parliament of Canada authority to legislate for their future welfare and good government; and we most humbly beg to express to Your Majesty that we are willing to assume the duties and obligations of government and legislation as regards these Territories.

What were the terms of the Order in Council of the 23rd of June, 1870, in reply to this address?

It is hereby ordered and declared by Her Majesty, &c. . that from and after the 15th day of July, 1870, the said Northwestern Territory shall be admitted into and become part of the Dominion of Canada upon terms and conditions set forth in the first hereinbefore recited address, and that the parliament of Canada shall from the day aforesaid have full power and authority to legislate—

For the provisional welfare? No, Sir;

—for the future welfare and good government of the said Territory.

Mr. Haultain's contention is that the powers exercised under that Order in Council were provisional, and that the moment we pass this legislation those powers are wiped out and the educational provisions of the law of 1875 are abolished in the Northwest, because, he says, you could only give provisional powers, and the moment you create provincial government, the new provinces must have the same powers as [illegible] previously. The history of the legislation of 1875 has been given in this debate. The origin of that Act, which was introduced by Mr. Mackenzie at Mr. Blake's request, was stated in the debates of those days. Was it enacted that separate schools should exist in the Northwest Territories only for the time that they should be under our care and supervision? Was it only a provisional disposition? No. Mr. Blake stated that we should avoid introducing into that new country the religious disputes that had existed in the other provinces, because the parliament of Canada wanted to invite Roman Catholics to settle in the Northwest Territories as freely as any other class of people. Was it hinted that the Roman Catholic who went there to settle would have the liberty of education, as long as the provisional government existed, but that the moment this parliament, which had given its pledge of honour that that liberty should exist for all time to come, formed a provincial government, that government would be free to wipe out this privilege? After a man had tilled the soil for twenty-five or thirty years in the hope that his children would reap the benefit of his labour and have the same liberty that he had enjoyed, was it intended that the federal parliament should then say to him: 'You shall have your liberty no longer' and leave him at the mercy of the majority which has given evidence that it would not permit him to have that freedom? I say that if this parliament acted in good faith in 1875—and I do not want to presume that Mr. Blake, Mr. Mackenzie, Sir John Macdonald and Sir Alexander Campbell were men who did not act in good faith towards the people who would settle there—we are bound in honour, whatever may be the text of the law or the arguments of quibblers—if we are not bound by a sheet of paper, we are bound by the honour of this parliament, and by the memory of the men who made confederation—men like Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Blake, Sir John Macdonald and Sir Alexander Campbell—to be true to the pledge they gave and to prove that those statesmen were not perjurers.

But how is it that Mr. Haultain and the leader of the opposition, with their great care for provincial rights, have not a word to say against the maintenance of the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company which was passed by this parliament? Where are provincial rights in that case? Where is the theory of Mr. Haultain, that everything we did before this was provisional, and that we cannot restrict the new provinces? Mr. Haultain, the leader of the opposition and the

hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), are willing that we should impose on the people of the Northwest Territories for all time to come the incubus of that legislation. If we are going outside of our powers in trying to maintain the Act of 1875, in the matter of education, how is it that we are acting within our powers in maintaining the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway as regards the taxation of property in those Territories? At different intervals, while listening to the speech of the hon. the leader of the opposition on the second reading of this Bill, I was reminded of a saying of Sir Charles Tupper. And of Sir Charles this must be said, and I think it will be admitted on both sides, whatever may be our views regarding him in other respects, that he was always frank and outspoken. He never tried to shelter himself behind small texts of law. I well remember a sentence he uttered once during the debate on the Manitoba school question. Being taunted one day with not being versed in the law and being told that he had better not mix himself up with those legal texts, the old gentleman said: If to be a lawyer means that one must confine himself to texts of law and forget the difference between truth and untruth, I thank Heaven I am not a lawyer. Sir, at one part of the speech of the leader of the opposition I was forcibly reminded of that declaration of his predecessor. It was when turning to the Orange section of his party—I would rather not refer to the fact but it was patent to everybody—he said: If the government will show me a written contract in the case of education such as exists in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I am ready to abide by its maintenance. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that in his study of texts and legal quibbles, my hon. friend has forgotten one of the basic principles of law, and that is that the written document is not the contract. What is really the contract is the agreement entered into between the two parties, and the written document is only the evidence of that agreement. I will go further. Written contracts were invented by legislators when men became dishonest enough not to be true to their pledges and in order to guard against dishonesty. But if we are bound by our contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway, if the hon. the leader of the opposition and his followers are not strong enough to oppose the Canadian Pacific Railway, are we not bound by a far greater bond to the minority in the west, if there is any sense of justice and honour in this parliament? Are we not bound by the promise made by the highest statesmen of this country to the fathers of families who settled in these Territories, relying on the word of honour of the Canadian parliament? Are we not bound in honour by the word given to two millions of our fellow subjects of His Majesty, that in those Territories, which were bought with their money as well as the money of the majority, the rights of the minority, the freedom of conscience of the minority would be respected? This is a fact which should not be forgotten. Without going again into a deep and fine study of the question whether those Territories became part of the union in 1870 or whether those new provinces are entering the union now, there is one thing we know, and that is that they were purchased and paid for by the people of Canada as a whole. We know that every dollar which has been spent on the development of that country, we know that the millions of dollars which have been expended to bring foreign people into it, were contributed by Roman Catholics as well as Protestants. Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is one principle upon which I think we can safely appeal to the spirit of justice of any English speaking majority, it is that every man is equal before the collector of taxes. Therefore I say that when we are considering the rights and the law and the constitution, this very simple fact should not be forgotten. May I not go a little further? May I not make a special appeal, not to my compatriots but to the English speaking majority of this parliament, to pause and consider a little what the French Canadians have done for the opening up and development of that country.

When the English settlers of His Majesty were still on the banks of the Atlantic and had not crossed the Ohio and the Missouri, French Canadian priests, French Canadian traders and settlers had opened up that country. I shall go further. If there is one thing which ought to make a Canadian proud of his country, it is the contrast between the relations that have existed in Canada between the white and the red men and those relations which have existed between these two races in the neighbouring republic. Admitting that some credit is due to the policy of the government, long before governments existed, long before any law was introduced into that country, Catholic priests had gone there; and if those pioneers of Christian faith had not 200 years ago gone into that country to preach the law of charity and Christian civilization, we would have had repeated in Canada the same sad lamentable story of wars between the white and the red man which has marked the history of the United States. The peace of this western country of ours has been due to the good seed of charity, civilization and enlightenment which was sown there years ago by the members of that hierarchy which is now trying to impose its will upon the tender consciences of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition and Mr. Haultain. Let me proceed further, and point out that in 1870 there was a rebellion in that country, and a rebellion which has been justified by history and by the testimony of many public men. On what did the government of Canada then rely to appease those people? Did it rely on

armaments and rifles ? No, it relied on still more effective means. Were there then any cries raised about the powerful domination of the hierarchy ? No, the Prime Minister of that day, Sir John Macdonald, begged Archbishop Taché, who was then in Rome, for Heaven sake, to come back at once to Canada and establish peace in the Red River settlement. There is no hesitation to call in the hierarchy, when we can benefit by its aid. As the editor of 'La Patrie' very happily put it the other day : What we are denied is not our right to pay. Oh, no, it is our right to have full freedom. Archbishop Taché acted at once on this appeal. He abandoned his functions at the Ecumenical Council at Rome and came to the Red River settlement, and on his way stopped at Ottawa to meet Sir John Macdonald. 'Take any steps, said Sir John to him, to appease the Indians and the half-breeds.' Archbishop Taché however did not want to impose any pledges on politicians which perhaps they would not be strong enough to keep, and all he promised the native population was that the division of their lands would be respected and that they would have the free exercise of their religion and the schools they preferred for their children. What has become of those pledges ? The lands were divided against the wishes of those people and a second rebellion took place—a rebellion which has been justified by no less an authority than Colonel Denison who will not be charged with disloyalty and French demagogy.

What has become of the religious liberty, of the liberty of teaching of the Catholic population of the Northwest ? It has been abolished in Manitoba, against all pledges, against all words of honour ; and the author of that legislation can gain applause in this House by saying : 'If I have a title to the approval and support of the people of Canada, it is because I have gone back upon the pledges given in the name of the Queen of England to a law-abiding and peaceful population.' This, Mr. Speaker, is what we have come to. And now we are called upon to bow to this storm of feeling that has been aroused and to allow a still greater invasion of the rights of the people of that territory. It is time to face the storm. The powers that have raised that storm do not deserve that we should acknowledge their sovereignty. The principle of provincial rights is against them. The constitution is against them. The law is against them. Past pledges are against them. I will go further and say that a religious principle is at stake in this matter.

Under the terms of the capitulation of Montreal, in 1760, and of the Treaty of Paris of 1763, the free exercise of the Catholic religion was promised to the settlers who remained in Canada. And I say that there is no free exercise of the Catholic religion unless the Catholic parent has the full right to give to his child the education he wishes to give according to his conscientious beliefs. It is strange that there should exist in this country a prepossession in the minds of some people to the effect that in matters of education Roman Catholics have nothing to complain of if, in the public schools aided by the government, there is no sectarian education. As against this, let me put the authority, not of Roman Catholics, not of French Canadians, not of Canadian politicians, but of members of the Privy Council. During the appeal cases on the Manitoba school question this argument to which I have referred was brought forward—that there was no injustice under the laws of Manitoba, that the Catholics were on exactly the same footing as all others with respect to education, because education in the public schools was perfectly non-sectarian. What did Lord Watson say about that ?

> These kind of questions were more or less burning questions in Great Britain about the year 1865 or 1866, and during the whole of that period, as far as my knowledge and experience goes, there were large classes of Protestants, and especially Presbyterian Protestants, who I am glad to see are recognized as Christians in Manitoba, who were in favour of secular education, and think that religious education ought to be imparted in the family, or by the church, and not in a secular school, where they are learning the rudiments of knowledge. On the other hand there are a great number of Episcopalian Protestants who take a different view ; but I have never yet met a Roman Catholic who took that view.

And what did Lord Morris say later on ? The point had been urged that the Catholics ought to accept these schools, and Lord Morris said :

> But what is the use of discussing other matters ? Nobody can deny that Roman Catholics cannot avail themselves of the system.

And Lord Watson, speaking especially of the idea of the denominational school in the mind of the Roman Catholics, said :

> I rather think that the original idea of denominational schools is a school of a sect of people who are desirous that their own religion should be taught in it, and taught in their own way—a doctrinal religion ; and not only taught because religion is taught in a non-sectarian school, but, in the view of those who founded denominational schools originally, the theory was that their views of religion and teaching of their religion should permeate and run through all the education given in the school—that, whether it were rudimentary science or anything else, there should be an innoculation of the youthful mind with particular religious views.

And, in the judgment that was delivered in the second case, Lord Herschell said, speaking of the public schools system of Manitoba :

> While the Catholic inhabitants remain liable to local assessment, for school purposes, the proceeds of that assessment are no longer destined to any extent for the support of Catholic schools, but afford the means of maintaining schools which they regard as no more suitable for the education of Catholic children than if

they were distinctly Protestant in their character. . . . It is true that the religious exercises prescribed for public schools are not to be distinctively Protestant, for they are to be 'non-sectarian,' and any parent may withdraw his child from them. There may be many who share the view expressed in one of the affidavits in Barrett's case, that there should not be any conscientious objections on the part of Roman Catholics to attend such schools, if adequate means be provided elsewhere of giving such moral and religious training as may be desired. But all this is not to the purpose. As a matter of fact the objection of Roman Catholics to schools such as alone receive state aid under the Act of 1890 is conscientious and deeply rooted.

Is it not a strange fact that in England, the centre and heart of Protestantism, where the Catholic population is but a mere handful, where the idea of Roman Catholicism is generally associated in the public mind with the Irish land question or the agitation in favour of home rule for Ireland—is it not strange that Protestant statesmen and lawyers should have a better understanding and a broader view of what the rights of Roman Catholics are than in this country, where Roman Catholics form two-fifths of the population, and where no man can point to an action, individual or collective, to the discredit of Roman Catholics so far as their loyalty, their observance of the law, or their national spirit, is concerned ?

And this brings me to a question that has been lightly touched upon in this House by—I was going to say the yellow hierarchy—which has been lightly touched upon by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). And—it is just as well to frankly admit it—this question is the very basis of this discussion. I wish to treat completely, if I can, the question of the influence of the hierarchy and the alleged sinister motives animating the Roman Catholics in this House. I have referred to the case of Archbishop Taché in 1870. That was only one instance. Let us take our history since the beginning ; and I may say that when I read what is now appearing in the Ontario newspapers, I cannot help asking myself what kind of history can be taught in the public schools of Ontario ? Eleven years after this country had been acquired by England by treaty, when practically the whole population of Canada was French and Catholic, when the English-speaking Protestant population consisted almost wholly of a few traders in the city of Quebec, as the House knows, some trouble arose in certain English-speaking Protestant communities to the south, and some regiments, entirely composed of Anglo-Saxons and Protestants, came to besiege Quebec. The Governor of that day was named Guy Carleton—I do not know whether his name is ever mentioned in the public school histories of Ontario. When it was known that these regiments were on their way to Quebec, Governor Carleton issued a proclamation requiring all those who were not loyal to the British Crown to leave the city, and calling upon those who were loyal to the Crown to remain and defend it. Who went out ? Who staid in ? All the English Protestants left the city and went to the Island of Orleans to wait for the result. The French Canadians, who have been conquered twelve years before, remained there and saved Canada to the British Crown. Mind you, there were among the Anglo-Saxon rebels men of our race and creed. There were French regiments in the American army. Appeals were made to us by men of our blood, men whom the French race had no reason to be ashamed of. Among them was the Marquis de Lafayette. And what was our answer to the Marquis de Lafayette ? Under the guidance of that dominating hierarchy, we declared that we believed in the pledge given us by the King of England. We declared : The free practise of our religion is guaranteed to us ; and, so long as the King will not go back on us, we will never go back on him.

Thirty-six years later there was another little disturbance between the two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon Protestant family. Canada was again invaded ; and remember that in those 36 years of time, the French Canadians had been ill-treated, their public men had been put in gaol because they wanted to have what ? The same right that British citizens enjoyed in any other part of the empire. Their bishops had been threatened with the same treatment if they still dared to appoint parish priests instead of allowing Governor Craig to nominate them himself. In spite of that when the time of danger came, what did the representative of that obnoxious hierarchy say ? He said : 'My brethren, it is true we have been ill-treated, but I still believe that the law of justice will be stronger with our King than injustice ; stand by him, be loyal, be constitutional and the time of justice will come.' The French Canadians fought at Chateauguay and elsewhere and once again contributed to save Canada.

Twenty-five years later, the same ill-treatment having been carried on, some of our people rebelled, wrongly I think, not because their case was not just, but because, as their leader at the time, Papineau, told them, the rule of any British citizen was to carry on constitutional agitation but to avoid rebellion. In any case, at the request of an English speaking Protestant physician of the British army they rebelled in arms. Who stood out against the rebellion ? The same obnoxious representatives of the hierarchy who asked the French Canadians to remain peaceful.

A few years later an annexation movement was started in Canada. By whom ? By the hierarchy ? By the Jesuits ? By French Canadians and Catholics ? No, by the very political fathers of the hon. gentlemen opposite, because the British Crown at last had opened its ears to the claims of its French speaking subjects and was beginning to grant justice, and as those gen-

tlemen had been fed on injustice for years and years they rebelled against the Crown and pelted the governor because he had granted a measure of justice to the French Canadians; and immediately after that they issued an annexation manifesto. Some French Canadians signed it and others were disposed to sign it. Again came the obnoxious power of the hierarchy who told the people of Canada : 'No, be true and loyal, the day of justice is beginning to dawn and it will come by and by.' Later on when Confederation was being discussed it was not entirely acceptable to the people of Quebec. They had some suspicion of the treatment they might receive at the hands of the English speaking majority which up to that moment had not been such as to give them much confidence for the future. Again the hierarchy stood up and asked the people of Quebec to accept the compact which had been entered into. Has the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and his colleagues of the same—might I say hierarchy or sect ? no, of the same group of thought, if there is any thought in that group—have these gentlemen ever reflected on that point ?

Mr. SPROULE. Heap it on strong.

Mr. BOURASSA. They have, I think, one group of allies in Quebec. There has been for many years past a small anti-clerical party that has been using all these arguments against the domination of the priests, against the power of the hierarchy, but what has been their aim and object ? It has always been to throw down the British flag; and the great grievance they have against the bishops is that the bishops prevented us from joining the United States in 1774, again in 1812, and opposed the rebellion of 1837, supported British supremacy in 1849 and induced us to accept confederation. When newspapers in Ontario are filling their sheets with attacks and insults on the hierarchy they are simply insulting the men who, for 100 years have been the bulwark of British government in Canada. If there was any sincerity in these men, who are the great apostles and preachers of loyalty, they should feel ashamed of the attack they are now launching on the Catholic bishops of Canada, because when they attack the hierarchy they attack the party that has always stood by the British Crown, that has always stood by law, that has always stood by the flag that has given us the basis of a nation in this country.

Coming back to the point where I left my argument, it is just as well to realize the position in which we are. When you speak of the liberty granted to the Roman Catholic to go into a non-sectarian school there is no such thing as liberty. He may abide by the law if he be forced to send his child to such a school, but his religious liberty is interfered with. When, by any measure in this House or in any provincial parliament you force a Roman Catholic to send his children to a non-sectarian school, you are committing an act of injustice just as direct, just as much against the conscience of the Roman Catholic, as if you would force the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec to contribute to Roman Catholic denominational schools. This is the position urged upon and this is what was acknowledged frankly by Lord Watson, Lord Morris and Lord Herschell. May I say that there should be in this House a little more of that broad British spirit of tolerance, so that at last when we come to judge the feelings and the convictions of our fellow-citizens we should not trample on their feelings and override their convictions—we should endeavour to know the convictions of their hearts and to learn their thoughts ?

Sir, there is no solid ground left for those who are opposing this legislation as far as school matters are concerned. There is just one ground ; it may be a good one for some, but on the whole it is not a lasting one ; and that is the right of might. If the rule is to be laid down that there is to be one law to protect the Protestant minority of the province of Quebec, and that the same law shall not apply to Catholic minorities elsewhere, so far, so good ! But let men be strong enough to stand up here and say : 'No, the Catholics of the western provinces cannot enjoy in the west what the Protestants enjoy in Quebec, because, on the one hand, they are Catholic and on the other hand they are Protestants.' Let a statesman be strong enough to stand up in the House and say that, and he will strike the root of this question of legislation. There was only one man who came near that point, and I acknowledge his sincerity. It was the hon. member for Brandon the late Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton).

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BOURASSA. Sir, on this ground, I know my words are useless. I know that I probably represent the views of very few men in this House, but there is one thing I would like to impress upon the minds of my Protestant English speaking fellow members. It is that when one party gets up and says that justice cannot be done to the Roman Catholics in the Northwest and another party gets up and says there must be only a scant measure of justice because it cannot afford to have the people accept a full measure of justice, allow me to say that I think the good people of Ontario are not fairly represented in this House.

An hon. MEMBER. Bosh.

Mr. BOURASSA. I cannot believe that if any member in this House would go to his constituency, even the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule)—although I think the great process with that hon. gentleman would be to bring his mind to the point of understanding the question—I do not be-

lieve that if any hon. member in this House, even if he represents the most Protestant constituency, would go to his county and say: 'Here is the treatment which is accorded to our fellow citizens in the province of Quebec, here is the treatment which is accorded not only under the written law but under the law of the humane heart of the French Canadians who even at the time when they were persecuted by the British Crown always gave an ample measure of justice to the Protestant minority. Now, we ask you to stand by us in giving the same treatment to the Catholics of the western provinces that the Protestants have in the east. We ask you to remain true to the pledges given to that effect by the greatest statesmen of this country—I do not believe that such language would fail to bring a fair reply from the good people of Ontario.

Let the Liberals be true to the memory of Mr. Blake, of Mr. Mackenzie and even of Mr. George Brown, because when Mr. George Brown made up his mind that this compact should be observed, he was courageous enough to say that it should be observed in fact and for ever. So far as hon. gentlemen opposite are concerned, I do not wish, on an occasion like this, to speak from a party point of view. I may say to the leader of the opposition, for whom, on all other questions I have had up to this time the greatest respect, that when I listened to him the other day, I came to the conclusion that he was not speaking for the Conservative party, he was not showing himself to be the heir of Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper, but he was only voicing the opinions of a gentleman who was obliged to find an abode in the county of Carleton in order to obtain a seat in this House. The hon. gentleman is broad enough—I render him that justice—he is broad enough by birth, by nature and by education to be fair-minded, that he had not the courage to stand by his new flag; and he felt obliged to gather up a pile of small documents and papers behind which to shelter himself in his denial of justice.

We have frequently been told: Why can't you trust the majority of the people of the Northwest? Well, Sir, here again I must speak frankly; and I say: No, we cannot. Suppose we could trust the people who are living there now; is there a man in this House childish enough to say that the condition of things which exists now is sure to exist in the Northwest fifty years hence? What will be the population up there? Who knows what feelings will dominate the majority there? Who knows but that the great majority of the people there will be settlers coming from a land where the idea, not only of non-sectarian schools but of Godless schools, now prevails, and to my mind, to the great detriment of the future of the republic? Who can tell what the future will be? But confining myself entirely to a survey of past events, I say now that we cannot trust the present majority of the people of the Northwest to stand for right and justice. Their record is before us. It is my intention to make a comparison, for the enlightenment of our friends up there, if my words can reach them, and for the enlightenment of my English speaking Protestant friends in the House and out of it; I am going to make a comparison between the history of the school legislation in the Northwest and the history of the school legislation in Quebec, and I am ready to abide by the judgment that will be passed by any fair minded man, if not by his vote, at least by his conscience.

The leader of the opposition made another fine legal argument to show that the people of the Northwest have never legislated on that subject. I admit that from a narrow legal point of view the people of the Northwest did not legislate freely, because they were bound by the Northwest Territories Act, just as this parliament cannot legislate freely because we are bound by the British North America Act, and just as any parliament in this country is not free because all the powers possessed by any legislative body in Canada is limited by imperial legislation. But I presume that we can ascertain the feelings of the people of the Northwest by considering their legislation. In 1885, ten years after the Northwest Territories Act was passed, legislation was enacted by the legislature which, within its scope, was just as free as this parliament. And what did they do? As the ex-Minister of the Interior clearly told us the other day, they passed a law quite in accord with the letter and with the spirit of clause 11 of the Act of 1875. They passed a law similar to the one we have in Quebec, a law by which Catholics had the management of their own schools, had the choice of their own text books, and had the right to have their schools inspected by men of their own creed—but all under government supervision. They enjoyed separate schools, not only in name but in fact, as the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) well stated the other day. The inspectors had to be appointed by the government, but they were chosen by the Catholic section, just as in the province of Quebec Protestant schools are inspected by inspectors chosen by the Protestant section of the Board of Education. The books used in the separate schools of the Northwest were also selected by the Catholic section, and approved by the government. That state of things went on for some years, and then, in 1892, after several other ordinances had been passed, the separate school system, as the member for Brandon stated the other day, was wiped out. Lately, Mr. Haultain, who is now here claiming liberties for his people, has given utterance to his lofty opinions on this matter, he has

said: If I were a dictator to-morrow I would not abolish separate schools, all I want is freedom for my province. But Mr. Haultain never told the country of a little fact in his political career which I will take the liberty of divulging to the House. When Mr. Dalton McCarthy, in 1892 and in 1894, brought into this House a Bill to abolish separate schools and the French language in the Northwest Territories, he was acting upon an address voted in the legislature of the Northwest Territories, moved by Mr. Cayley and seconded by Mr. Haultain. Therefore I think I now have the right to say, as claiming some liberty for the minority in the Northwest, that I have no confidence in Mr. Haultain, who now comes here posing as our friend, but who was one of the first men to start a movement in the legislative assembly to abolish the separate schools.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY. Would the hon. gentleman allow me? I think he is a little inaccurate in stating that this was legislation to abolish separate schools. The legislation then sought was only to delegate to the legislative assembly the right to do as they saw fit; and they will of course continue the separate school system if they so choose.

Mr. BOURASSA. I am glad my hon. friend has interrupted me, because he affords me an opportunity of illustrating once more what I said a little while ago, that every time an act of persecution is committed, it is committed under a false pretense. Everybody knew the views of the hon. gentleman—and whose views I certainly respect—who was so closely connected with the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. L. McCarthy). The motion which was made in this House by Mr. Dalton McCarthy, and which he developed by a very eloquent argument, was to wipe out the separate schools and wipe out the French language on the ground that there should be only one race and one language in this country. It is useless to resort to legal quibbles. The purpose of Mr. Haultain and of Mr. McCarthy was to abolish Catholic education and the French language; they succeeded so far as the language is concerned, and they succeeded to a large extent in so far as schools are concerned, according to the testimony of the hon. member for Brandon.

There is one fruther point I would like to draw to the attention of our friends on this side of the House. I have listened to the very nice words, words with which I agree completely, spoken to us by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs; I entirely agree with their conciliatory sentiments. I especially coincide with the Minister of Finance, who gave us a good illustration and a strong re-enforcement of the argument I have tried to make, when he painted the happy condition of things which exist in the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, where the majority, in order to do justice to their Catholic fellow citizens, had to grant them separate schools in fact. So it is not only in Quebec and Ontario that we have separate schools. I have visited the maritime provinces frequently, and was happy to observe the good relations which exist between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants there.

But, may I suggest to the Minister of Finance, if the Roman Catholic minority had not developed the strength of numbers that it represents to-day in those provinces, would it be treated as it is treated? We know the history of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. I do not want to bring up old feuds, but I am bound to say, looking through the history of all the provinces of Canada, that while in the province of Quebec the same ample measure of justice was always granted to the minority, unfortunately in all the English speaking provinces there was a time when the passions of the majority were aroused and successfully aroused against the Catholic minority. In consequence, a feeling has developed—not of distrust—but a feeling has developed amongst us that if we want equality and peace to reign in this country, we must give to the representatives of the majorities in the English speaking provinces the right to do what Sir Oliver Mowat did. I took an active part in two elections in the province of Ontario; I was but a boy at the time, but I was proud to stand by Sir Oliver Mowat and help in his campaign for justice and equality. I was living on the borders of the province of Ontario and I crossed the river of my own free will without being asked by anybody, without being known by anybody, to do what I could in support of the old statesman. What was the argument used by Sir Oliver Mowat? He was prudent and he knew of the power of the appeals made by such men as the member of East Grey. When the system of separate schools was attacked in Ontario, Sir Oliver Mowat said. 'I shall not discuss the relative merits of separate schools and public schools; I am not any partisan of separate schools; but separate schools have been established in this province under law, and therefore it is useless to agitate against the law of the land.' What I want is that the future rulers of the Northwest may be put in such a position that when passions are aroused and prejudices fomented by such men as we have in this House, by such newspapers as we have in this country, these future rulers of the Northwest will be in a position to say—when passion is too strong or when they are not strong enough to oppose it—'What is the use? there is a law protecting the minority.' I do not wish to cast any aspersion on the breadth of mind of any

future statesman of Canada, but it is no harm for the peace of the country, it is no harm for the good of our land, that should prejudices exist between creeds and nationalities, every Canadian statesman, whether he be weak or strong, whether he be popular or unpopular, can always find a shelter under the constitution of our country and be able to point out to all men that there is laid down in our constitution the clear written principle that equal justice exists for all and that Catholics as well as Protestants have the right to live in this country.

It may be said : But what is all this trouble about ? The minority in the west is satisfied ; it is only the hierarchy, it is only the Quebec crowd who are trying to impose their will upon the Territories. Sir, that is one of the most cynical arguments that has been used so far. We have the testimony of the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), who ought to know, that when the ordinances abolishing separate schools were passed in the Northwest, a protest was made. The member for Brandon—I do not know if it was in a moment of forgetfulness, or if it was because he also has been drawn into the dangerous abyss in which some gentlemen opposite are having such a fine time these days—but the member for Brandon said the protest came from the Roman Catholic clergy and in order to convince us, he immediately gave the opinion of two of the most eminent laymen of the Northwest Territories ; two fathers of families, two representatives of the people, one the Lieutenant Governor to-day and the other a judge of the Supreme Court. These were the members of the hierarchy quoted by the hon. member from Brandon. These gentlemen came here and they said: 'An injustice has been done us ; we are deprived of the right of giving to our children the education which our conscience binds us to give ; our money is taken for the support of schools we cannot attend.' But, they were sent away from Ottawa ; they were not numerous enough probably to obtain justice. Then they went to the provincial assembly and again they laid their case at the foot of the Crown—as the Crown was represented there—and again they were found to be too weak and too few. Because they did not rebel in arms, because they accepted the established state of things; a state of things which was a breach of the compact, a state of things which in the words of Sir John Thompson and the words of the member for Brandon, constituted a legal encroachment upon their rights; because they did not rebel in arms; because they followed the advice that has always been given by the hierarchy to the Catholics of this country to be peaceful ; now they are told : 'You are satisfied ; ask for nothing more because you can't expect it.' To my friends who are saying to us : 'Be conciliatory ; let us cut in two what remains.' I shall cite a little illustration which may perhaps help some of them to realize the situation. Suppose that Canada stands in the position of a father having two sons, big Peter and little Paul. He gives $4 to big Peter and $2 to little Paul and he says : 'Now, boys, agree together, work together, do the best you can with the money I gave you.' Once they are on the street big Peter gets after little Paul, beats him and takes $1.50 of his two dollars. These gentlemen opposite stand up and say : Don't tyrannize big Peter ; but force little Paul to give Peter the 50 cents he has left. And hon. gentlemen on this side of the House get up and say : Be conciliatory, take those 50 cents left to Paul, and divide it with big Peter, for after all big Peter is a good fellow.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Little Paul comes from Nova Scotia.

Mr. BOURASSA. I am not going to be dragged into provincial limits just now. Now, Sir, there is another subject which is much talked of in the public press, but which has not been treated of in this House and I think one voice at least should be raised in parliament to protest against it. It is said : 'Admitting that the constitution allows you to grant separate schools to the Northwest, yet you should not fasten upon these people such a bad system of education which has made of Spain, of Italy, of France, of all Catholic countries, the scum of the earth.' And we are told : Look at the province of Quebec, look at the south of Ireland, a degraded population, a low-minded ignorant people.

I propose to deal for a few moments with the subject of Catholic education, with what it has done for the world, in what way it has succeeded and why it has not always succeeded. Here again I am tempted to ask: What kind of history is taught in the public schools of this country ? I know as well as any man, and I have learned to know in the Catholic schools where I was educated, that there is such a thing as the evolution of nations, that nations in our own age as well as nations in the past, and as well as nations to come for all time, have and will have their periods of prosperity, and their days of decadence.

The race from which I sprung has done so much for the enlightenment and civilization of this world that I can, without undue baseness, admit that the Anglo-Saxon is now ahead among the nations. But I may remind my English speaking friends that three centuries before there was anything like English civilization, Catholic Spain had covered the world not only with physical power, but with civilization and enlightenment—with schools of higher education and primary education and with a knowledge of all then available sciences that no nation

has since surpassed ; and this is no disparagement of the English any more than the present pre-eminence of the Anglo-Saxon is a disparagement of the Spanish. May I remind my Englisr-speaking friends also that three hundred years ago, in Venice and Genoa, those Catholic-ridden states, the system of book-keeping, of stock exchange, of currency, of everything which the Anglo-Saxon is using now with such success, was practiced to an extent which brought to those little republics a degree of prosperity and civilization which, considering their time and their size, has never been surpassed. I could go on with examples like these ; I could make a history of the world with such examples, after the manner of a speech which was made in this House some years ago by I think my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes), who began at the creation and ended with the end of the world. I will content myself with stating the truism that nations grow, develop, prosper, and then pass into oblivion. The Greeks have passed ; the Romans have passed ; the Italians and Spanish have passed. Let the Anglo-Saxon look to the Slav and the Japanese before he concludes that he possesses the world for ever. But this is not the point. The point is, what has Catholic education done for Catholic countries ? If our friends who are making so much noise about the corruption of Catholic countries would go to the depth of the history of those countries, they would find that their greatest time of material as well as moral prosperity coincided with the time when the Catholic church, not dominated, but inspired those countries, and when Catholic education high or low, was given to all classes of the people. Spain began to decay when greeders in the colonies displaced the missionaries—when the King of Spain lent himself to the anti-Catholic movement which started in France and which led to the abolition of the Jesuit order. The same thing happened in France. But why not go for an example to countries which are now under Catholic influence ? The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule)—I do not know what text book he got his information from, but if it is authorized in any province, it should be taken from the schools at once—spoke of the national non-sectarian system of education carried on in Belgium. Now, Belgium is one of the most prosperous countries on earth, and there you have Catholic education right through, from the primary school to the university. But let me point to a Protestant nation, Germany, where thirty-three years ago the Prussians abolished Catholic education and expelled the Jesuits and other religious orders from the country. What do you see there now ? The German Emperor, observing the progress which Catholic education has made in the empire, is turning to the Catholic hierarchy and asking them to save his empire from the dangers of socialism. Might I refer some of our friends also to the comments appearing daily in the American papers and reviews, coming not from Catholic priests or bishops or Catholic religious orders, but from Protestants, eminent Protestants, men of science, professors of universities and statesmen, among a few statesmen who find their way to political life in the United States, who recognize that what must save the United States from the social plague which is going to involve all nations between the crushing burden of capitalism and the equally crushing burden of standing armies, is the influence of the Catholic church on the working classes. I am not saying this in disparagement of any other creed ; but, in view of the fact that during the past two months railing attacks have been made against the creed of two millions of the subjects of His Majesty in this country, I feel that I should stand up here and say that the Catholic people and the Catholic hierarchy will never suffer when compared with any other creed or sect.

But, leaving aside foreign countries, and coming to my own poor province, the province of Quebec, let us study for a moment what has been the influence of the Catholic church on the development of education in that province ? It is generally contended in all English-speaking provinces that we are—I will not say an inferior race, because I do not think that is accepted by a great number of the English-speaking people ; but it is very often contended that the system of education in the province of Quebec is an inferior one, and that that province has a greater number of illiterate people than any of the other provinces. It may be that a little insight into the history of the educational system of Quebec will throw some light on the subject. Before the conquest, the French government had given lavishly what was necessary for the support of public education in New France. At the time of the cession there was necessarily a great disturbance of the whole system. Five years after the cession of Canada the Jesuit order was suppressed by the Pope ; and, strange to say, there was nobody at the time to raise an argument against the English government for using a papal bull. On the day that papal decision was registered, all the estates belonging to the Jesuits were seized by the British government. Those estates had been given to the Jesuits with the legal obligation of founding colleges and secondary and primary schools ; and before the conquest they had established two colleges and a great number of primary schools—a greater proportion being given to the people of New France than were given in the British colonies to the south. After the estates of the Jesuits were seized by the British government, were the proceeds used for the education of the people ? No. The Montreal College was destroyed, and was replaced by the Champ de Mars.

the Quebec College was seized and the pupils and professors turned out, and soldiers put in. For thirty years after representative institutions were given to us, we petitioned the British government to give us back those estates, not to return them to the Jesuits, but to use them for the purposes of education, and we were refused. For twenty-seven years we were refused any education law. In 1801 the government imposed on us a system of education under the control of the Anglican bishop of Quebec, through which Anglican students of theology were sent to all the Catholic centres with the avowed object—because at that time they had the frankness to avow the purpose of their operations—of turning young French Canadians into English-speaking Protestants. Naturally our people refused to send their children to those schools: but while the legislative assembly was voting money for educational purposes, the English governors handed the proceeds over to the Protestant schools and gave not one cent to the Catholics. That continued during 24 years until at last the legislative assembly passed a law which gave the Catholic church wardens the right to take a part of the revenues of their poor parish churches and devote it to the building and maintaining of their own schools. And at the same time the Protestant schools were kept up with the moneys paid by the Catholics and appropriated by the government. That went on until 1841, when the two provinces of Upper and Lower Canada became united. It was only then that the province of Quebec obtained its first school law. What was that law? It was a law which Lord Sydenham forced upon his advisers. Under it the whole school system was put under the municipal authorities, who were appointed by the governor personally, and the governor was careful to appoint a majority of English speaking Protestants to regulate the school system of a population, nine-tenths of which were French speaking Catholics. It was only in 1846 that we finally secured a system of schools satisfactory to our people. So that during 100 years we were deprived of the right of using our own money for the education of our own people. Is it then surprising that there should be some people in our province to-day who can neither read or write? While the English speaking immigrants who did not profess the Catholic religion, found on our shores, even in the Catholic province of Quebec, a system of education suited to their consciences, under which their own schools were entitled to their proper share of the public money, and while these people had come from the British Isles or the United States, from countries where there was an established system of education which suited them, for a hundred years the great majority of the province of Quebec were deprived of the opportunity of educating their children. Am I not then justified in saying that if you will compare the results of our education, which is only fifty years old, with those of the education in the English speaking provinces, which practically had no beginning, because it was simply the continuation of the American and English systems, we have no reason to be ashamed. As far as higher education is concerned—and that education with us is entirely in the hands of our clergy—let me give, not my testimony, but that of a professor of McGill University, Dr. Johnstone, who some years ago made certain comments upon the difference between the attainments of the pupils of McGill University who came from the Catholic colleges and those who came from the high schools. He was struck with the fact that there was always a preponderance of points secured by those who came from the Catholic colleges, and he said:

> There was no possibility of mistaking the superiority of the men with classical training. I was so struck with what appeared to be a marked difference between the two divisions of the classes that without suspecting what I now believe to be the true course of it, I, many years ago, assigned separate rows of seats in the lecture room to them, in order to make quite sure of the fact. Year after year there was the same invariable result.

May I also refer to the results of the examinations carried on at the Manitoba University, where the pupils of the Jesuits college of St. Boniface compete in the proportion of 1 to 15 or 18—three or five out of 80 or 100 altogether? Those pupils of the Jesuits' college generally carry off from thirty to thirty-five per cent of the points and medals given. True, we are not now discussing higher education, but primary schools. Well, if the primary school system be so rotten as it is said to be, surely it could not send to our colleges young men who are so successful when they come into competition with the students from the other schools. But I look at the question from another point of view. Suppose there should be a little less book-keeping taught in our primary schools than is taught in the public schools. I lay it down as a basis of social law that the right to educate the child belongs in the first place to its parents; and, therefore, when the state takes the place of the parent, it is bound to give that child the same moral education which the father would give it in his own house. Secondly, the duty of the government is to develop law-abiding, broad-minded citizens; and, thirdly, to give the child school knowledge. I claim if that rule is considered our system has given better results than any other. We never see in the province of Quebec or in any part of the country in which Catholics can have any control, the display of passion and prejudice which we are now witnessing among those who advocate public schools as against separate schools. We see in the outbursts to-day

in which sectarian prejudice is appealed to, the result of public school education, and we are justified in saying that in the province of Quebec, under our system, we have never produced any thing of the kind.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has pointed with pride to his own province. But there is still one province ahead of Nova Scotia as far as the spirit of tolerance is concerned, and that is the province of Quebec. Do some of our friends who make so much noise about the illiteracy and narrow mindedness of that province under priestly control, know that Lower Canada was the first self-governing part of the British Empire, not excluding Great Britain and Ireland, where disabilities were removed from the Jews? We emancipated the Jews in the province of Quebec before the Catholics were emancipated in England. At the very time that we in the province of Quebec were denied our most sacred natural rights, every new creed that came to that province was given complete civil and corporate powers. Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists were granted by the Legislative Assembly of Quebec the same powers to keep civil registers and act as corporate bodies as were given Catholics. Do they know that at the time when we were denied the right of teaching our children according to our conscience, we always put Protestant schools on the same footing as our own as regards the law and the constitution? I go further, as far as the working of our system of education is concerned. May I refer hon. members to a speech made by the right hon. the First Minister in 1893 in which he said in substance : 'I know that the law protects the minority in the province of Quebec, but there are many ways in which an unwilling majority can evade the law—and we have evidence of that in several provinces of the Dominion. Suppose, for instance, the government of the province of Quebec were to abolish the Protestant section of the Council of Education. Would not that be an infamous thing which would call for redress at the hands of a federal government?' Well, that was done by the government of the Northwest Territories some years ago. But if it be infamous to abolish the supervision of Protestant schools by Protestants, how comes it to be perfectly proper to abolish the supervision of Catholic schools by Catholics? How can one thing be good in the west and bad in the east? How can it be just in the west and unjust in the east? If we are to make a nation of this country, surely every one will admit that the principle must prevail, not in word but in fact, of equal rights and equal justice to all.

To again give the House an idea of what kind of argument is offered to our English speaking friends these days on this question, may I read a few lines written by a very talented gentleman in the city of Quebec, and an Anglican minister, the Rev. F. G. Scott:

> If we are to be a house divided against [illegible] if we are to set province against province and perpetuate our racial discords, there can be but one ultimate result, and that is the submergence of Canada by the United States and the grand sweeping away of all of our civil strife by the uprooting of treaties, rights and legal safeguards under a nation that recognizes no state religion and tolerates no duality of speech.
>
> To avert that, to save Canada to Canadians, we must establish, as I have said a broad spirit of Canadian sentiment and that can only be done by a system of national common schools. The day is past when we looked to England's interests first. Canada comes first to Canadians ; and to the west, broad, tolerant and expansive, we look for the light and healing of the spirit of true Canadianism that will put an end to the inherited animosities which darken and strangle the national life of the older Canada.

And then there is this still better :

> Of course, the true inwardness of this attempt to force upon the new provinces a school system distasteful to them, is the desire to establish French Canadian colonies in the west, where separate schools would enable them to establish the French language over wide areas. The means for doing this would be readily furnished by the religious communities expelled from France, and it would not be many years before there would grow up in the west a new Quebec, with all its racial, lingual and sectarian animosities, eating the life out of true Canadian nationalism.

There are English-speaking Protestants from my province in this House. I wish the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) were here. I see here my hon. friend from Shefford (Mr. Parmelee). And the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) is present. I will ask any one of these Protestant representatives from my province, whether present at the moment or not, and whether Conservative or Liberal, and regardless of their opinions in the legislation that is now before us, to state frankly in this House whether there is, in their opinion, in any part of Canada, or in any part of the world, so much toleration of so much breadth of mind as that shown by French Canadians towards their English-speaking Protestant compatriots. The other day a letter was published in the Toronto 'News' which attracted my attention. It was written by a gentleman in the town of Aylmer in the neighbouring county of Wright. This is what it said, speaking of the schools of Quebec :

> The separate school system is one of distrust, suspicion and antagonism. . . . As it is, the priesthood are given control and proficiency, while they teach the merest rubbish for history, while the teaching of the catechism leaves no other impression possible but that Protestants are a curse to the earth.

Now, that letter was written in the county of Wright opposite Ottawa. That county is two-thirds French Canadian and four-fifths Catholic. There was a by-election in that county three weeks

before that letter was written. Three candidates were in the field. The Liberal candidate was an Irish Canadian without a drop of French blood in his veins. The Conservative candidate was a Scotch Presbyterian without any trace of French Canadian blood. A third candidate came into the field and appealed to my fellow-countrymen, saying: 'This county is two-thirds French Canadian; you should not vote for an Irishman or a Scotchman; you should vote for me, a French Canadian.' And what was the result? The French Canadian who appealed to racial passion in that county, notwithstanding that the voters were brought up under this priestly education, notwithstanding that they were educated in schools where they were 'taught that Protestants were a curse to the earth'—this French Canadian lost his deposit. The Irish Canadian was elected. And the Scotch Presbyterian received the strongest Conservative vote that had been cast in the county for years and years. And, in the city of Hull, where the whole population is under 'priestly education,' where the teachers are not merely the ordinary parish priests, but priests who belong to the monastic orders, some of these 'abominable orders' of which the Reverend Scott is so afraid; in the city of Hull where the schools are wholly in the hands of friars and nuns, and where any man who spent his childhood there has received no other education than that given by these friars and nuns under the control of the hierarchy; in that Liberal Catholic and French Canadian city of Hull the Scotch Presbyterian Conservative candidate had a majority of the votes. Sir, the province of Quebec, where you may so frequently notice Protestant Englishmen elected by a French-speaking majority, is the only province where you find such proofs of toleration and breadth of view. And the same has been true since confederation and long before confederation.

Mr. Speaker, may I be allowed to speak of a little experience I have had in this relation? It shows the working of the school laws in my province. There is a small country newspaper in the county of Quebec which has declared that the result of the separate school law in Quebec was to drive the Protestants out of the province. I refer to the Huntingdon 'Gleaner.' And the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has re-echoed that declaration. I passed most of my life—and my happiest days, because they were before I entered public life—in a small village on the borders of the Ottawa river forming one municipality of eight hundred souls. This village was separated municipally and for school purposes from the parish in which it was situated and which also contained some eight hundred souls. In these two municipalities there were three English-speaking Protestant families. The father of one family was the head of a large lumbering firm and the fathers of the other two families were the other's clerks. These three families lived in the village. They organized a separate school under the law. Then the lumbering company bought immense properties in the parish. Under our 'priest-administered' law, the Protestant ratepayers—as they were entitled to do by law—annexed this property to the village for school purposes, thus depriving the Catholic ratepayers of the parish of all the receipts of their schools on account of that land. But there was not a word of dispute. There came a time when the separate school was not carried on according to law, because, in our province as in others, it requires a certain school attendance to make a school under the law. There came a time when all the taxes paid by the Protestants went to support a school where there were only five or six children, which is only half or one-third of the number required under the law. One of the Catholic ratepayers suggested: 'Why don't we abolish the separate school and get all that money?' I put my foot upon the proposition at once. I said: 'My friend, if you think as I do and as, I believe, the people of this parish and of this village do, you will never ask a man, rich or poor, to contribute a cent to the maintenance of a school system in which he does not believe.' And the whole population was with me. That whole 'priest-ridden population'—and they were poor farmers—preferred to pay twice as much as they otherwise would rather than ask these Protestant ratepayers to contribute, as they were legally bound to do, to the maintenance of any other than this separate school. Show me such an example in any of the English-speaking Protestant provinces of this Dominion, and I will admit that the separate school system cannot develop a national spirit.

Let me refer my hon. friends to the example of a country, that, perhaps above all the nations of the earth, has done most for the development of ideas of liberty and toleration: the little republic of Switzerland. There is in Switzerland a population composed of three nationalities with clearly marked differences of religion. They have the Protestant Germans and the Catholic French and Italians. After their common struggle for liberty, they fought among themselves for years and for centuries—the Germans to impose the German language and the Protestant religion upon the others and the French seeking to impose the French language and the Catholic religion upon the Germans. But the day came when they found out that only principle under which they could maintain their union was that every man should be free to worship God in his own church and to educate his children in his own school. And upon that principle of toleration they have carried on their schools; and to my mind, their national

spirit is much more united, than unfortunately ours is at the present day.

Now, Sir, there is one last point I wish to make. I contend that if we look upon this question from the point of view of a broad national ideal, not only should we propose the widest measure of liberty for the minority of the Northwest, but, even if it were not asked for and if we were not bound to give it, we should, in duty to Canada and to the integrity of the empire, establish separate schools in the Northwest in the fullest sense of the word.

I have stated, at the opening of my remarks, that nobody knows what the population of that country will be fifty or one hundred years hence. Do you want to make it safely Canadian? Do yo want to have there a nucleus of population whose only love, whose only care will be for this soil of ours, who will have no other devotion but to the future and the welfare of Canada? Open the Northwest to the French Canadian, emplant him there and give him all his freedom and liberty. Make him feel that he is at home in the west just as much as in the east, make him feel that he can have there the same religious liberty that he enjoys at home, and which he gives to his neighbour at home and you will have there a growing tree that will stand the storm, resist the influence of American absorption and the development of foreign ideals, because the French Canadian is the oldest Canadian, because the French Canadian has founded on the soil of our country the whole of his hopes. He has abandoned the past; he has ceased to look to any foreign country for the development of his moral and material forces and when you compare the past with the present, when you think that all the French Canadians, whether living in this country under the British flag or in the United States under the stars and stripes, that these 3,000,000 French Canadians are all the descendants of 60,000 peasants who were abandoned on this land by the French government 150 years ago, who had been ruined by the French government, robbed by French intendants whose methods British governors faithfully followed; when it will be remembered that those 60,000 peasants, unaided by any influx whatever of immigration and capital, have developed their education, their agriculture and their trade; that they have done all they could for Canada whether in peace or war, and if you consider the point at which they started and the result they have achieved, there is no reason why any man in this House should be afraid of the hold the French Canadians may obtain in the west.

Again referring to past history might I once more appeal to my English speaking friends in this House and say to them: Do not trust the religious zealot. Remember the New England Puritan who burned witches 200 years ago. He condemned the British Government because it granted religious liberty to the French Canadians, but ten years later he rebelled against the British Crown and was stopped from entering Canada only by the French Canadians. Do not trust too much to the political jingo. Remember 1849, when the fathers of the Tories wrecked the parliament buildings and rotten-egged the governor for giving freedom to all. I simply say this and I leave my friends with these words: Be just to the French Canadians. That is all I ask. I do not ask you to be generous, if the state of mind of your province has not yet been brought up to the state of mind that we have in Quebec. If you cannot afford to be generous, all I ask you is to be just. Give us the same rule that we have given you, do for us what we have done for you and trust the French Canadians under the guidance of that hierarchy which has stood for British connection in the past. The French Canadian's heart is generous, his heart is grateful and he will never forget what you have done. But on the other hand—and in this I am not uttering any threat—I regret every time I go back to my province to find developing that feeling that Canada is not Canada for all Canadians. We are sometimes in Quebec accused of being provincialists. We are not provincialists by nature. We have stood for the defence of the whole soil of Canada and have contributed our share for the benefit of the whole of Canada. But after such examples as we have had in New Brunswick, in Manitoba, and the Northwest Territories, after such attempts as were made in Ontario itself where we were preserved only because there was a text of law, we are bound to come to the conclusion that Quebec is our only country because we have no liberty elsewhere. I do not say that we are treated as slaves; but we are proud enough and I contend that we have rendered service enough to claim at the hands of the majority of this country not only such treatment as you would grant to a good natured inferior being, but such treatment as I think we, as your brethren, are entitled to receive at your hands. If you do that, if you are just and just without quibbling, just and just without trying to take with one hand what you give with the other, I say: Trust the French Canadian in the west or in the east, trust the French Canadian anywhere in Canada; he will be true to you, true to the British Crown, if you do not expel from his mind the belief that Canada is a free country and that the British Crown is in this country the protector of equal justice and equal law.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN (Peel). I do not propose to follow the very lengthy address of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). I am quite sure that the people of the province of Quebec and of the

other portions of Canada are quite well aware that the hon. gentleman has been delivering this same lecture in different parts of Canada for several years past. While I do not wish to make any comparisons, for I do not think it is the duty of a member of parliament, living in a country of this kind, to make too many comparisons between the different nationalities of this country, may I be permitted after the reference that my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) has made to the narrowness of the English-speaking people of Canada to say that I come from the province of Ontario. We had a general election for the local legislature there a few weeks ago and I might say to my hon. friend that the city of Toronto sent a Roman Catholic representative to that legislature and that Roman Catholic has the honour of a seat in Mr. Whitney's cabinet at this moment. And may I be permitted to remind my hon. friends of the French nationality that for the first time in the history of the province of Ontario your own town, Mr. Speaker, has been recognized by the putting into office of the Hon. Dr. Rheaume, Minister of Public Works in Mr. Whitney's cabinet. And of course I need not refer to my hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Claude Macdonell), who sits on this side of the House, as another example of the generosity of the English speaking people of that important province, I was a little interested to hear my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) dealing with those legal questions and I thought I would look up the history of the hon. gentleman to see what knowledge he had to bring to bear in competition with that of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). I find on examination that my hon. friend had one special Act of parliament passed in his own province of Quebec to permit him to study law in that province. Then on further examination, I find another special Act of parliament passed for the hon. gentleman to allow him to pass an examination that he has never yet passed and he has not to this date practised law in his own province, and yet my hon. friend will put his opinion on these legal questions in competition with the opinion of the distinguished leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). On February 21, the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) introduced the two Bills that are to constitute new provinces in what is now known as the Northwest Territories. The right hon. gentleman gave to the House a very lengthy history of different matters in connection with those Bills. I have here Bill (No. 69) 'An Act to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta,'

Clause 12 of the Act reads:

> Until the said legislature otherwise provides, the legislative assembly shall be composed of twenty-five members to be elected to represent the electoral divisions defined.

Clause 3 of the Bill says:

> The said province shall be represented in the Senate of Canada by four members: provided that such representation may, after the completion of the next decennial census, be from time to time increased to six by the parliament of Canada.

Clause 8 says:

> Unless and until the Lieutenant Governor in Council of the said province otherwise directs, by proclamation under the great seal, the seat of government of the said province shall be at Edmonton.

Clause 20 of the Bill says:

> The Dominion lands in the said province shall continue to be vested in the Crown and administered by the government of Canada for the purposes of Canada.

Clause 24 enacts:

> This Act shall come into force on the 1st day of July, one thousand nine hundred and five.

I may be permitted briefly to refer to Bill No. 70 to establish and provide for the government of the province of Saskatchewan. The same number of representatives, 25, are to be elected in that province; the same number of senators, four, are to be appointed to the senate of Canada, with the privilege of parliament increasing the number to six. The capital of the province is to be Regina; and this Act also is to come into force on the 1st of July next. I will now give the areas in square miles of the various provinces:

Amount to be paid annually to each province.	
Support to government	$ 50,000
Estimated population of 250,000 at 80 cents per head	200,000
Interest at 5 per cent. per annum on $8,107,500	405,375
In lieu of lands retained by the Dominion government	375,000
Construction of public buildings to be paid yearly for five years only	94,500
Total	$1,124,875 each.
For two provinces	$2,249,750
This to increase from time to time until it reaches an annual payment of	$2,207,875 each.
For two provinces	$4,415,750
Prince Edward Island	2,284
Nova Scotia	21,428
New Brunswick	27,985
Quebec	351,873
Ontario	260,862
Manitoba	73,732
British Columbia	372,630
Total	1,110,694
New Provinces.	
Alberta	250,000
Saskatchewan	250,000

I wish now to point out the financial assistance that is to be given to these two new provinces. This, briefly, is the substance of some clauses in the Bill.

Now, Sir, when the right hon. gentleman introduced this Bill he expressed some surprise at the references made by newspapers and by some distinguished gentlemen in this country. Of course the people of Canada everywhere were very much interested in the introduction of these Bills. This question had been up for consideration in this parliament. Indeed, the leader of the opposition had moved a resolution in the session of 1903 and again in 1904 in favour of absolute provincial autonomy being given to these Territories, unrestricted right to deal with every thing of a provincial character. That was the policy of the opposition in this House in the sessions of 1903 and 1904. May I be permitted to tell the right hon. gentleman what was the chief reason for the adverse newspaper comment and criticism which he has read from distinguished men in this country? It is because they had known the stand the right hon. gentleman had taken in 1896 on this educational or religious question. The people did not distrust the right hon. gentleman, they never thought for a moment that he would go back on his record of 1896, and venture to introduce into this House certain clauses in the Autonomy Bills which would stir up religious strife in this country. Therefore, he had at his back the whole Canadian people; he had not only the confidence of the Liberal party, but the confidence of a great number of Liberal-Conservatives in this country, many of whom voted for him in 1896 on this very question. So, Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman would not have far to go to find a reason why the newspapers and leading gentlemen who had supported him in 1896 were very much surprised to find that he had now changed his policy in regard to provincial rights. Some hon. gentlemen who have spoken from the other side of the House ventured to say that those who have criticised this Bill are not well acquainted with the question. Well, that may be the case as to some of the criticisms, but I do not think the right hon. gentleman or any member of his government would say this applies to all the criticisms that have been offered to the educational clauses in these Bills. I have here a protest from the Presbyterian body. I am glad to see my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, who as I am informed is a distinguished member of that denomination, in his seat. I will read this protest from the Presbytery of Guelph:

> Another protest against the Educational Provisions of the Autonomy Bill.
>
> A meeting of the Guelph Presbytery was held in Melville church, Fergus, to-day. The following resolution was moved by Major Hood, Guelph, seconded by Rev. Mr. Horne, Elora: The Presbytery of Guelph, representing a large portion of the counties of Waterloo, Wellington and Halton, hereby presents its strong protest to the parliament of Canada against the educational clauses of the Provincial Autonomy Bills now before the House for consideration. The presbytery regrets that any attempt is being made to debar a free people from the exercise of their constitutional prerogative, the right to decide for themselves the character of their school system. It is the conviction of the presbytery that should the proposed legislation become law it would involve the new provinces in perpetual racial and sectarian discord, which would be a most serious obstacle to the future prosperity and happiness of the people. Believing that the placing of such an Act on the statute book would be a misuse of the powers of the federal government, members of the presbytery pledge themselves to do all in their power to oppose and prevent such proposed invasion of provincial rights, and most respectfully urge the government and both Houses to grant to the two new provinces complete control over their educational system.

I have here a statement by a gentleman who stands at the head of the Presbyterian Church in the province of Ontario, and who spoke at a mass meeting in Toronto, in Massey Hall, on March 20. I refer to Rev. Dr. Milligan, moderator of the Presbyterian Church, who declares:

> That, believing in a commonwealth with equal rights for all and favours for none, and believing that a great crisis had arisen in the national history, demanding united and patriotic action by every citizen, irrespective of creed or politics.
>
> The premier's policy in the present issue, he continued, had come to him like a clap of thunder from a clear sky. It was a direct controversion of the attitude taken in 1896.
>
> Wherever one party had privileges at the expense of another there could never be peace. Let there be no restrictions imposed on the new west, but one common brotherhood and one common school system. He noted that the federal separate school legislation in regard to Ontario and Quebec was in the nature of an exception, and he urged the fallacy of the argument which sought to make this exceptional case apply to all the provinces.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that statement voices the views of all the Presbyterians in Canada—or, to be more correct, of nearly all the Presbyterians in Canada, who believe that the government are now invading provincial rights in attempting to fasten upon the new provinces a dual system of education.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. BLAIN. Who says 'no, no'? I say that the Presbyterian body in Canada and the leading Presbyterians who are as well versed as the member who calls out 'no, no,' have sent in their protest with these facts before me. I have the right to say that the Presbyterian body of this country are almost a unit in opposition to the government forcing upon the people of the west this educational clause. Here is a protest from the Church of England.

Keep hands off—Provinces must be free in matter of education.

In a sermon preached in this city by a distinguished gentleman, the Rev. Dr. Spencer, in Emmanuel Reformed Episcopal Church :

He argued that the scriptures do not warrant a state church in any form. The union of church and state, he said, would be fraught with trouble. National money should be used for national purposes only and not for the promotion of any propaganda or teaching of dogmas of any sect.

He concludes by saying :

We should say to any church : Keep your hands off the public treasury—and we would say to the state : Keep your hands off the church. Give to no denomination privileges not common to all and to no one of them precedence by right.

That is a protest from the Church of England body in this country, and I would remind the right hon. gentleman that it represents in the main the feeling of the Church of England people in every province in Canada. I am therefore right in saying that the Church of England denomination of this country are opposed to the Autonomy Bill in so far as it takes away the rights of the people in the western provinces to deal with their own educational matters. What is the opinion of the Baptist Church ?

Baptists state their position. Let new provinces determine their policy. Bill was a surprise. A large and representative meeting of Baptists was held last evening in the lecture room of the Bloor Street Baptist Church, Toronto, to consider the situation arising out of the introduction in parliament of the Autonomy Bills creating the new provinces. A resolution was unanimously carried by a standing vote protesting against the proposed legislation.

I think I shall read that resolution, because I am anxious that the Baptists shall be put on record. I heard the Minister of Customs say the other night that some of the criticism was from gentlemen who did not understand the question and were unable to give a fair and honest opinion, but I invite the attention of the Minister of Customs to this resolution, and I will ask him whether it does not speak as if those behind it understood the question quite as well as some gentlemen on the other side of the House and possibly as some members of the government. The resolution reads as follows :

Whereas, the British North America Act, as to provinces other than Ontario and Quebec, provides that each province may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject to the right of the Dominion parliament when appealed to in a specific case to enact remedial legislation ; and the imperial Amending Act of 1871 empowers the Dominion parliament to establish new provinces, and to define the constitution thereof, but prohibits such parliament from ever afterwards altering such constitution ;

And whereas, the Bill establishing the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan proposes to make the maintenance of a separate school system a permanent constitutional obligation of these new provinces, thus depriving them of their full provincial rights and fettering their whole future educational development ;

And whereas, the introduction at any time of such a question into federal politics is calculated to awaken ill-feeling on a subject in regard to which the Canadian people are peculiarly sensitive ; and more especially at this time, since no intimation was given to the electorate prior or during the recent general elections that it was intended in connection with the granting of autonomy to the Territories to impose any such fetters.

Therefore this meeting of Baptist citizens respectfully protest against the proposed legislation, and expresses the hope that the government may so modify its Bills as to leave the determination of their future educational policy to the free action of the new provinces.

I may say to the right hon. Prime Minister that Mayor Urquhart, of Toronto, the gentleman to whom he sent a very interesting telegram last election was present at this meeting and he stood up with the others and endorsed this resolution in favour of leaving educational matters to the provinces. Mr. D. E. Thomson, K.C., a distinguished gentleman in the city of Toronto, spoke thus in support of this resolution :

Under the powerful leadership of Hon. George Brown the Liberal party had made a stand for the principle of local government and provincial rights. The Liberal party were returned to power in 1896 on that stand. . . . To pass the Autonomy Bills now before parliament would be a complete reversal of the policy, both of the Liberal leader and party. If Sir Wilfrid Laurier be sincere in his suggestion that the provisions of the British North America Act cover the ground, why not leave the question to the Act ? . . . . If Sir Wilfrid Laurier had told his policy in advance he would have come out of the election twenty short.

Mr. Thomson points out that if this matter had been submitted to the people in the last election, instead of my right hon. friend sitting on that side of the House he would be sitting on this side in opposition. That speaks for the Baptist people of Canada, and I leave it for the consideration of the Prime Minister.

There is another denomination, called the Congregationalists, not very large, yet very important. The Rev. Dr. Wild, a gentleman well versed in those questions, spoke at a meeting in Toronto a few days ago and said :

Of the thirty-two nationalities that will compose these two new provinces, most of them of different churches and creeds, we cannot expect to favour any one race or creed at the expense of the others. The state has its rights and must look especially to the education of its citizens. If we are to have an intelligent population as voters this is essential. No church, creed or race must have special legislation that will discriminate against others. A

state form of education is the only sure way and just way.

That, I think, represents the Congregational body. Then I have the opinion of the Methodist people of Canada. On March 15, 1905, the 'Christian Guardian,' the leading Methodist newspaper wrote :

Sooner or later the Roman Catholic church in this country must be taught conclusively that it does not and cannot dominate its public affairs. It must be taught that it is only a sect among sects, a church among churches, and that the adherents of the smallest and weakest among them has equal rights with its own adherents in all political and social relations. It must be taught that its sinister influence upon public men and public life will no longer be tolerated, and that it must be content with holding precisely the same relation to governments and laws as are held by other communions. It must be taught that, while absolutely free and untrammelled in its spiritual functions, it has no status in law or in fact that differentiates it from any other body of Christians in the wide Dominion.

Then, I have here a resolution passed by the Methodist ministers of the city of Toronto, a few days ago and addressed to the right hon. leader of the government :

METHODIST MINISTERS' PROTEST.

The Question of Education is Entirely Provincial.

The following letter has been sent to the premier by the Methodist ministers of Toronto :—

To the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, G.C.M.G., P.C., President of the King's Privy Council, Ottawa :

Honoured Sir,—The assembled ministers of the Methodist church of Toronto, in their regular meeting on Monday morning, March 13, 1905, unanimously beg to advise you as follows :—

That we view with alarm the introduction into the Autonomy Bill of that clause relating to separate schools against the wishes and contrary to the vehement protests of the peoples most deeply affected in the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Our position is clear and firm that the question of education is purely and entirely a provincial matter, as defined by the British North America Act, and should be left to the exclusive authority of the provinces to determine.

We therefore most respectfully urge the government and both Houses of parliament to grant to the two new provinces full provincial rights, and to each complete control of its educational system. By so doing these new provinces will develop a true, healthy, self-governing citizenship, which will be an element of strength to the Dominion.

Signed on behalf of the Methodist Ministers' Association of Toronto

Yours rspectfully,
GEO. M. BROWN,
Chairman.
ROBT. R. CADE,
Secretary.

The Rev. C. O. Johnston, a leading Methodist minister, opposed to separate schools in any form, says this :

It was absolutely necessary in a country such as this that the people should live together in harmony, and to this end there should be one wide, national school system. The public schools of Canada were not Protestant schools in the proper acceptance of the term, but the system was so framed as to admit of all creeds and classes attending without fear or favour. For his part, as a British subject, he objected to any form of separate schools, whether they be Methodist, Presbyterian, Anglican, Baptist, Roman Catholic or any other denomination.

I will read a sentence or two from a letter by a gentleman who is at the very head of the Methodist body in Canada, the Rev. Dr. Carman, the general superintendent of the Methodist Church ; and I do not think any one would charge him with being an overardent supporter of the Conservative party. In a letter over his own signature, he says :

There is something astounding even in the realm of politics that the men who gained power in our Dominion in 1896 by resisting the coercion of Manitoba on the school question are now, in less than a decade, undertaking to impose a vastly heavier and severer coercion for all time on the new provinces, Alberta and Saskatchewan.

* * * *

Where are the Anglicans' rights, and the Methodists' rights and the Quakers' rights, and the Lutherans' rights, and the agnostics' rights, and the rights of Doukhobors and Jews ? And if all these people claim their special rights and get them, and go taxing their separate communities and drawing on the public funds, where is your national school system ? Where are your united populations, your firm and strong Canadian commonwealth ? Plainly the foe of our public school system in the foe of national strength and prosperity. The legislation that weakened national schools threatens our liberties and fills the land with irreconcilable divisions and ceaseless strifes.

* * * *

Let the people of the new provinces determine their own school matters, settle their own school policy, as is provided in the fundamental law of the Dominion. There are in the proposed Act of Autonomy the charter of the new provinces, at least two iniquities, forcing separation on the people for all time, and providing for it from public lands and public funds which constitutionally belong to national and public education. The rights of minorities can be secured and safeguarded in the west as they are in some of the older provinces.

A. CARMAN.

Toronto, March 2, 1905.

That is a letter to the Toronto 'News.' Now, that is the feeling of the church members of Canada. I hope my hon. friend the Minister of Customs is not more anxious to keep peace with his government than he is with his church. My hon. friend will have to take care of that himself.

Now, the Liberal party had something to say about this. I take the following from the Toronto 'Globe' of March 14, 1905 :

At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Liberal Association of Centre Toronto held on Saturday the following resolution was unanimously passed :—

That whereas the Liberal party has always taken strong ground on the question of provincial rights ; and

Whereas all matters pertaining to education are by the British North America Act delegated to the provinces ;

Therefore, we, the Executive of the Liberal Association of Centre Toronto, desire to place ourselves on record as being of the opinion that the government should expunge entirely the clauses from the Autonomy Bills relating to education, and that all matters pertaining to education be left entirely to the new provinces.

This is a voice from the right hon. gentleman's own party in the city of Toronto. The right hon. gentleman might issue the writ for an election in Centre Toronto and test the question. Then we would see whether or not this Reform Association expresses the views of the people regardless of politics in that great city. I am reading these extracts because I think they are stronger than any statement I could make to show why the people of this country were aroused when the right hon. gentleman introduced this measure. The Toronto 'Globe' of March 8, 1905, has a long article which I will not stop to read. It is well known throughout the country that the Toronto 'Globe' is very much opposed to the educational clauses in the Bill, and in this article it warns the government not to force them through parliament. Then, I have a heading of the Toronto 'News' of March 14, and continued from day to day: 'A Free West, A Common School, Provincial Rights and Religious Equality.' With that I may give a statement from the editor of this important and valuable independent journal, who, I may say, is a personal friend of the right hon. Prime Minister. Indeed, I think he wrote his life some little time ago.

An hon. MEMBER. A part of it.

Mr. BLAIN. A part of it, I mean. My hon. friend says he may not get out a second edition. The editor of the 'News,' Mr. J. S. Willison, speaking on the school question, made this statement:

He took the ground that nowhere was education provided by separate schools as efficient as the public schools, and many Roman Catholic citizens and lay Catholic educationists were gravely dissatisfied with the conditions of elementary Catholic education in this province. The future of Canada depended largely on the measure of success achieved in resolving the many nationalities which compose the population into common Canadian citizenship, and it was vain to argue that such a process could be served by a school system which tended for separation rather than union.

That is the statement of the editor of the independent Toronto 'News,' which is doing so much service for the people of Canada at the present time. I have here the authority of the Huntingdon 'Gleaner,' published in the province of Quebec, and which, if I am correctly informed, is one of the leading English speaking journals of that province.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friends say no, but I rather think I am correct in that statement because in the earlier days, before my right hon. friend came into the House, it was quoted very often in the interest of the Reform party. Dealing with the statement of the First Minister that the Protestants in the province of Quebec have nothing to complain of, the editor writes as follows:

How does the premier reconcile this declaration of his with the fact that the English-speaking people outside of the island of Montreal have largely disappeared and are continuing to disappear ? Whole townships, settled by them and which prospered under them, are to-day French. Protestant churches are to be found in which no service is held and that the spot where Protestants were buried for three generations and more are now to be found in the corners of farms of French Canadians. In only one of the counties that compose the Eastern Townships have the Protestants a majority, yet once they had absolute control. Do men throw up their farms and leave a province where they have no cause of complaint ? Let Sir Wilfrid explain this—the extraordinary spectacle of a people abandoning the land of their birth, to which they are bound by every tie of affection and patriotism, to seek new homes in the United States, for the proportion has been trifling who have gone to our Northwest. What is it they find under an alien flag they could not in the province of Quebec ? We want no rhetorical generalities, no vapouring about justice and toleration. Here is a plain problem—Why are the Protestant farmers of the province of Quebec going away ? Do men flee a province where they have no cause of complaint ?

There is no more saddening aspect in the condition of our province than the groups of Protestant children to be found here and there all over it destitute of the means of acquiring the elements of education, and threatening us with a coming generation of Protestant farmers as ignorant as Russian moujiks. This is a fruit of separate schools. If we had national schools, instead of sectarian schools, no child in the province would be without opportunity to learn to read and write. Another consequence of these sectarian schools should never be lost sight of, and that is, where Protestant farmers are too few to have a school, they are taxed to support Catholic schools, which, sometimes, have as their teachers nuns and Christian brothers. There are hundreds of Protestant farmers who are forced either to support Catholic schools or sell out.

That is the statement of the Huntingdon 'Gleamer,' and I commend it to the consideration of my right hon. friend.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BLAIN. Before you left the chair, Mr. Speaker, I was giving some quotations

from leading newspapers of Canada showing their opinion of the educational clauses of the Autonomy Bills. As there was some slight reference to the politics of the Huntingdon 'Gleaner,' from which I quoted, I thought I would produce a newspaper which will be acknowledged to be a supporter of the government. I turn to the Toronto 'Globe,' which is looked upon as the leading government organ of the province of Ontario, and a very creditable journal indeed. I quote from the issue of February 28, 1905:

Why not leave the question to him——

Referring to Mr. Haultain, the premier of the Northwest Territories.

——and his colleagues in the new provincial government? It belongs there by the terms of the Confederation Act. If it is dealt with at Ottawa there may develop opposition from the provincial governments, not because they would abolish separate schools, but because they would resent federal dictation in matters of provincial rights. If the people of Saskatchewan and Alberta want separate schools, let them have them on their own motion and in the way provided by the constitution. If they do not want them, any attempt at constitutional compulsion, even if it succeeds, would awaken antagonism which would embitter local politics and be disastrous to the separate schools themselves. And for that proposition we can ask the support of Catholics and Protestants alike. It involves the principles of provincial rights. On that ground all classes and creeds can stand together.

I have another opinion, which I regard as a very valuable one, objecting to the educational clauses. This is from Mr. Haultain, the Prime Minister of the Northwest Territories. I quote from his letter addressed to the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and bearing the date of March 11th, 1905:

I must take strong exception to the way in which the subject of education has been treated both in the conferences and in the Bills. I must remind you of the fact that your proposition was not laid before my colleague or myself until noon of the day upon which you introduced the Bills. Up to that time the question had not received any attention beyond a casual reference to it on the previous Friday, and I certainly believe that we should have an opportunity of discussing your proposals before twelve o'clock on the day the Bills received their first reading. No such opportunity, however, was afforded.

He continues:

With regard to the question of education generally, you are, no doubt, aware that the position taken by us was that the provinces should be left to deal with the subject exclusively, subject to the provisions of the British North America Act, thus putting them on the same footing in this regard as all the other provinces in the Dominion, except Ontario and Quebec.

That I regard as a very valuable opinion indeed. It is the opinion of the duly authorized representative of the Territories, the man who has the right, and whose duty it is, to speak on behalf of the 500,000 people there. Of course, it will be a little surprising to the people of Canada to know that, though the Prime Minister of that Territory was sent for by this government to consult with upon the clauses of the Autonomy Bills, yet the educational clauses, the all-important clauses seemingly to the people of Canada, were not submitted to that hon. gentleman until noon of the very day when the Prime Minister introduced these Bills in the House. I will not make any comment upon that further than to ask the Canadian people to consider what it means. Perhaps they will be able to answer it to their own satisfaction.

I come now to the county I have the honour to represent, the county of Peel. I have presented some petitions from the county. I have here the resolution of the Brampton Ministerial Association, held at the residence of the Rev. W. S. McAlpine, B.A., on the 6th of March, 1905:

Moved by the Rev. J. G. Bowles, B.D., and seconded by the Rev. R. N. Burns, B.A., and carried unanimously:

That the premier of the Dominion government has introduced a Bill by which separate schools are to be fastened on the Territories to be organized into new provinces;

And whereas, we do not favour separate schools in principle and practice;

And whereas, the matter should be left wholly to the new provinces to decide;

Therefore be it resolved, that we, the members of the Brampton Ministerial Association, place ourselves on record as being unalterably opposed to the educational clause of the Bill, and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to R. Blain, M.P., the representative of the county in the Commons.

W. S. McALPINE,
President.
WM. HERRIDGE,
Secretary.

I have, in addition to that, the names of several leading gentlemen in my own county who have signed the petition that was circulated and afterwards presented to the House. Among the others, I find the following: George A. Robinson, Claude; John McEachrine, merchant, Englewood; Alex. Dick, manufacturer, Alton; Rev. G. C. Balfour, Inglewood; David Graham, Inglewood, David McGregor, Inglewood; T. H. Graham, Inglewood; and H. H. Shaver, Cooksville. These are the names of some of the leading Reformers whom I have the honour to reprensent, who willingly signed a petition to this government protesting against the educational clauses of the Autonomy Bills. And I may say that, while I have had the honour of sitting in this House since 1900, no question has ever arisen on which I represent so large a proportion of the electorate of my county as I do in protesting against the educational clauses of this Bill.

Some very unfair criticism was offered this afternoon by the hon. member for Labelle

(Mr. Bourassa) against the Orange Association of Canada. That association does not require any defence at my hands. But when that hon. gentleman thought it his duty to cast reflection upon the Orange Association, already numbering about 400,000 members, and those not now affiliated, I thought that some slight reference to the association, though it may seem a little beside the question, may be in order. I turn up the Act to incorporate the Grand Orange Lodge of British America, which was assented to on April 24th, 1890. Among the names of the corporators are those of the late Hon. N. Clarke Wallace, the late Edward F. Clarke and other leading men. I have looked very briefly over the clauses of this Act of incorporation of the Grand Orange Lodge of British America to see if any special favours had been given to the association by this parliament. I find that no special favours were given—this is simply a Bill permitting the members of the association to organize, to hold property and to take care of their own rights, and to extend those rights to every other loyal citizen in Canada, whatever his creed may be. And I have here a copy of the Orange constitution, which I will be glad to send to my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), for evidently he has not looked into this document before venturing upon the statements which he made this afternoon. This constitution is open to every man in Canada, and from beginning to end there is no clause in it that interferes with the rights and privileges of any class of people in this country. I think it does not come with a good grace from the hon. gentleman to cast reflection upon this important body. Other references were made to the Orange Association a few days ago, one by the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I thought I would try to learn what part the Orange Association has taken in the agitation since this Bill was introduced on the 21st of February last. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), who holds the highest position in the gift of the Orange Association in Canada, felt it to be his duty to sound a note of warning to the Canadian people, and he issued this letter and sent it to the different Orange Associations throughout the Dominion :

Ottawa, February 16th, 1905.

Dear Sir and Brother,—

We believe an effort is about to be made to impose separate schools for all time on the people of the new provinces, now being established in the Northwest Territories. It behooves every lover of liberty, and especially every Orangeman, to lend a helping hand, to prevent this injustice being perpetrated on a liberty-loving people. Being comparatively weak and helpless they must largely depend on others to fight their battles for them.

The effort made in 1896 to compel Manitoba to grant separate schools nearly drove the people of that province into rebellion, and had it not been abandoned, would doubtless have resulted in serious consequences. In view of this, is it not little short of criminal folly to attempt to deprive the people of these new provinces of the right to control their own educational affairs as to them seems best. I would suggest that every member of our order lend a helping hand to prevent this outrage by writing or wiring and getting others to do so as well, the member for his constituency to oppose any legislation or enactment for that purpose. If we speak out freely and do our duty no government would dare to disobey our request. Brethren, let us do our duty ; also get accompanying blank petitions signed by all friendly to our cause, giving name and occupation in every case, and forward to me to House of Commons post office, Ottawa, at earliest possible date.

T. S. SPROULE.

I shall also read the petition sent out which is referred to in this letter :

To the Honourable the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, in parliament assembled :

We, the undersigned electors of the electoral division of do pray that in granting provincial autonomy to the Northwest Territories the Dominion parliament will not by any enactment or otherwise withhold from the newly created provinces full and unrestricted freedom of action in all matters affecting the establishment, maintenance and administration of schools—

That is the document sent out by the hon. gentleman who holds a distinguished position as head of the Orange Association, and I would like to ask any hon. gentleman on either side of the House what objection he could take to the statements either in the letter or in the petition. These petitions have been returned, signed not by Orangemen altogether, but by hundreds and thousands of electors of Canada not all Liberal-Conservatives, but very many of them Reformers who supported this government at the last election. The petitions have been presented from both sides of the House entering protest against the educational clauses contained in the Bill.

Leaving the educational question for a moment, clause 20 of the Bill reads thus :

The Dominion lands in the said province shall continue to be vested in the Crown and administered by the government of Canada for the purposes of Canada.

I was wondering what the hon. gentlemen representing western constituencies would think about that clause, a clause which says that the provincial governments of these two territories cannot control their lands, but that the lands shall be controlled by the parliament sitting at Ottawa. I therefore looked up the records of some of these hon. gentlemen. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) speaking in the debate of October 13, 1903, on a resolution moved in this House by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) for provincial autonomy for the Northwest Territories made this statement at page 13892 of 'Hansard' of 1903 :

I may say that I have had a long acquaintance with Mr Haultain, and I am quite satisfied that he is able to protect himself; and from my more brief acquaintance with the members of the present government, I believe they are able to take their own part, and that we can leave that matter to be settled between them

The House will bear in mind that Mr. Haultain had submitted a proposition for provincial autonomy to the right hon. gentleman who leads the government, and in that proposition he said he would ask that the lands be retained to the provincial government and the hon. member for Alberta said that he had entire confidence in Mr. Haultain, that he would take care of himself and his provinces. I was a little surprised the other evening when the hon. gentleman addressed the House on these Bills that he should say nothing or almost nothing about the land. It is a well known fact that the gentlemen who have been representing the western constituencies in this House for several years stated in this House on more than one occasion that the lands should be vested in the provincial governments. I shall read from the remarks of Mr. Davis, an hon. gentleman who represented Saskatchewan in the last parliament, but who has now gone to the Senate. At page 13896 of the 'Hansard' 1903, he made this statement:

I have taken the liberty of boiling down the demands, and I think I can give in brief just what Mr. Haultain asks this House to give him, if we are prepared to give provincial autonomy. He wants first all the public lands. The leader of the opposition said he was prepared to support that part of the proposition. I am glad to see that he has approached the matter in that spirit. We in the west would like to see the lands given to the government of the Northwest Territories.

That was the statement of an hon. gentleman who represented a western constituency. We have another statement from an hon. gentleman who represented West Assiniboia in the last parliament and who is also in this parliament (Mr. Scott). Indeed it is said by some Ottawa newspapers, that the hon. gentleman is about to go into the position lately given up by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) and to become Minister of the Interior in the government. I shall read to the House what he said on this land question, because he has been bubbling over in support of these Bills. On October 13, 1903, at page 13926 of 'Hansard' the hon. member said:

I wish to take occasion to thank the hon. leader of the opposition for the expression of opinion which he gave in favour of the view which we in that country unanimously take, that when a province is formed it is only fair, just and proper that the lands, timber and mineral resources in that province should be handed over to the people dwelling there to be managed and owned by them. This should be done in the Northwest Territories.

The hon gentleman is now supporting the land clause in the Bill but I am wondering what change has come over the people in his constituency in the west that they would permit him to make a statement of that kind in 1903, and now in 1905 he is saying: Do no give us the lands, leave them with the government in Ottawa, they can take care of them better than we can. I suppose if the hon. gentleman goes into the government and goes back to his constituency for re-election, the electors will take care of that part of the question.

I shall refer for a moment to the debate which took place in this House on March 20, 1896, when the Manitoba school question was up for consideration and the present Postmaster General was dealing with it. He made this statement at page 4189 of 'Hansard.'

There are seven provinces in this Dominion, there is territory out of which to carve many more. There is a minority in every province. Shall we to-day, hastily, thoughtlessly and without due consideration, without first exhausting every other means of settlement, legislate as is proposed by this Bill, and place upon our statute-book a statutory invitation to the minority in every province now existing, and every province that may hereafter be carved out of our territory, to appeal to the people's representatives in this parliament to settle questions that might be better settled, under the spirit of the Confederation Act, by the provinces in which those questions arise. We have been six years dealing with this one issue, six long years, and we are only at the threshold of it yet.

That was a suggestion to the leader of the Conservative government, then in power, to leave Manitoba alone, Manitoba could take care of her own affairs, but now the Postmaster General says: No, we must not leave the new Territories alone, they cannot take care of themselves, we must take care of part of their provincial matters here at Ottawa. I was wondering why this great change in the hon. the Postmaster General. My hon. friend from Labelle made some reference to separate schools, pointing out the splendid educational system in the province of Quebec, a system that, he said, turned out first-class students, who were the pride and admiration of the people of the province of Quebec. I would not venture to put my opinion against that of the hon. gentleman; but I will quote the opinion of a gentleman who occupied a high position in his own province, an opinion which I find quoted in the 'Hansard' of 1896, page 2768. I will read an extract from the report of the Superintendent of Education for that province for the year 1895, as published in the Montreal 'Gazette,' in the year 1895:

The country schools are not as good as they might be. The children leave them without having received a sufficiently lasting impression to make them wish to increase their knowledge. . . . .To quote from one inspector's report,

the slow increase in efficiency is due to the apathy of most of the members of the school board—too many of whom are unable to read—to the indifference of parents, to the miserable salaries paid to teachers, which make it difficult to obtain competent ones. . . . In one district, another inspector declares, where 166 schools were in operation, 38 teachers were without certificates, and 66 the year before. . . . Most of the teachers are entirely ignorant of the first principles of pedagogics, have no system in their work, and content themselves by making their pupils learn their books by rote. . . . The pupils recite their lessons fairly well, but without understanding their meaning. . . . As it is declared that the average salary to teachers is, in some districts, $108 for ten months work, and as some must get considerably less than this, and as these small wages are not always promptly paid, it is not difficult to understand what is behind the teacher's indifference. . . . To put it briefly, the people, in too many cases, do not appreciate their duty to their children in the way of education. They are content to fit them to be hewers of wood and drawers of water for their more fortunate or better educated fellow citizens.

I am not going to say anything about that statement, further than that it comes from one of the inspectors of this educational system in the province of Quebec, and therefore I am not responsible for it. My hon. friend can read this over at his leisure. The right hon. gentleman who leads the government, when speaking on these Bills the other evening, said that we must not copy from the United States because they had a godless school system. Well, I will not say much about that. I am not very much of an imitator of the United States myself, but I look upon them as a very advanced nation, and a nation from whom we might take some good lessons. I have here a statement from an educationalist of some standing, Prof. Goldwin Smith, of Toronto, who has had experience not only in Canada but in the United States and England as well. What does he say about the United States :

In the United States the public school system serves the very special function of assimilating the alien elements introduced by an immense immigration.

Now this government pride themselves on bringing out a large immigration from the different parts of Europe ; I do not wish to detract any credit from the right hon. gentleman and his government for that. These people are coming into Canada by thousands every year, coming from every part of Europe and settling in western Canada. Professor Goldwin Smith says that a uniform system of education such as they have in the United States is best suited to assimilate these different populations ; and if that be so for the United States, would it not apply to Canada as well ? That might be worth the consideration of the right hon. gentleman and his government when they are deciding this question.

We have had some resignations from the cabinet in the last few years. The Minister of Public Works resigned during the last parliament, and the Minister of Railways and Canals left the government as well. These gentlemen differed from their colleagues on important questions and resigned their positions in the cabinet ; they thought their differences were sufficient to justify them in resigning from the government. I have very little to say about these hon. gentlemen, they are not in the House, and therefore I will not say much about them. I will say, however, that the people of Canada were disappointed in that these gentlemen, after having left the government, did not go into the country and defend their principles which they considered were in the best interests of the people of this country. I think it was their duty to go before the electors and endeavour to uphold their views. But these hon. gentlemen did not do that. We have had another resignation within the past few days in the case of the late Minister of the Interior, who left the government upon this school question. He just stepped outside the cabinet, some people say he is going back into it. I know nothing about that ; if he does, some hon. gentlemen on the other side will be very much disappointed, I am sure. The people of Canada expect better things from the hon. member from Brandon (Mr. Sifton). He had been fighting in opposition to separate schools in his own province of Manitoba, and he came down to Ottawa and entered the government of the right hon. gentleman. In the preparation of these Bills, he says he was not consulted on the educational clauses. Well, I have not much sympathy with the hon. gentleman on that point. He had been taking an active part in the preparation of the western country for provincial autonomy. When the hon. gentleman knew that these Bills were coming up to be considered in this House, it was his duty, as a representative of the Northwest, to see to it that the educational clauses were such as would be satisfactory to the western people, and if they were, I think they would satisfy his own views too. But he left them alone. He had entire confidence in the right hon. gentleman. But the right hon. gentleman rather disappointed him, because he introduced the Bill before the Minister of the Interior came back. Then when he looked at the clauses he said: I will leave the government. But the other night he gave an exhibition of coming back. He condemned the separate school clauses of the Bill, he says that separate schools were a bad thing in the province of Manitoba, and he did not support them very earnestly on the floor of the House the other evening. But, he says, rather than shake up this government any

more, rather than that this government should be defeated at the polls, I will set aside my principles of a lifetime, I will let the educational clause go as it is, and allow this government to fasten separate schools upon western Canada for all time to come; I will sacrifice every principle which has been dear to me for the last fifteen years in order to preserve the government from defeat.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for myself, I am absolutely opposed to fastening separate schools on these two new provinces. I believe it would be in the best interests of the people of Canada that only one educational system should prevail in that western country, and that that system should receive every dollar of public money and all the revenues from the public school lands in order to make it a perfect system. I would open the door to every nationality, and allow every child to receive the same uniform education. This is the policy I am here to support. The people are not so much interested in what we are saying upon this question, because it is an old question and one that has been debated for many years, but the people of Canada are interested in how we vote, and for my part I will vote against the government in respect to this educational clause.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Only?

Mr. BLAIN. Not only, because I am opposed to the land clauses and I believe that the people of western Canada can take care of their own lands better than the federal government. I would vote to postpone provincial autonomy for five or even ten years rather than fasten for all time on the new provinces a dual school system, both systems receiving public aid and sharing in the revenue from the public school lands. That is my position. I would rather vote for an increased subsidy from this government to western Canada for five or ten years yet to come than I would record my vote to take away the rights of the people of that western country to deal with their education as they see fit. That is my policy and I have nothing to add to and nothing to detract from what I have said. I am in favour of absolute provincial rights for western Canada in all matters. The people of that country are the sons and daughters of the people of older Canada, living there with the people who are coming from foreign countries, and I am anxious that their children shall have the best education that can be given them. I do not believe in dividing the school money (part of it going to the separate school system and part of it to the national school system.) I do not believe they can perfect these two educational systems in that way. If the people of the west wish to do so then let them be responsible for it themselves. For my part I do not wish to take the responsibility of recording my vote to fasten this separate school system upon them. I have, therefore, much pleasure in supporting the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition which reads:

Upon the establishment of a province in the Northwest Territories of Canada as proposed by Bill (69), the legislature of such province, subject to and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Acts 1867 to 1886, is entitled to and should enjoy full powers of provincial self-government including power to exclusively make laws in relation to education.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Solicitor General). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with much pleasure to the able speech delivered by my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain), and if I had not been within the precincts of parliament when he was reciting all the protests which have been sent from the province of Ontario and elsewhere, I would have thought that I was present at a church meeting and not in a legislative chamber. Listening to my hon. friend reciting the protests from the Presbyterians, the Baptists, the Congregationalists and the Methodists, uttered as they were in his own sweet voice, I thought we were listening to a preacher and not to a parliamentarian. The thought crossed my mind, that if we in the province of Quebec are to be accused of being priest-ridden, my hon. friend (Mr. Blain, well deserves the compliment of being himself ridden by some of the ministers of the dissenting sects. Let me tell my hon. friend further, that if there came from the pulpits and from religious bodies in Ontario and other provinces protests against the educational clauses of this Bill, I can appeal to him to point to one speech, one word, one sentence delivered by a member of that fearful Quebec hierarchy. Not one word, not one phrase, not one sentence of protest was uttered in the province of Quebec for or against the educational clauses.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the petitions?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will explain the origin of those petitions. In this matter, the Conservative party has played the same old double game it played years ago when it stirred up the feelings of the austere Protestants in Ontario and the ultramontane element in the province of Quebec. When petitions were, so to speak, commanded from the Orange lodges by the member from East Grey, at the same time an order was given by the Conservative organization in Montreal to get protests from some of the counties in Quebec. We presented these petitions to parliament, as it was the right of the petitioners to ask us, but we said we were not responsible for them. My hon. friend (Mr. Blain) stated this afternoon that the right hon. the Prime Minister had obtained power in 1896 by riding the Catholic horse in the province of Quebec, and he told us that if the Liberal party were in power to-day it

was due to its alliance with the Catholic clergy in that province. Sir, the hon. gentleman ought to know better; he ought to know that during the elections of 1896 in the province of Quebec, every Liberal candidate was asked by his Conservative opponent to choose between the Catholic church and the leader of the Liberal party, and in spite of the hurricane of protests which came from some presbyteries and some pulpits the candidates of the Liberal party in Quebec stood to their guns and won the battle.

My hon. friend (Mr. Blain) quoted not only the opinions of some clergymen in Ontario and other provinces, but he also referred to the defection of the Toronto 'Globe. I have been a reader of the 'Globe' for many years; every Liberal in this country is proud of the great Liberal organ in the province of Ontario, and I, for one deeply regret the defection of the 'Globe' on this question. I regret that it forgets what the policy of George Brown did for the Liberal party. The Toronto 'Globe' should remember that the policy of George Brown on certain questions, kept the Liberal party out of office for a quarter of a century. But I must say this to the credit of the Toronto 'Globe': Though it fought the government and is still fighting the government on the educational clauses of this Bill, it has made no wild appeals such as those made by my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in his paper. The Toronto 'Globe' has discussed fairly the question from its own point of view. It has appealed to its own readers who belong to the school of George Brown, and it has loyally severed its connection with the government on this question. But what has been the policy pursued by my hon. friend, the editor of the Toronto 'World.'

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. A consistent one.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What has been the policy of Mr. Willison, of the Toronto 'News'? What has been the policy of the 'Mail and Empire'? Have they presented calmly to their readers the question now before the House, like men desirous to create an opinion, or have they not discussed it like men anxious to stir up passions and bad feelings? Sir, I have known my hon. friend since 1896. I have been a journalist myself, and I have read his paper for many years; I have followed his career in this House very closely; and I say to him that he would not dare to utter before me, eye to eye, what he has published in his paper since the biginning of this debate.

The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) quoted from the Huntingdon 'Gleaner,' which he said was a leading Liberal organ in the province of Quebec. I admit that the editor of the Huntingdon 'Gleaner' Mr. Robert Sellar, is an old journalist. He resides in the county of Huntingdon, a county where the French Canadians and Catholics form nearly a majority of the electors, and elect Protestant members. During the last election they elected an Irish Protestant. Mr. Robert Sellar is an intelligent man, an honest and pious man; but, Sir, he is a doctrinaire. My hon. friend who is ready to accept the statement of Mr. Robert Sellars, whom he does not know; who is ready to accept the statement of the Huntingdon 'Gleaner' which he does not read once a year, because the paper has but a limited circulation in the county of Huntingdon, should, instead of accepting blindly such statements, look around him and ask his friend the member for the county of Huntingdon (Mr. Walsh), and his friend the member for the county of Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington), and my hon. friend who represents St. Antoine division of Montreal (Mr. Ames), and my hon. friend who represents Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), and my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), to read the article referred to and he will learn then whether it is true or not that the French Canadian majority in the province of Quebec is driving away the English-speaking minority.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I say this to the hon. member, that I remember distinctly that some years ago an application was made to the government of the day—and two maps were brought here showing how the country had been peopled with English-speaking people years ago and the condition it was in then—to lend or grant them money enough to take them to the Northwest Territories, because they were becoming so few that it was utterly impossible for them to keep up their schools and churches and to have English-speaking communities, as they had before.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend has not made even a point. Does he for one moment believe that the French Canadians in the province of Quebec are driving away the English-speaking Protestant minority? Does he believe that?

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. member will allow me to explain, I say I believe it—not that they are driving them away offensively, by any means; but here is the system that was represented to us: that whenever a farm was offered for sale, or a farmer was at all willing to sell, a French Canadian was prepared to buy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPROULE. Will hon gentlemen extend to me that courtesy which I always extend to them? Not that the French Canadians were desirous of getting the farms at less than their value; but it was said that they were always ready to buy, and that they had a fund at their disposal to

buy out the English-speaking farmers. They could get money at a very low rate of interest——

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman refers to a fund. What fund is that ?

Mr. SPROULE. A fund supplied by the church.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPROULE. That may be something laughable, or it may be something absurd.

Mr. BRODEUR. Will the hon. gentleman——

Mr. SPROULE. Now, the hon. gentleman made it a point to interrupt me repeatedly when I was up before. I simply made the request to be allowed to explain. Then it was said that the farm was purchased—why ? For this reason, that as soon as the farm got into the hands of a Roman Catholic it was subject to the tithes which the church could collect, and thus became a supporter of the church ; but that so long as it was owned by a Protestant, it was not a supporter of the church. Therefore there was a strong inducement for the Roman Catholic to purchase it. It was said that a fund was raised by the church for this purpose—not improperly at all—and that one farm after another was taken over in that way until the English-speaking population got to be so few that they were unable to keep up their schools and churches, and these were closed ; the people had no community of interest amongst themselves because they could not keep up their schools, their children were raised in ignorance ; and this application was made to the government for assistance or for a loan to enable a number of these people to go to the Northwest Territories. That is the explanation.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. Speaker, you have there an evidence of the ignorance—the honest ignorance, I must say—of my hon. friend. I appeal to his neighbour, my hon. friend from Beauharnois, to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, to my hon. friend from St. Antoine, to my hon. friend from the county of Huntingdon, where the Huntingdon 'Gleaner' is published, and I ask them to stamp at once such statement as arrant nonsense. To think that the church, which is greatly indebted in the province of Quebec, and which is even borrowing money from English insurance companies and English banks, has a fund to buy farms from the English-speaking people of the province of Quebec, why ! it is simply preposterous.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that the tolerance that is extended to a member who wishes to say a word on behalf of Protestantism in this country ? I treat those hon. gentlemen with respect and am entitled to expect a like return from them. I rise to say that the Huntingdon 'Gleaner' gives an account of the very same thing described in the letter I read.

Mr. FISHER. It is altogether astray.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) quoted some of the authorities against this measure, and did not fail to mention the name of Mr. Haultain. I have very much respect for the First Minister of the Northwest Territories. Mr. Haultain is a talented young statesman from the west. He has been in Ottawa a few weeks, and no doubt feels compelled to speak in accord with the Tory press, because he is also a Tory statesman. During the last elections he took a very prominent and active part against this government in the Northwest Territories. Mr. Haultain is therefore bound to be against the government. But there is another gentleman who accompanied Mr. Haultain on his mission to the Ottawa government. We saw him on the floor of this House when this Bill was introduced. I refer to Mr. Bulyea. I understand that Mr. Bulyea gave an expression of his opinion to the Toronto press not long ago, and when I compare the statements of Mr. Haultain with those of Mr. Bulyea, I find that they differ toto coelo. Mr. Haultain has taken this government to task on the educational clauses, the land clauses and on the division of the provinces, But Mr. Bulyea declares, speaking for his province and himself, that he is perfectly satisfied with the measure as presented by the government.

Sir, the question now before the House and the country marks an epoch in the history of Canada. It deserves our best attention and all our solicitude, as it is surrounded with immense difficulties. I must crave the indulgence of the House during the few remarks I will offer, remembering always that the more contentious an issue is the more it must be approached in a spirit of conciliation and tolerance, and I earnestly hope that not one word, not one sentence, will fall from my lips that will in the least offend even the most sturdy opponent of the measure.

As to the principle of autonomy, I do not believe that there is in the House one dissenting voice. From every part of Canada the birth of the twin provinces has been hailed with joy ; nay, more, with a legitimate pride.

The Northwest Territories are the creation of the Canadian commonwealth. They are its offspring. The fathers of confederation were not satisfied with the union of the different British colonies scattered from one end of the continent to the other. They thought—and wisely so—that the immense prairies extending from the great lakes to the Rocky mountains should also be included in the Dominion, so as to unite, under the British flag, all the territories extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific. They did

not hesitate to pledge the credit of the country to what was then considered a huge amount of money—but which has since been found to be but a trifling sum—in order to secure for Canada that great lone land, known only in those days from the early pioneers, from the missionaries, from the voyageurs and the trappers of the Hudson Bay Company.

Sir, the more we study the history of confederation the more we appreciate the spirit which guided its fathers. They were nation-builders, the men who sat at the conference of Quebec. Their vision of the future extended much beyond the union of the four original provinces. They foresaw that, in the years to come, the existence of a great Canadian nation under the ægis of British monarchical institutions was not only a dream, but a striking reality ; aye, even by the side of by far the greatest of all modern and ancient republics.

Before I proceed any further, let me express the hope that the day is not far distant when the last link will be added to the chain of Canadian provinces by the entry of Newfoundland into confederation. More so, now that the vexed French shore dispute has been settled between England and France. It seems to me that nothing stands in the way to prevent the union of Newfoundland with the Dominion on fair terms. The public men of both countries would indeed be remiss to their duty if they did not grapple and overcome the objections or the difficulties which have been raised in the past whenever the question was brought up for discussion.

As I said, a moment ago, the granting of autonomy to the Northwest Territories has been received with favour by the country at large. Long ago, it was felt, that if ever the tide of immigration would turn our way it would never recede. The tide is on us—more especially since the last five or six years—and from all parts of the world, immigration is pouring so to say, towards the new promised land of western Canada. With a population of half a million inhabitants ; with the expectation of doubling that figure before many years have elapsed ; having fairly passed the period of infancy, it was but just and fair that the Northwest Territories should be given the full control of their local government.

I insist however on two points : 1. The Northwest Territories have been acquired by Canada,—they are our creation ; 2. Whilst in the case of Canada, the constitution was framed by the imperial parliament, in the present instance, with regard to the Northwest Territories, their constitution is framed by the Canadian parliament. It seems to me that at this stage of the debate, it is well to bear in mind those two peculiar features of the situation. Though not eternal, constitutions are not by any means of a transitory nature. They are framed to be permanent—as permanent as human institutions can possibly be. I therefore quite understand the keen and lively interest which the two Bills now under consideration, have aroused from one end of the country to the other. I less understand, however, the sentiment of bitterness which, of latter days, they have so intensely developed.

Sir, I do not intend to discuss the several clauses contained in the Bill. The masterly effort of the right hon. the leader of the House, when he introduced this measure, has made our task an easy one indeed—I will confine myself to the land question and the school question.

I wish, however, before taking up those two features of the Bill, to say a word or two concerning the division of the Northwest Territories into two provinces. This is one of Mr. Haultain's grievances—but from all appearances, it seems to be a personal grievance. Is it because, as future premier of one of the provinces, he will command less influence ? That, I would not venture to say. But be it a personal grievance or not, the fact remains that the division of the Northwest Territories into two provinces is in accord with public opinion all over Canada. Sir, we are legislating for the future whilst Mr. Haultain—if his views on this question were adopted—would bind us to the present only. Moreover, we live in a confederation. Should not the history of other confederacies be an object lesson to us? The danger may be remote, but do you not agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that by carving two provinces out of that immense western territory, the balance of power is more equally, more equitably distributed as among all the others ? At the time of the first republic of France, a great orator, Vergniaud, said of the French revolution that it resembled Saturn devouring his own progeny. Sir, I am not a pessimist, but I fear that the very reverse would likely happen, if we did create one huge province extending from Manitoba to the Rockies; in this instance the child abnormally overgrown, would soon devour his father.

The hon. gentlemen opposite and the Conservative press throughout the Dominion, have been very loud in their protests against the clause of the Bill which vests in the Dominion the property of the public lands in the Northwest Territories. 'Why is the west deprived of its birthright'? is the question put by those who, by all means, are bound to find fault with this measure. 'Why not treat the west as well as the other provinces'? Sir, such appeals may perhaps stir up the feelings of those who do not know under what peculiar and exceptional circumstances the Northwest Territories entered confederation. But surely, they cannot and will not bias the judgment of any of the hon. gentlemen who sit in this House. True it is, that the British North America Act stipulates that each province

is vested with the property of its lands. Such has been the case with Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and British Columbia. But one must remember that when they entered into confederation, each of these provinces had the property of its lands. They were independent colonies and they exercised a sovereign power over their Crown lands. Nearly all their revenues have since been derived from that source. Their right was inalienable and they stipulated in 1867, that they would continue to exercise it. Quite different in the case with the Northwest Territories. At the time of confederation, the delegates of the provinces inserted a clause in the British North America Act by which they empowered the Dominion to purchase from the Hudson Bay Company—then suzerain of the Territories—all this vast tract of country. The purchase was made in 1870, and the price paid by the Dominion to the Hudson Bay Company amounted to £300,000. Out of that domain, was first carved the province of Manitoba, but, with the exception of the swamp lands, all the public lands of the new province remained the property of Canada.

Mr. MONK. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) allow me to ask him a question ? If the land in the Northwest remains vested in the Dominion, why was it necessary in the case of Manitoba to put a special provision in the Bill creating that province to reserve the lands of that province ? It does not seem to have been necessary, according to the hon. gentleman's argument.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It was to avoid litigation. The province of Manitoba might have said : We must be treated as the other provinces have been treated ; the other provinces have their public lands and we must have our public lands. Therefore there was a special enactment in the Act of 1870, that Manitoba should not have its lands but that these should remain vested in the Dominion.

We were told the other day by the right hon. leader of the House how Sir John Macdonald refused the request of Manitoba when in 1884 that province raised a claim to the property of her public lands. The same policy has been followed with regard to every new state entering the American union. It seems to me therefore that we would not have been justified to adopt a different policy with regard to the two new provinces. Their territory covers in round figures a total area of 345,000,000 acres—one-third of which has already been reserved or sold. We must deduct from that total area, the land grants made to railway companies by the Conservative administrations, the Indian reserves, the timber limits, the school lands, the Hudson bay lands, and the homesteads already taken, which leaves a balance of about 225,000,000 acres. Sir, I claim that this domain is the property of the whole Dominion of Canada. Administered by Canada since 1870, it has added not a little burden to the public exchequer. We had to pay the cost of two rebellions and besides, we have—in order to maintain law, peace and order—equipped a corps of mounted police, which has patrolled the west and afforded ample protection against the Indians and the rough element. Again, the Dominion has spent millions to advertise and settle the west. We have subsidized the vast system of railways which is now netting so rapidly the prairies from north to south, from east to west. The Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific are in a sense national highways, but who will deny that the Northwest Territories are not the most interested in their completion ?

All this vast expenditure has enhanced the value of the Northwest Territories and the Dominion has yet to draw the interest to which any creditor is entitled on an investment. Would it be fair, Mr. Speaker, to divest ourselves of our lands, under such circumstances ? Would not that policy be inopportune and unwise ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend will of course remember, and he will pardon me for interrupting, that this is exactly the argument which was made fifty or sixty or seventy years ago in Great Britain as a reason for not handing over to the people of the various provinces the control of their lands and their minerals.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, it is always well to borrow from Great Britain. Sir, I have read some very wild statements in the press, concerning this question of public lands. Having myself been a journalist ; far be it from my mind to minimize the influence of the press—but it thus happens that sometimes the press finds grievances which are more imaginary than real. Some people have that weakness ;—they are happy —yet a grievance heretofore unsuspected comes to them as a relief. Let me, Mr. Speaker, answer some of the statements made in favour of entrusting the lands to the new provinces. First, it must be admitted that a revenue had to be provided to run the machinery of the local government. This is what is being done by granting a subsidy in lieu of lands. Is this subsidy a fair equivalent for the public lands surrendered to us ? In order to answer this question, one must bear in mind the following facts. The lands are not sold by the federal government, but are given away as an inducement to the settlers. Suppose the lands were left to the now provinces, would they depart from the policy of free grants to the settlers ? I assume that they would —in all wisdom—continue the issuing of free grants. Thus, the revenue which otherwise would accrue from the sale of these

lands, would amount to nothing—with perhaps the exception of very limited receipts arising from stumpage dues or timber limits and royalties on coal lands. Let us suppose, Mr. Speaker, that the lands would be vested in the new provinces. What would happen ? One of two things would have to be done—either issue free grants to the settlers or sell the lands. In the first instance, i.e., issuing free grants, the provinces would get no revenue. In the second instance, i.e. selling the lands, true they would derive a revenue from the sales, but at the same time, they would fatally restrain and check the growth of population. On the contrary, the continuation of the free grants system will, by increasing the population increase aiso the annual payments made by the Dominion government. The actual revenue which the Dominion government draws from the Northwest Territories is derived mainly from (a) homesteading fees and from (b) royalties on coal mines—but without worrying the House with figures, we may take it as granted that this revenue is quite insignificant compared to the cost of surveying, settling and administering the lands. I say, Sir, that if these lands were in the future offered for sale, instead of being free, the Dominion government would hardly be justified in maintaining as it does, a costly scheme of immigration at the general expense of the country, which would chiefly benefit the land speculators of the Northwest Territories.

I claim, Sir, that the new provinces have received a generous, a liberal treatment at the hands of their government. The financial clauses of the Bill bear evidence of our generosity. What do they receive besides their autonomy ? Each province at the very start-off will have in addition to the usual federal subventions, an income in lieu of its lands of $375,000. This amount will grow with the growth of population to $562,500 when either of the provinces has 400,000 souls ; to $750,000 when it has 1,200,000 souls, and when it exceeds that number, the payment will reach $1,125,000 yearly. In addition, interest will be paid on swamp lands valued at $4,250,000 which will increase eventually to a capital amount of $7,500,000.

Moreover, the Dominion will—and this fact should not be overlooked—still maintain our corps of mounted police in the Northwest Territories—a maintenance which entails an annual cost of $300,000. Sir, I will not begrudge the Northwest Territories the happy circumstances under which they assume their political autonomy. This is not the time—and it is not in my nature to be envious. The prosperity, the happiness of my neighbour rejoices me ; it never saddens me. But may I not pause for a moment and remind the House that the older provinces might well envy the fortune of Alberta and Saskatchewan ? They, of their own volition, acquired the great lone land in 1870 ; they—patriotically—pledged their credit for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway ; they unreservedly launched themselves into a vast scheme of colonization in order to settle the prairies, Yet to-day, after thirty-five years of sacrifices, saddled with their own obligations, cheerfully assess themselves again, to endow generously their two younger associates, in order to complete the gigantic work of confederation.

Again I say that I do not begrudge the Northwest Territories their good fortune. The ideal which we, as Canadians, pursue in this North American continent is too noble, too exalted, not to call for some sacrifices. The game is well worthy of the stake ; the aspirations of Canada call forth our common efforts ; the task of to-day is not unbecoming the attainments of to-morrow. In the language of the poet :

> In the race, not in the prize,
> Glory's true distinction lies.

I have now reached, Sir, the educational clauses of the Bill—which, in the present instances, might well be termed the crucial clauses if one can judge by the storm—nay, by the tornado they have raised in the Dominion. Political agitation is always fraught with danger even in a country where one race alone is dominant, but, Sir, far more dangerous is a religious agitation in a country like Canada, where two races and two creeds are staring at each other. Experience has taught us how easy it is to inflame religious passions and how difficult to quell them. Yet, it seems as if this sad experiment was to be renewed periodically in this fair land of ours. As a Canadian, I deplore the intolerant spirit which of late has pervaded spheres, where one would expect Christian charity, broad-mindedness, fair-play, to inhabit. After the bitterness displayed from one end of the country to the other on this school question, after the abuse heaped upon one particular class of His Majesty's loyal subjects, I fear not to say, Sir, that unless reason and wise counsels prevail, the future of this confederation is doomed and the cause of union buried for ever. Well might we apply to the present situation the prophetic word of Thiers when the 2nd empire was on the eve of crumbling to pieces : Il n'y a plus qu'une seule faute à commettre.....

I fail to understand, Sir, why the educational clauses have roused such anger amongst men who, by their calling in life, should be specially guarded against any display of temper. I quite agree with you that there are firebrands who delight in seeing the country ablaze, but I am not referring to the professional demagogues. I am addressing myself to that honest yet credulous class of people, whose sleep is haunted by nightmares, and who—once led astray—

talk of rebellion instead of constitution. And yet, Sir, that matter or rather this difficulty is purely a constitutional one. It is in the light of our constitution that the question must be examined. To look at it from any other point of view is to err and to quibble. According to the British North America Act has the minority in the Northwest Territories any rights to a system of separate schools ? This is, in my judgment the only question to be decided. But before I answer it, let me, Sir, add a few missing links to a chapter of the history of the Northwest Territories. I do so, in no hostile spirit, I am only refreshing the memory of some Canadians who are too apt to forget. Sir, in the early part of the 18th century—nay even in the 17th century, the explorers of the Northwest were men of my race. La Verendrye and his sons, were the first Europeans who climbed up the Rocky mountains. The French missionaries soon found their way towards those distant lands to preach the Gospel to the Indian tribes. The fur traders, the voyageurs, the trappeurs and coureurs des bois followed—filling the early history of these vast domains with their adventurous yet heroic exploits. Not a river, not a lake, not a hill, not a valley that was not discovered by them. One has only to read carefully the deed of transfer of Ruperts land to Canada in 1870, to realize that nearly all the posts of the Hudson Bay Company, in the far west, bear most picturesque French names. After the conquest, when the Hudson Bay company took full possession of that immense territory, the French Canadian element continued to be an important factor in the affairs of the west. So much so, that the Bishop of Quebec, whose diocese included all British North America decided to send missionaries in those distant regions. By referring to the archives of the Quebec Archbishopric, one will see that in 1818, the first school in the Northwest Territories was established at the request of Monseigneur Plessis, Sir John Cope Sherbrooke was then our Governor and it is under his protection that the three missionaries sent by Monseigneur Plessis entered the Northwest. The instructions of Governor Sherbrooke, given in writing, are well worth reading.

I do hereby call on all His Majesty's subjects, civil and military, and do request all other persons whomsoever to whom these presents shall come, not only to permit the said missionaries to pass without hindrance or molestation, but render them all good offices, assistance and protection wherever they shall find it necessary to go in the exercise of their holy calling.

That is what Sir John Sherbrooke said when the three first missionaries left Quebec to evangelize the Indian tribes of the Northwest Territories. They did not go there as marauders. The object of their mission, as indicated by the Bishop of Quebec, can be read in a very few lines :

The missionaries will make known to the people the religious faith they enjoy in remaining under the government of His Majesty, will teach them by words and example the respect and fidelity they should have for the sovereign, will accustom them to offer to God fervent prayers for the prosperity of His Most Gracious Majesty, of his august family and his empire.

These are the missionaries who explored the west, who discovered the west, so to speak, and opened it to civilization, and who preached the Gospel to the Indian tribes. Sir, they belonged to a noble race ; and when they bade farewell to their families, to their homes and to their province, they went knowing that some of them might not come back to civilization, in order to fulfil a sacred duty towards God and their King.

Now, before I refer to the legislation of 1871 and 1875, let me examine this section 93 of the British North America Act. First of all. I would like to say that the right hon. leader of the government has been taunted by many hon. gentlemen opposite and by the Conservative press throughout the country, because, forsooth, he had given us a page of history in explaining to the House, as he did on the 21st February last, when he introduced this measure, how that clause came to be inserted in the British North America Act. Now, it is usual, when we have legislation of a somewhat complicated character, as this is, to go to the root of that legislation and to inquire under what circumstances it was enacted. There is, therefore, nothing extraordinary in the fact that the right hon. leader of the government should have explained the peculiar circumstances under which that clause 93 was enacted. In the case of the St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company versus the Queen, Mr. Justice Strong, in giving his judgment, used these words :

In construing this enactment of the British North America Act we are not only entitled, but bound——

Mark his word, 'bound.'

——to apply that well established rule which requires us, in placing a meaning upon descriptive terms and definitions contained in statutes, to have recourse to external aids derived from the surrounding circumstances and the history of the subject matter dealt with, and to construe the enactment by the light derived from such sources, and so to put ourselves as far as possible in the position of the legislature whose language we have to expound. If this rule were subjected and the language of the statute were considered without such assistance from extrinsic facts, it is manifest that the task of interpretation would degenerate into mere speculation and guess work.

This is the language of the ex-Chief Justice of our Supreme Court, the highest court of our land, which he used a few years ago in a very important case. In that case Sir Oliver Mowat was defending the rights of the province of Ontario—I think it was the Provincial Streams case. The province of Ontario was deeply interested in that

case, and was represented by that upholder of provincial rights, Sir Oliver Mowat. He used this language :

In various cases it has been decided, I am not quite sure whether in this court or in other courts, reference has been made to the resolutions upon which the British North America Act was founded. What degree of importance should be attached to them has not been stated, but at all events it is reasonable for judges to look at them, and if they do find that they throw any light on the subject they should avail themselves of that light.

Therefore, I say that the right hon. leader of this government was right in going back to the history of confederation, to the origin of clause 93 of the British North America Act, in order that he might the better interpret it as the basis of the present measure. We know, from the history he gave this House, that if clause 93 was embalmed in the constitution of this country it was at the request of the Protestant minority of the province of Quebec. Now, Sir, I may say at once that it was not necessary to embalm that principle of religious equality in the constitution. If we examine the words of Sir John Rose, in the confederation debates, one may easily see that the Protestant minority of the province of Quebec did not require the enactment of clause 93 in the British North America Act. Here is the statement made by Sir John Rose :

Now, we the English Protestant minority of Lower Canada, cannot forget, that whatever right of separate education we have, was accorded to us in the most unrestricted way before the union of the provinces, when we were in a minority and entirely in the hands of the French population. We cannot forget that in no way was there any attempt to prevent us educating our children in the manner we saw fit, and deemed best; and I would be untrue to what is just, if I forgot to state that the distribution of state funds for educational purposes was made in such a way as to cause no complaint on the part of the minority.

That was the statement made by Sir John Rose at the time of confederation. Therefore, I say that in the light of this testimony it was not even necessary for the minority to exact the enactment of that clause 93. Nevertheless, Sir A. T. Galt, in fulfilment of the pledge given to the Protestant minority of Lower Canada, went to London and had that clause inserted in our constitution. Now, the first question which presents itself is that which has been treated this afternoon by my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), namely, does this clause 93 apply to Quebec and Ontario only, or does it apply to all the provinces ? My hon. friend from Labelle has cited the opinion of Lord Carnarvon. I will not weary the House by giving the quotation again, but I will only quote a few words. Lord Carnarvon, in 1866, used the following language :

The object of this clause is to secure to the religious minority of one province the same rights, privileges and protection which the religious minority of another province may enjoy. The Roman Catholics of Upper Canada and the Roman Catholic minority of the maritime provinces will thus stand on a footing of equality.

But has the local legislature exclusive jurisdiction in matters of education ? We are told that the jurisdiction of the provinces is absolute in matters of education. It is not so—on the contrary, it is limited. It is precisely what the Lord Chancellor said in rendering judgment on the second appeal to the Privy Council of the Manitoba minority :

The Act imposes a limitation on the legislative powers conferred. Any enactment contravening its provisions is beyond the competency of the provincial legislation and consequently null and void. In relation to the subject specified in section 92 of the British North America Act the exclusive powers of the provincial legislatures may be said to be absolute. But this is not so as regards education.

Sir, not only is the jurisdiction of provincial legislature restricted in matters of education, but to use the language of Lord Carnarvon :

In the event of any wrong at the hand of local majority, the minority may appeal to the Governor in Council and claim the application of any remedial laws that may be necessary from the central parliament of Canada.

Therefore, the Privy Council declared that in all matters enumerated in section 92, the powers of the legislature are supreme and exclusive, but we have the authority of the Privy Council—the highest authority in the British Empire—that on matters of education this Dominion parliament has certain authority. I can quote not only authorities from the other side of the Atlantic, but I can quote the authority of Mr. Edward Blake, of the late Sir John Thompson, and even of Mr. Dalton McCarthy, the champion of the public school system in this country. On March 6, 1893, Sir John Thompson, speaking in the House of Commons, and addressing himself to the scope of section 93, at a time when the separate school controversy in Manitoba was becoming acute, said :

I take it that the principle is well settled and well agreed upon by both parties in this country, as well as by lawyers and tribunals of justice, that that provision, that qualification, nullifies any Act of a provincial legislature which conflicts with it ; and that the legislature of a province, while to a great extent its powers are exclusive with regard to education, steps beyond its power and enacts a void enactment when it enacts a law which prejudicially affects any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons had by law in any province at the time of the union.

Sir John Thompson also quoted from Mr. Edward Blake, who some years before had introduced resolutions for referring a certain class of semi-political questions to the Supreme Court of Canada, and Mr. Blake dealt inter alia with section 93, and said :

Under these clauses a limited power to make educational laws is granted to a province, provided, amongst other things, that nothing therein contained shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any of the provinces had by law or, in the case of Manitoba, by practice at the union.

Mr. Dalton McCarthy's opinion will be found at page 73 of the official report of his argument before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the city of Winnipeg vs. Barrett. He was explaining to their lordships the meaning of section 93, and went on to call their attention to section 146 in these words:

By this section 146 the Dominion was to take in the province of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, and also it was assumed Rupert's Land and the Northwest Territories would be acquired, and would be ultimately divided into provinces, just as the Northwestern Territories had been divided into states. And provision was made for taking in these various provinces, and accordingly they were taken in, British Columbia first, if my memory serves right, in 1871, and then Prince Edward Island. This clause (section 93) was made applicable to British Columbia and Prince Edward Island, but in neither of these provinces were there any denominational rights, nor has it been so pretended, in respect of schools to be protected or reserved. But the scheme was to apply to the provinces as they came in the general terms of the British North America Act where there were not special circumstances which rendered some other legislation necessary.

And now, as to the contention that section 93 applies only to the four original provinces, or, as some contend, only to the two provinces of Ontario and Quebec, let me state what occurred in the province of Prince Edward Island. That province came into confederation in the year 1873. Although the delegates met at Charlottetown, although they had debated the union in Prince Edward Island, yet in 1867 that province declared that she would not join confederation, and she did not join at that date. Before 1873, there had existed in that province a system of public schools, and side by side with it had grown up a system of separate schools. There were French schools in several parishes, and in 1875 an Act was passed by the local legislature of Prince Edward Island, abolishing the separate schools system. An appeal was made to the Governor General in Council. On that appeal it was admitted by the appellants, the Roman Catholic minority, and by the respondents, the local legislature, that although Prince Edward Island had joined confederation only in 1873, clause 93 applied, and the late Hon. Rodolphe Laflamme, who was then Minister of Justice, submitted a lengthy report, in which he said that clause 93 could not be of any avail to the minority in the province of Prince Edward Island, because the system of separate schools had grown up illegally by the side of the public schools system. There was no legislation to warrant it, and therefore clause 93 could be of no avail.

But we are told by Mr. Haultain and a portion of the press that what may apply to a province does not apply to a territory. This is indeed a very fine and very subtle distinction. Mr. Haultain's objection is not serious. That it is only sophistry is quite obvious. In 1871, doubts had arisen as to the right of the federal parliament to establish provinces out of the Territories admitted in the union. The imperial parliament then passed a statute amending the British North America Act in order to remove any such doubts. What does section 2 of that Act declare? Our parliament was authorized

To make provision for the constitution and administration of the provinces carved out of those regions, and for the passing of laws for the peace, order and good government thereof.

I claim that by the clear and concise enactment I have just quoted, ample authority was given this parliament to frame a constitution for the Territories. Mr. Haultain's interpretation of the British North America Act is this one: He wishes to date the entry into confederation of the two new provinces back to July 15, 1870—because, forsooth, at that time there was no system of separate schools established by law—such as there is under the law of 1875 and under the ordinances 29, 30, 31. As section 93 of the British North America Act does not mention Territories, but provinces. Mr. Haultain concludes that it cannot benefit the new provinces. But the hon. gentleman cannot alter facts. Territories were admitted in the union in 1870. But in 1905 we admit provinces—according to section 2 of the imperial statute of 1871.

It is only this year that this Bill will be in force; it is only on the first of July next that the Northwest Territories will join the union as provinces, and therefore the legislation enacted in 1875 by this parliament granting a system of separate schools, can be retained by the present legislation. I could cite the ablest authorities on the American constitution, Cooley, Randolph Tucker, Sutherland, and others, to show that when the Territories are acquired they do not become states, and so it is with our own Territories. When they were purchased by Canada they did not become full-fledged provinces. And how did these Territories come into Canada? We are aware that there was some doubt expressed as to the validity of the Act of 1870. Some people believed that we could not carve provinces out of these Territories, and therefore Sir John Macdonald, who was Prime Minister, applied to the imperial authorities to have the legislation of 1870 confirmed by an imperial statute. It is well to refer to the memoran-

dum sent to the home government by Sir John A. Macdonald in order that we may see the scope of the imperial statute. Writing to the Earl of Kimberly, he asked the imperial parliament to enact legislation in its next session :

1. Confirming the Act of the Canadian parliament, 33 Victoria, chapter 3, above referred to, as if it had been an imperial statute, and legalizing whatever may have been done under it according to its true interests.

2. Empowering the Dominion parliament from time to time to establish other provinces in the Northwestern Territory, with such local government, legislature and constitution as it may think proper, provided that no such local government or legislature shall have greater powers than those conferred on the local governments and legislatures by the British North America Act, 1867, and also empowering it to grant such provinces representation in the parliament of the Dominion.

These were the purposes, as stated by Sir John Macdonald, for which the imperial parliament passed the Act of 1871.

With regard to this Bill, the British North America Act of 1867 cannot alone apply. The British North America Act of 1871 must also apply. The two must be construed together.

Let me go one step further. Are the educational clauses of this Bill inconsistent with the spirit of our constitution? Read the preamble of the British North America Act and what do you find ?

Whereas the phovinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick have expressed their desire to be federally united into one Dominion under the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, with a constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom.

I ask you, Sir, is there anything in the educational clause contrary in principle to the constitution of the United Kingdom?

Sir, if there is a redeeming feature in the present debate for the partisans of the separate schools system, it is the fact that in Great Britain, in the mother country, there is also a system whereby denominational schools are state aided. Yes, Mr. Speaker, in England, the country wherefrom we borrowed our parliamentary institutions ; in England, wherefrom we borrowed a constitution; in England, minorities enjoy their full liberty in matters of education. I, a Canadian and a Roman Catholic, am proud to cite this example of tolerance given by our mother country. I ask my friend from Grey would he be in Canada less generous, less tolerant than the average English Protestant in England ?

Sir, I need not refer at any length to the history of the school question in England. But I may say at the outset that the right hon. leader of the House is not the only statesman who has had to face grave difficulties with regard to an Educational Bill. Sir, the greatest of all modern British statesmen has also had his hours of anxiety when in 1870 he attempted to legislate upon a similar question. Mr. Gladstone lost many a warm friend, many a firm supporter, when he introduced the Educational Bill of 1870.

For years, I might say for centuries, there had been in England a system of national schools. But there were many sects, many creeds in England, and it was felt that it would be a violation of the principle of religious liberty if the dissenters were forced to send their children to schools, the religious teaching of which was not in conformity with their views. So, by the side of national schools, grew up a system of voluntary schools—that is to say, separate schools—where the dissenters of all sects and denominations sent their children. The secular teaching did not differ much from that of the national schools; but the religious teaching given the children was in accordance with the tenets of the parents' faith. Catholics, Wesleyans, Quakers established all over the realm voluntary schools. So much so, that a time came when more children frequented the voluntary schools than the national schools. The board schools were state aided; the voluntary schools were self-sustaining. There were in England, as there are in this country, partisans of the neutral school. There were also men who thought that the children had a right to a religious teaching according to the religious belief of their parents.

Such was the opinion of Mr. Gladstone. Such was also the opinion of Lord Salisbury. Let me quote, Mr. Speaker, the opinion of those two great British statesmen. As far back as 1856 Mr. Gladstone said:

We have happily found it practicable in England to associate together in the most perfect harmony these two principles, the principle of voluntary exertion, through which you get heart and love and moral influence infused into your school instruction, and the principle of material aid from the state, by which the skeleton and framework of your education is provided. I am convinced that the harmony which has hitherto been maintained between them, even in times of doubt and difficulty, will continue, and, if possible, increase, but if I were driven utterly to abandon the voluntary, or to place exclusive reliance upon it, I would not hesitate a moment in making my choice. In such an emergency, I would say at once, give me the real education, the affection of the heart, the moral influence operating upon character, the human love, that are obtained through the medium of the voluntary principle carried by men whose main motive is one of Christain philantropy rather than throw me upon a system which, whatever the intentions of its mover may be, must sooner or later degenerate into hard irreligion.

Lord Salisbury, on another occasion, spoke as follows :

There is only one sound principle in religious education to which you should cling, which you should relentlessly enforce against all the conveniences and experiences of official

men, and that is, that a parent, unless he has forfeited the right by criminal act, has the inalienable right to determine the teaching which the child shall receive upon the holiest and most momentous of subjects. This is a right which no expediency can negative, which no state necessity ought to allow you to sweep away ; and, therefore, I ask you to give your attention to this question of denominational education. It is full of danger and of difficulty, but you will meet the danger by marching straight up to it and declaring that the prerogative of the parent, unless he be convicted of criminality, must not be taken away by the state.

Sir, as I said a minute ago, the first important Bill in relation to education in Great Britain was introduced in 1870. For the first time parliament passed a measure making provision for a 'sufficient, efficient and suitable' elementary education; but mark well, it was understood that the work of efficient voluntary schools should not be hampered, but that their efforts should be supplemented. In those days there were men like my hon. friend from Grey who opposed denominational schools. Here is the answer which Mr. Gladstone gave to their opposition:

Can it be said that the prevalence of denominationalism in those schools at the present moment is generally felt to be a grievance ? On the contrary, is it not the case that everybody and every section are telling us continually that the religious difficulty directly you came to practice becomes insignificant, and that it is a difficulty made for parliament and for debate rather than on which would be felt within the walls of the schools ? Now I come to denominational, or as I shall call them, voluntary schools and if I am told that an overwhelming majority of voluntary schools are denominational, I think I can draw a lesson from that fact, which is that it shows what a powerful agency we have to do our bidding, to perform much of our work for us, if only we will not obstruct it. We are as much convinced as he is that with respect to these voluntary schools, the duty of the state is to make use of them for the purposes of secular instruction which they give, but to hold itself entirely and absolutely detached from all responsibility with regard to their religious teaching.

This was, Sir, the opinion of Mr. Gladstone with regard to denominational schools. But I explained a moment ago, though the voluntary schools were tolerated—they were self-sustaining, whilst the other schools were state aided. I shall not refer to the school legislation which since 1870 was passed by the imperial parliament. I come immediately to the Education Act of 1902, an Act passed by the Balfour government.

Mr. Balfour has himself, in a few words described what reforms were brought about by the Bill :

Our reform, if it is to be adequate, must, in the first place, establish one authority of education—technical, secondary, primary—possessed of powers which may enable it to provide for the adequate training of teachers, &c. In the second place, I conclude that this one authority for education, being, as it is, responsible for a heavy cost to the ratepayers, should be the rating authority of the district. In the 3rd place, I lay down that the voluntary schools must be placed in a position in which they can worthily play their necessary and inevitable part in the scheme of national education.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the object, one of the objects of the Bill was to include in the national school system the voluntary schools. The Bill became law and to-day, Sir, you have in England, a system of denominational state-aided schools. Of course, Mr. Speaker, this law gave rise to a great opposition amongst a certain class of people. In England, as in Canada, the government lost many of its friends. Mr. Balfour and his colleagues were assailed. They were denounced as being 'under the unchecked sway of the priest.'

It is a clerical war, said Dr. Clifford, and this Bill is meant to be its victorious Waterloo. The coveted goal is the rule of the priest over the British people. The reason of the cleric is the motive and spirit and aim of this movement, and this legislative measure is the ladder constructed by the cabinet up which the cleric is to climb.

And further :

We cannot therefore treat too seriously a measure which is the latest of a series of efforts of clericalism to capture young England and carry it over to Rome.

And further :

We never dare let the clergy have their own way; they would have destroyed us; we should have been as Sodom and as Gomorrah.

When a bad government and bad religion work together, the ruin of the government is as certain as death. It is that union we have now to face.

You have, Sir, in the few lines I have just read, an idea of the campaign of vituperation to which the government was subjected in England. I find in those impassionate appeals, a certain relationship with those we have heard during last month.

But Sir, in England as well as in Canada, the government, though assailed and bitterly so, faced the situation with courage. I do not wish to worry the House with any lengthy quotations, I will confine myself to a few, emanating from men, who occupy leading positions in the British empire. The Prime Minister, speaking at Manchester, on January 18, 1895, said :

I altogether object to the tone which is sometimes taken up by the controversialists upon this subject. They appear to think that the voluntary school is the relic of an ancient system permitted as a matter of compromise to remain, tolerated by parliament, submitted to by the department, but altogether out of harmony with the needs and requirements of a progressive community—an instrument of edu-

cation which in process of time shall be thrown on one side as of an antiquated pattern and worn out by long use. I take precisely the opposite opinion. In my views, the normal education, the normal machinery for education required alike by the parent and by the community, is the voluntary school. I do not say there ought not to be—I have no attack to make on—a school board system. We require to deal with these questions, one who will look at them from a broader standpoint, who will feel that, outside the question of grants and the question of classes there are other issues to be decided, other interests to be considered, and who will feel his duty as Education Minister as but very imperfectly accomplished if he does not do all in his power to foster every influence which may mould, not merely the children committed to his care, not merely these subjects of secular learning—which may not advance their happiness in life—but these larger questions, the sense of these greater issues, necessary, as I must firmly believe, to the well-being of every community and most of all necessary in these days among the rising, full-fledged forces of the new democracy. In making this profession of my educational faith have I said anything which runs counter to the interests of that democracy to which I appealed just now.

Sir, if there is a man whose name has been heralded throughout the length and breadth of this country as that of a great statesman; if there is a man whose imperial policy we have been asked to adopt; if there is a man who, in one section of the country at least—enjoys unlimited confidence and great popularity—this man—this British statesman is Mr. Chamberlain. What views does that enlightened statesman hold on this question of education?

In the course of this controversy, I observe a great number of people appeal to the time-honored principle of religious equality, well, I entirely approve of that. I consider myself to be a devoted advocate of religious sentiment of that kind. What do you mean by religious equality? How far are you prepared to go in order to secure? For instance, do you think it consistent that churchmen, Roman Catholics, Jews, Unitarians and a number of other minor sects should be forced to pay rates which provide religious instruction which in their opinion either leaves out the essentials which make it valuable, or in other cases teaches doctrines in which they do not believe. Do you think, I say, that it is religious equality to insist upon that and at the same time refuse to those denominations the right of having their religious instruction for their children to which they do attach real importance?

And further:

I ask another question. You are in favour of religious equality. Would you be willing to accept a system by which it has been attempted to secure that equality in some of the provinces in Canada, where every ratepayer is permitted to say to what class of school his rates should go? That is a religious equality.

And further:

And if you admit the right of these people who built the schools for the greater part by private contributions, who have supported the schools by really very large contributions, amounting on the average during the past 30 years to something like one million pounds a year—if you admit their right to have secured to them the results for which they make their sacrifices—that is to say, the right to give and have given to their children the education, the religious education, which they believe to be essential—then there is no reason whatever why upon every other point sensible men and moderate men should not be able to come to an agreement.

As I said a minute ago, Mr. Balfour met a very strong opposition when he introduced his Bill—even in the ranks of the Unionist party, many friends of the government were somewhat influenced by the wild appeals such as that I have already mentioned. Mr. Chamberlain uttered the words I have just quoted at a meeting of the leading Liberal Unionists held at Birmingham on the 9th of October, 1902. At the conclusion of his speech, the stand taken by Mr. Chamberlain in favour of denominational schools was endorsed by the whole party.

I might quote the opinions expressed on the same subject by Mr. Lyttleton, the present Colonial Secretary, by Sir William R. Anson, by Canon Maccoll, by Mr. Haldane, M.P., and many others, but I do not wish to worry the House.

It seems to me, Sir, that the opinions of the leaders of public opinion in the British empire have on such a grave issue, more weight than that of the hon. gentleman from East Grey (Mr. Sproule).

But, Sir, my friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) has triumphantly referred to France in his address of Thursday last. Church schools have been abolished in France, exclaimed my friend, because forsooth they had produced illiterates, and to remedy that state of things the government has established a system of neutral schools. True it is, Sir, that in France the government is seeking to suppress denominational schools. But what has been the result? Does not my hon. friend read the papers? The government which suppressed the schools, which exiled the religious orders, denounced the Concordat—that government has been also suppressed, yes suppressed after many a tumult, many an uprising of all liberty-lovers in France. The movement against that act of the French government was not started by the illiterates; it was organized by whom? By members of the Académie Française, by men like François Coppée, Jules Lemaître, Brunetière—by men of all parties, of all creeds; aye, by free thinkers, by French Protestants like Mons. de Pressensé, one of the most eminent French writers of the day. These men are all united, and they have published a manifesto protesting against the policy of the government. Let me quote a few lines of that manifesto:

We can have no illusion. Efforts have been made to strangle the liberty of education. One is not free to think when one is not free to propagate one's thoughts publicly, and one is not free to think when one is not permitted to have one's children brought up in accordance with one's ideas, conviction and faith. To suppress the liberty of education, the government dares not act openly, but invokes hypocritically a law of which the apparent and declared object was to extend the scope of the liberties indispensable to a democracy. . . . To grant the monopoly of education to one party doctrine and opinion is to establish a censorship over matters of public instruction, to organize the servitude of thought, and to prepare political tyranny.

This is what the élite of the French littérateurs think of the school policy of the French government. Let me tell my friend from Grey that he is greatly mistaken if he really believes that the denominational schools in France have produced a race of illiterates. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the land of Racine, of Molière, of Corneille, of Bossuet, is not a land of illiterates ? Surely the schools and the lycées which have produced men like Victor Hugo, Lamartine, Thiers and Guizot, were not mere hotbeds of ignorance and cretinism ! The hon. gentleman, in his endeavour to give the public schools a superiority over the denominational schools, might have spared his French Canadian friends in the House his untimely reference to the so-called illiteracy of Frenchmen. For my part, Sir, I am a British subject, and an admirer of the British institutions. I may add that, politically speaking, I am more at home in London than in Paris —that my ideals in politics are at Westminster, not at the Palais Bourbon ; yet no one will ever deny—I for one will never do so—that in literature and in fine arts, France is second to no other nation in the world. But if France is still, at the beginning of this twentieth century, the leading nation of the world in the field of literature and fine arts, she has nothing to regret of the teachings given to her sons in the old church schools.

Reference has been made during this debate to the American settlers in the west. We are told that we must have public schools, because the settlers happen to come from across the boundary line, where a system of public schools exists. In other words, we must ignore the spirit and the letter of our constitution because the Americans are coming to our country. I shall not discuss the school system as it exists in the United States, but I have enough pride in the institutions of my country to believe that our system is not inferior to theirs. I have enough patriotism to stand by the rights of a Canadian minority, even if it does not suit the American settlers. And I am amazed, Sir, to see the ultra loyalist element of Canada so subservient to the desires, to the wishes, of the newcomers. Let them come from Dakota, from Arkansas, Illinois, or from any other state of the union. I do not object to that ; but, in the name of common sense and for our own dignity, let us not trample upon our own constitution because it happens to please these people.

Sir, it has been suggested in the course of this debate that the Northwest Act of 1875 provided only for a temporary state of things. There is no such declaration in the Act. Let me say, Sir, that the men who enacted that law had taken part in the battle for confederation. They knew what had been the stumbling block of the union and what compromise had been reached. They, therefore, deliberately pledged the faith, the honour of parliament, that as long as there would be a Catholic minority in the west it would be entitled to its schools. Thirty years have elapsed since 1875. The separate school system has been adopted, and to-day we are told that those who have settled in the west with that guarantee should do without it. The Act of 1875 was passed under Mr. Mackenzie's government, and it was supported by Sir John Macdonald. It was amended in 1882 under a Conservative administration, and the separate school system was maintained.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, that in the British empire, if there was some sympathy for the Uitlanders, it was because it was asserted that President Kruger had not kept faith with them. In 1880 President Kruger went to London, and he then invited immigration to the Transvaal, promising the immigrants full citizenship. I have read several books on the South African war, and in them I found that the chief cause of the war was the lack of faith of Kruger in his stringent naturalization laws. Sir, laws concerning education are also with us fundamental laws. We enjoy religious liberty in Canada. Religious education is to a large degree considered essential by Roman Catholics. Why then should we deprive them of their right to schools ?

Mr. Speaker, we are told, those of us who favour this measure, that we should trust the western people. Such is the language of the 'Globe', such is the language of the Toronto 'News.' For my part, I would trust, and I do trust, the western people as well as the eastern people ; but the present issue has been made a religious one. The protests which have been made from the pulpit, the petitions which have been sent to this House, all bear the mark of religion. We have had petitions from the Orange Order, from the Baptists, the Presbyterians, the Methodists ; and there is between the opponents of the separate schools and the opponents of the public schools such a wide breach that, if left to the popular vote in the west, it would be impossible to bridge the difficulty. Those who sincerely believe in the separate school system would soon come to grief, because their opponents are unquestionably the majority. Besides the opposition to the separate schools seems to be doctrinal, and I do not see how you could reconcile both

systems. By the census of 1901 I find that the several religious denominations in the Northwest Territories stand as follows :

Presbyterians	27,800	
Methodists	22,151	
Baptists	5,340	
Lutherans	12,097	
		67,394
Roman Catholics	30,073	
Anglicans	25,366	
		55,439
		15,949

Having those figures in hand, I find that there is a majority against the system of separate schools of 11,955 in comparing the relative strength of the two factions. Under these circumstances, and in the interest of peace and harmony, do you not believe that it is far better to settle the difficulty at once, by an honourable compromise satisfactory to all those who believe in moderation and fair-play ?

We have been told the other day by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that the Catholics of the United States were paying something like fifty million dollars per year, in order to have their separate schools. Is it not far better to enact the present legislation, which, although giving the minority their right to religious teaching of their own, brings their schools to the standard of the public schools system in secular matters ? If you were to refuse them what they are getting by the ordinances, they would be left to their own private resources ; they would be self-sustaining. How could they compete with the state-aided public schools ? What interest have you to starve them ? Surely the half hour of religious instruction should not debar the Catholics from government assistance.

I ask any fair-minded Protestant if he believes, in his heart and conscience, that my son can be taught history, for instance, in the same book as his son ? Is it possible for an honest Protestant and an honest Catholic to think alike, and to see in the same light any of the historical events connected with say, the Reformation, Mary Stuart, Henry VIII, Queen Mary, John Knox or Thomas Beckett ? Are there not, on such questions, deep differences which it is almost impossible to reconcile ?

We are told that this legislation is an infringement on what is called provincial rights. As a consistent Liberal, I claim myself to be an upholder of such rights. After the battles fought by the late Sir Oliver Mowat and by the Hon. Edward Blake, we on this side of the House cannot but defend the rights of the provinces. But, as I have already demonstrated, the rights of the provinces are clearly defined by section 92 of the British North America Act. Section 93 gives also the federal parliament a jurisdiction on matters of education. At the time of the Equal Rights movement, when parliament was asked too to disallow the Jesuits' Estate Act, we too invoked provincial rights, and we were answered by the late leader of that campaign, the late Mr. Dalton McCarthy, as follows :

> The worship of what was called local autonomy, which some gentlemen have become addicted to, is fraught, I venture to say, with great evils to this Dominion. Our allegiance is due to the Dominion of Canada. The separation into provinces, the right of local self-government which we possess, is not to make us less citizens of the Dominion, is not to make us less anxious for the promotion and welfare of the Dominion, and it is no argument to say that, because a certain piece of legislation is within the power of a local parliament, therefore the legislation is not to be disturbed. By the same Act of parliament by which the power is conferred upon the local legislature, the duty and power—because where there is a power there is a corresponding duty—are cast upon the Governor in Council to revise, and review, the Acts of the legislative bodies. If you are to say that because a law has been passed within the legislative authority of the province, therefore it must remain, we can easily see, Sir, that before long these provinces, instead of coming nearer together, will go further and further apart. We can see that the only way of making a united Canada, and building up a national life and sentiment in the Dominion, is by seeing that the laws of one province are not offensive to the laws and institutions, and it may be to the feelings, of another—I will go so far as to say that they must be to some extent taken into consideration.

I have quoted the above extract in order to show that the principle of provincial rights is not always adhered to by those who are quite ready, when circumstances arise, to invoke it. Let me, however, give the opinion on this subject of one of the fathers of confederation. In an address to his constituents, October, 1864, Sir A. T. Galt said :

> It was clear that in confiding the general subject of education to the local legislatures, it was absolutely necessary it should be accompanied with such restrictions as would prevent injustice in any respect from being done to the minority.
>
> Now this applied to Lower Canada, but it also applied, with equal force, to Upper Canada and the other provinces, for in Lower Canada there was a Protestant minority, and in the other provinces a Catholic minority. The same privileges belong of right here, as belonged to the other right elsewhere. There could be no greater injustice to a population than to compel them to have their children educated in a manner contrary to their own religious belief.

Therefore, I say, Sir, that I am within the scope of provincial rights in asking that this parliament should protect the minority in the Northwest. But, there is something else than provincial rights. We, the Liberal party, stand for provincial rights. That was the policy of our old leader, Alexander Mackenzie; it was the policy of Sir Oliver Mowat; it was the policy of Mr. Edward Blake. It is still the policy of the Liberal party. But, Sir, with provincial

rights there are other rights which are under the care and protection of the Reform party. These are the rights of the minority of whom Mr. Edward Blake once said in this House that it should be given not only a fair measure, but an abundant, an overheaping measure of justice. Sir, I shall not refer to the hierarchy and the Quebec ecclesiastics. I think this question has been threshed out in the masterly speeches of both my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and of my friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). I do not wish to pose as the defender of the Roman Catholic clergy in this House. As a Liberal, I have, during the few years that I have been in public life felt at times the interference of the clergy in politics. I will say nothing however in condemnation of the clergy of my province, as they acted within their rights as citizens, but I can say this, that the history of the Roman Catholic clergy in this country is its best vindication. My hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) recalled what has taken place in 1774 and in 1812. I will invite the hon. gentleman who spoke the other day, the member from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to come to Montreal. I shall ask him to pass with me along Notre Dame street at the seminary of St. Sulpice. He will see there, an old gate and an old sun dial. I will remind him that in 1774 the American rebels despatched to Montreal a young ecclesiastic, who later on became Bishop of Baltimore. That young ecclesiastic passed under that historic gate in order to ask the old French priests, the Sulpicians, to induce their flocks to join the American rebels. Sir, what was the answer given by the superior of the Sulpicians? There at that very gate near the old sun dial? Carroll, who had been despatched here by Lafayette and Washington was answered by the old superior that he could not stay one hour more in the country, that he would not be allowed to induce the French Canadians to become rebels to His Majesty's government. This is only one of the chapters of the history of the Roman Catholic clergy in my province.

I regret to have to quote in conclusion the very caustic remarks made by a man who resides in the city of Toronto and who bears a name which should be a protection and a shield against any such vituperation. I read, Sir, the interview given the other day to a newspaper by Mr. Sam. Blake, of Toronto. What does he say:

> Why, he asks, should the Dominion, while awarding provincial rights of these new provinces, try to strangle them in their birth by insisting on the trail of the Jesuit surrounding the vital matter of the education of their children?

This is the language of Mr. Sam. Blake, the brother of that great Canadian statesman, the undaunted friend of the minorities in the British Parliament as well as here in Canada, the man who enacted the very legislation of 1875. This is the language which Mr. Sam. Blake has used towards the province of Quebec and the Roman Catholic clergy. Sir, I will not answer by my own words. Let me quote in answer to Mr. Blake the words uttered by the Archbishop of Canterbury who visited this Dominion last fall. Speaking in Quebec in that old church of the Recollets, now the Anglican cathedral of Quebec, the Primate of England said:

> But you, who know far better than I the varied story of Quebec, are recalling to-day the earlier memories which—in a larger than any technical sense—gave imperishable consecration to this place, which links it back along a chain of quite peculiar pathos, and interests to the work done centuries ago by members of the fraternity of St. Francis of Assisi, and along with them for a little while, at least, to the devoted men who, in a very different 'society,' a society whose very name became a catchword for a policy of behaviour which we condemn—did yet show to the whole world an example of missionary enthusiasm and a steadiness of persevering faith in face of persecution and suffering which, while the world standeth, will encircle with a halo of glory, the memory of the Jesuit missionaries of 250 years ago. In the words of the foremost historian of the colonial church—a historian of whose staunch Protestantism none can make question—at every season and in every place the unwearied French missionary was seen winning his way to the Red man's home. Sometimes lost amid the trackless snow or forests, at other times hurried in his light canoe down some fearful rapid, he perished and was never heard of more. Of some, the tidings came that they had met with death more terrible than this, tortured by every art of savage cruelty, burnt or scalped or starved or mutilated in every limb. Yet none quailed or faltered. New men instantly pressed on. As we mark the steadfastness of the faith which animated the hearts of Goupil and Jogues, and Lalement, and Brebœuf and Daniel in their martyrdom, we feel that we should violate the truth did we withhold, or only with niggard and reluctant spirit, acknowledge the praise which is their due.

This is my answer, this is the noble answer of the Archbishop of Canterbury to Mr. Sam. Blake. In conclusion, Sir, let me repeat the words of the great Protestant writer Lecky. Speaking of the Catholic priesthood he said:

> No other body of men have ever exhibited a more single-minded unworldly zeal, refracted by no personal interests, sacrificing to duty the dearest of earthly objects, and confronting with undaunted heroism every form of hardship, of suffering, and of death.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY (Calgary). Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to give a silent vote on this question, nor do I intend at this late hour to be led into a discussion of the statements of different newspapers. It seems to me that there are matters of greater importance to be considered in the discussion of this Bill. There is just one matter

to which I wish to refer in regard to the insinuation that Mr. Haultain does not represent the views of the people of the Northwest Territories, nor the views of the Territorial government. The hon. the Solicitor General (Mr. Lemieux) has seen fit to state that the letter signed by Mr. Haultain was not assented to by his colleague, Mr. Bulyea, and that therefore it did not represent the views of the Territorial government. Now, I assume that the same reason would apply if we should say that this Bill was introduced by the right hon. First Minister without the consent of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). Let me ask the Solicitor General to point out one fact of one protest in that letter signed by Mr. Haultain, that is not borne out by the draft of the Bill which he submitted to this House in December, 1901, and to which the legislative assembly at Regina had given their approval. That was their mandate, that was their case; and until the hon. gentleman can point to something in that letter which is not borne out by that draft Bill, then I would consider that the insinuation is not worthy of any further reply. If the hon. gentleman is looking for some members of the Territorial government who have been false to their trust, he certainly cannot point his finger to Mr. Haultain. Mr. Haultain needs no recommendation in the west, nor does he in Ottawa. He has been dealing with the federal government, and it is in your judgment as to how he has laboured to secure the rights of the people of the west.

Now, Sir, I was somewhat surprised to hear the Solicitor General revive the old contention that the federal government had purchased the Northwest Territories. We are advised to-day that we were not only purchased for the general benefit of Canada, but also that we were discovered by a French Canadian. I think if he will look into the records he will find that that argument was abandoned many years ago. In 1885 the strongest position this government would take was that they had a large pecuniary interest in that country, and that is the position they did take. Let me ask the hon. gentleman to answer a couple of questions in regard to the purchase to which he has referred. Let me ask him to explain to this House when the Bill comes up for discussion of the clauses seriatim in committee, if that money was paid as the purchase price of these lands, why was not the deed of surrender made to the people who paid the money? Again, let him explain why, if this land was purchased for the general benefit of the Dominion and to be held for the benefit of the Dominion, a large part of that land was included in the area handed over to the province of Quebec in the year 1898? All we desire in this matter is to be treated as our other fellow-citizens are treated throughout the Dominion of Canada. Let me also say in passing that the Solicitor General can produce no document which will show that £300,000 were paid as a purchase price for the land. That money was paid to get rid of a trading monopoly, and, as he says, it has been a very bad investment. But I would like to direct him to the debate of 1869, where he will see that the increase in customs and excise duties more than doubled the amount of interest on this £300,000 that was paid for the release of the land. I would also point out that the purchase of these rights opened a field for the trade of eastern manufacturers which has been worth ten times, or a hundred times, the money that has been paid for it. Now, he seems to think that this administration has some claim or title upon that land because they have expended a certain sum of money upon it. He says that it has cost us a couple of rebellions, and that we have been obliged to keep up the mounted police. Well, on the same reason I assume that the Dominion own part of the province of Ontario for the cost of the battle of Queenston Heights.

Sir, I regret that this government has seen fit to place restrictions upon the educational freedom of the new provinces. I do not fail to realize the importance of that question, I do not desire to belittle it for one moment. But I regret that this discussion should take place at this particular time, when our boundaries are being fixed, when our political status is being determined, questions of the most vital importance to us that are liable to be lost sight of in the excitement of this racial and religious question. As representing a western constituency, I do not relish being ushered into confederation under such circumstances, circumstances that have been created by this government without any demand, without any complaint, and without any doubt expressed by the minority in that country in the spirit of fairness of the local government when they come to deal with this question of education. I speak of course subject to correction. The right hon, the First Minister, when introducing this Bill referred to certain threatening letters; perhaps if these letters were produced we would see where this agitation originated. Now, I do not intend to go into this educational question at any length. I have had occasion to observe that it is likely to receive very careful nursing from hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House. I intend, however, to deal with it before I take my seat.

I desire particularly at this time to direct the attention of the House to some features in this Bill which are liable to be lost sight of in the excitement which surrounds the discussion of the educational question. First of all let me refer to a statement made by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) a few evenings ago. To my mind it

goes directly to the principle of the Bill which we are discussing. In order that I may not misquote the hon. gentleman I will read what he said :

I represent a section of the people of the Northwest Territories and I say that the people of the Northwest Territories have never asked for provincial autonomy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know who represents the people of the Territories the better, the thirty-five representatives in the local legislature at Regina or the hon. gentleman who represents Edmonton. I do not know what he means by stating that the people of the Northwest Territories never asked for provincial autonomy. I would remind him of the fact that on July 20, 1900, an address was sent to this government by the legislative assembly at Regina, and that on December 7, 1901, a draft Bill was prepared to which reference has been made and the terms of which were familiar to the thirty-five local representatives at Regina. In the year 1901, the Board of Trade of Edmonton, the town the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) lives in, passed a resolution asking that the Territories be created into two provinces. On April 2, 1902, the Eastern Assiniboia Liberal Association met at Indian Head and passed similar resolutions. I am not quite sure, but I have a suspicion that the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) was present at that meeting in company with Mr. Bulyea. In 1902, there was a local election in the Territories, and in the platform put forward by Mr. Haultain there were these two planks :

1. Equal rights with all the other provinces of the Dominion.
2. Control of the public domain in the west.

These are the matters that the government of the Territories are now fighting for and these are the matters upon which your judgment is invited in my appeal to you for re-election in the legislature. A similar appeal has been made in every constituency in the country by every candidate whose election will give support to the government at this particular period in the history of the Territories. The issue is plain ; it is for the people of the Territories to decide.

The election took place and the result of that election demonstrated that Mr. Haultain and his supporters represented public opinion in the Territories on the question of provincial autonomy. I find that four resolutions have subsequently been passed by the territorial assembly demanding the provincial status ; I find also that the very strongest advocate of the stand taken by Mr. Haultain, was, up to a short time ago, the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). He complimented Mr. Haultain on the stand he had taken in asking for provincial autonomy, but a short time afterwards the hon. member (Mr. Scott) changed his opinion, and assigned as a reason for delay that litigation was now pending as to the exemption of the Canadian Pacific Railway from taxation, and he held it would be folly for the government to put through a Bill leaving that matter an open question. But to-day, the hon. member (Mr. Scott) is supporting a Bill which contains a clause continuing that exemption for ever. I also find that on April the 3rd, the Prince Albert Board of Trade passed a resolution declaring that the government should grant provincial autonomy. On March the 3rd, there was a similar resolution from the Calgary Board of Trade. On March 25th, the Conservative convention at Moosejaw at which there were over 200 delegates, some of whom came 700 miles to attend, passed a resolution declaring in favour of the immediate granting of full provincial autonomy including the ownership of the public lands, mines and minerals. I also find that the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), speaking on October 13, 1903, used these words :

I would wish to point out to the hon. members and to the gentlemen on both sides, that it is not we who are objecting to provincial autonomy. We are asking provincial autonomy, but we want it on certain terms.

In January, 1904, the Liberal convention in nominating a candidate for Southern Alberta, passed a resolution in favour of provincial autonomy. On September 29 last, the right hon. the First Minister wrote to Mr. Haultain promising that if his government were returned to power they would immediately take into consideration the question of granting provincial autonomy to the Territories. I may point out that seven of the Liberal candidates were returned to this House, and not one of these gentlemen, so far as I know, has been instructed by his constituents to repudiate the pledge given to the people by the Liberal leader. I say, Sir, that the resolution I have read, asking that the mines, lands and minerals be left to the provinces, represents the true sentiment of the people of the west. They have the conviction that they are entitled to have in the local government the administration of the mines, lands and minerals in their territory, and without that they will not be satisfied. The only argument which I have heard presented in support of the overturning of the principles of the union, is that there might be a conflict between the local and federal authorities, and that the federal government might not be able to carry on its immigration policy. That argument was used by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), but he has not always thought that way because in the province of Manitoba in days gone by he contended for full provincial rights and he advocated handing over the lands to his province ; later on he advicated handing over the school lands as well.

The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) seemed to fear greatly that if the control of the public domain should be given to the provinces, the provinces would use the lands for revenue and would not settle the outlying districts. Well, Sir, I am not so willing as he is to suspect the foresight and business-like management of the local assembly. That assembly has undertaken no function up to date that the people of that country would consent to have abrogated, and the enlargements heretofore made in the powers of the local assembly have been amply justified by the results. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) also entertained a different view of this question in days gone by, and on the 24th of July, 1884, he moved in the local legislature a resolution which expressed his views at that date, and which are not his views of to-day. He tells us that the lands might be exploited by the people of the west, but let me ask him if the people of the west are not the most interested in the proper administration of these lands, and do they not realize that by settling these lands they would be enhancing the value of their heritage. For my part, Sir, I am not prepared to say that if the immigration policy were handed over to the local government, they would continue the present system in its entirety. I do not know that a large expenditure out of the immigration vote for campaign literature would be carried on ; I do not know that the large army of officials now in the Northwest would be continued in office, and I do not know that the local government would hand over its lands in blocks of 250,000 acres at one dollar an acre.

We are told now, Sir, and it is common report throughout the country, that the duties of the Department of the Interior have become too onerous for one man. We were told that the ex-minister (Mr. Sifton) was so broken down in health that he of all men was unable to attend the conference with regard to the granting of autonomy to the Territories. Is not this a very good opportunity to relieve the Department of the Interior of some of its work, and of handing over to the local administration of the Territories the control of the public lands, a right which is enjoyed by every other province but one in this Dominion ?

All that we have heard from the ex-Minister of the Interior is that there would be a conflict; but that will not satisfy the people of the west. They want some more satisfactory reason, in view of the attitude which the hon. gentleman assumed in days gone by. They will not endure in silence the withholding of their public lands. I doubt if some of the other Liberal members, in view of the statements which they have made in days gone by, will get up in this House and make the declaration that the people of the Northwest Territories are not fit to be entrusted with the same measure of self-government that is enjoyed by the various provinces of this Dominion. If they do, I think we on this side of the House will have some reason to congratulate ourselves on the manner in which they will be received by the people of that country after such a declaration. In view of the statements that have been made, I think it is only fair to this House and to the people of that country that these hon. gentlemen should give the grounds for the conclusions at which they have arrived.

The hon. the Solicitor General was very pleased to exalt and extol the British constitution. He thought very much of the British constitution in certain respects; but if the British constitution applies in one direction, why should it not apply in the other ? If we are going to follow the British constitution in respect of education, why should we depart from it in regard to the important matter of the control of the public domain ? Are hon. gentlemen opposite, in withholding from the new provinces the control of the public domain, following the British colonial policy ? What was that policy ? It is perhaps unnecessary for me to state to the House that the original idea of the British statesmen was to control the lands in the colonies; but when they tried to put that idea into practice, they had to abandon it for a better policy, namely, that the people on the spot were best qualified to manage their own lands, and that was the policy they adopted. They felt that with local representation the management of the lands would be better looked after. Is that principle not equally applicable to-day? Here we have a territory two thousand miles away, represented in this House by only ten members. If those lands are handed over to the local government, there will be fifty members looking after their management in the interest of the people; and if mistakes or jobbery are liable to happen, are these not more likely to be detected by governments representing fifty members than by a government representing only ten ? I say that to withhold from the provinces the management of their own lands is directly contrary, not only to British colonial policy, but to the spirit of confederation. When confederation was formed, what was the arrangement made between the various provinces ? Was it not that each province retained the right to administer the public domain, while the customs and excise duties were surrendered to the Dominion ? That was the policy carried out with regard to Quebec, Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Then, in what spirit are these provinces being created to-day ? I take it that it is under section 146 of the British North America Act, which especially provides that the admission shall be 'subject to the provisions of this Act.' The spirit is also in section 109, if the letter is not, un-

der which is handed over to the original provinces the right to administer their public domain. If there is any doubt as to the policy that was adopted by the fathers of confederation, let us see what was said. I find in the confederation debates, at page 40, that Sir John A. Macdonald said :

It will be seen that the local legislature have the control of all the local works; and it is a matter of great importance, and one of the chief advantages of the federal union and of local legislatures, that each province will have the power and means of developing its own resources and aiding its own progress after its own fashion and in its own way.

Another distinguished Canadian, also one of the fathers of confederation, the Hon. George Brown, referring to this matter, in the course of his speech, said :

Each province is to have charge of its own Crown lands, Crown timber and Crown minerals, and will be free to take such steps for developing them as each deems best.

Further on, the Hon. Mr. Holton, interrupting Mr. Brown, said :

Unfortunately for your argument, the lands will be in the hands of the local governments.

Mr. Brown replied :

So much the better. My hon. friend can manage his public lands in Lower Canada as he likes, and we will manage ours.

At page 16 of the debates of 1869, Mr. Edward Blake made the following statement in opposing a resolution to admit Newfoundland into the union and to pay Newfoundland $150,000 a year in lieu of its lands :

He was very strongly opposed to the Dominion acquiring the Crown lands of Newfoundland, and he has as strongly objected to Newfoundland being deprived of its Crown lands. He commended the policy of the framers of the constitution in leaving to each of the provinces the control of their own public lands. This was from the Canadian point of view. Then as to Newfoundland the arrangement was equally objectionable : (1) Its distance from the seat of government (2) and its small representation in parliament would lead to an unsatisfactory management.

The local government would be deprived of the control of these lands, which might by it be rendered valuable for the future development of the colony.

The development of mineral wealth could not be effected by raising a revenue, but by encouraging local enterprise. If the proposition was between giving Newfoundland $150,000 a year and taking her lands, and giving $150,000 a year and leaving her her lands, he would willingly vote for the latter (hear, hear). These lands under the local management of the government would contribute much more largely to the prosperity of Newfoundland than if they were in the hands of the government of Canada.

And he closed with an amendment to the resolution to this effect :

That the public lands can be managed more efficiently, economically and satisfactorily by the provinces in which these lands are situated than by Canada, and that there is no good reason for a departure from the principle of the Union Act.

That is a statement which I desire to impress upon the members of this House in regard to the principles of the Union Act, as Mr. Blake regarded them in 1869.

But, Mr. Speaker, if there can be any doubt at all as to what was in the minds of those gentlemen at that day, I will refer to another statement which was made on June 10 in the same debate by Mr. Alexander Mackenzie. Mr. Blake had made his argument first, and had been twitted by the members of the government for voting to pay money to the Hudson Bay Company. If there could be anything plainer or clearer as to what was in their minds at that time, it would be hard to find it. Mr. Mackenzie said :

The Minister of Public Works, and the premier said they were surprised that the member for West Durham should object to our acquiring the public lands of Newfoundland after voting for the acquisition of lands in the Northwest Territories.

There was (a) difference between the two cases, in the Northwest Territories there were at present no constituted authorities as there were in Newfoundland, and it would not be pretended that after a government was established in the Northwest Territories we would administer its lands from Ottawa.

That statement to my mind is most significant because it was made in the year 1869, the very year when the surrender was taken from the Hudson Bay Company ; and I am sure that the First Minister and the Solicitor General will pardon the more obscure members from the west if we venture to differ from them in opinion, backed as we are by the statements of these men at the very time the contract went through. These were the views that prevailed at that time ; and in the consideration of this question we look to our fellow-citizens in the other provinces to admit our right to be put on an equal footing with them and be given the administration of our own public domain. I have shown what the arrangements were when the four original provinces entered confederation. Let us trace what the subsequent arrangements were in the case of those provinces which entered later.

British Columbia, which entered in 1870, was a colony entitled to its public lands, and not only has it control of its lands, but the Dominion pays it annually the sum of $100,000 for a twenty mile strip through the Rocky Mountains that was alienated for railway purposes. Prince Edward Island entered in 1873, and I think at that time her Crown lands were in such a shape that an annual grant of $45,000 was given her in lieu thereof. Manitoba is the one exception. That province was not allowed to retain its public lands, and hon. gentlemen opposite take glory in the fact that

the arrangement with Manitoba was made by their predecessors. They are willing to shield themselves behind the example of their predecessors in some things, but see how different were the circumstances in Manitoba then as compared with what they are to-day in the Territories. In Manitoba in the year 1870, there were only 12,000 people, and it was perhaps prudent to withhold from that mere handful of people, unaccustomed to self-government, living on the banks of the Red river, their right to administer their public lands, but the conditions which then existed no longer remain nor do they exist in the new provinces about to be established. Whereas in Manitoba you had only 12,000 people in 1870, you have in the Territories to-day, if we are to believe the Minister of the Interior (Mr Sifton) a population of 500,000 people, and a population accustomed to all the responsibilities that go with self-government. But fourteen years later, when the same party was in power, the government of Manitoba came down to this parliament and asked to be given control of its public lands and its petition was refused. True the province of Manitoba agreed to waive her claim to the public lands in consideration of an annual payment of $100,000. But it was her privilege to do that, and that does not form a precedent to be followed in this case. Besides hon. gentlemen opposite have been holding themselves out as nation builders and carefully avoiding any errors into which previous governments have fallen, as all government must fall sometimes. But can any man, I ask, look into the negotiations which have taken place between Manitoba and the federal government, and say that the policy followed was a wise one ? Look at the negotiations which have taken place at frequent intervals between that province and the administration at Ottawa, and you will find that the result of that policy has been continued dissatisfaction and continued agitation for better terms. Look at what has taken place. It is a record of almost annual pilgrimages from Manitoba to Ottawa for better terms. In 1876 her subsidy was increased to $90,000. In 1879 it was increased to $105,653. Again in 1882, she came knocking at the federal door, and her subsidy was increased to $215,000. In 1885 she was still given further assistance. She was given swamp lands, 150,000 acres for a university, $100,000 a year in lieu of public lands, and a per capita grant on a basis of population of 150,000. But that was not the end. In 1898 further application was made and she was given a cash grant to construct the government house, and in 1899 she was given better lands in exchange for the swamp lands. These are only a few of the begging trips of Manitoba ; and I ask : Is it good policy, is it wise administration to keep the provincial government at the mercy of the federal ? I submit, Sir, that to the province of Manitoba as well as to the new provinces should be given the right to administer the public domain within her borders. Speaking for my own constituency, I believe that a majority of the people of the Territories would be willing to take up the case of Manitoba and make the fight together, and I believe that at no distant day, when we receive the representation in this House to which we are entitled, we will be here in such numbers as to justify us in insisting upon equal rights with the other provinces to administer the public domain within our respective borders.

We have heard a great deal about representations with regard to educational matters which were made to certain people when they went out to that country. I have seen pamphlets in circulation claiming protection for a certain class in matters of education and in matters of religious teaching on the ground that they went into that country relying on the protection of a certain clause in the constitution. But let me ask hon. gentlemen opposite under what promise did the hardy pioneers go into that country? Under what constitution did these men go into that country and enhance the value of those one time unoccupied lands by their energy, thrift and enterprise ? Is there any difference in that respect between that part of the Dominion and any other part? When people went out to that part of the Dominion did they give up any portion of their birthright, and is it right, when they take up the burden of a province, that they should start out in confederation as a province on any less advantageous terms than any other province ?

But what is the real reason why these public lands are being retained by this government and withheld from the Territories ? Is it because the governments of the Territories are not capable of giving an honest administration ? No, Mr. Speaker, that is not the reason. We have in that country to-day a large population accustomed to self-government, and no one has as yet ventured to sugest the merest suspicion against the competency of the people in the Territories to manage their own public affairs in their own public interests. That is not the reason, but the reason is that the Ottawa administration realizes that as long as it can retain the immense army of officials which it has up there now, it will have under its control a great machinery for securing votes. That is the difficulty in the way of giving up the lands and no matter what party may be in power, there will always be the danger of its making an improper use of its machinery, because the recent experience we have had up there is not such as to allay our apprehensions in that regard. That this objection is a serious one cannot be denied and

such experience as we have recently had in the west is hardly sufficient to relieve our apprehension, and I assert, Sir, without fear of contradiction, that popular sentiment in the west emphatically condemns any attempt to use government officials for political purposes.

I will give you the names of a few officials who participated in the recent elections in one riding in the last election.

1. Neil G. McCallum, Yorkton, H.I., acted as an agent for Liberal candidate at McKenzie.
2. S. G. McKee, Yorkton, clerk, Dominion Land Ordinance, acted as an agent.
3. John Komainitaky, clerk, interpreter, Dominion Land Ordinance, acted as an agent.
4. Carl Cenik, Winnipeg, Interior Immigration Office, acted as an agent and canvassed for Liberal candidate in McKenzie.
5. Mr. Wolf, Winnipeg, Immigration Office, acted as an agent, and canvassed for the Liberal candidate in McKenzie.
6. Paul Bredt, Immigration Agent at Regina, resigned and since promoted, addressed meetings and canvassed for Liberal candidate in McKenzie.
7. C. W. Speers, Central Colonization Agent, canvassed for Liberal candidate in McKenzie.
8. Mr. Halloquist, Scandinavian Interpreter, canvassed for Liberal candidate in McKenzie.
9. Thos. McNutt, acting Immigration Agent, canvassed for Liberal candidate in McKenzie.

Some of these men, homestead inspectors and interpretors were brought all the way from Winnipeg. I merely mention this matter to direct the attention of the First Minister to it. I regret that he is not in his place. The Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock), if I remember correctly, stated that a public officer should be persona grata to all the people. And the Prime Minister said :

I feel as strongly now in 1903 as I did in 1896 that when a man has taken office under the government he should take no part in politics.

I mention this to the House to ask these hon. gentlemen, in view of the statements I have given as to the British colonial policy, is it sufficient reasons to withhold from these new provinces the right to administer their public domain ?

Now, coming to the educational clause, I desire to examine these clauses for a few minutes. Before I proceed to discuss the amendment of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) from its merits, I wish to direct my attention to the speech made a few evenings ago by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). He claimed that the clause inserted in Mr. Haultain's draft Bill was identically the same as that of the Bill now before the House, so far as the educational question is concerned. And, for fear of misquoting him, let me give his own words as found at page 3163 of 'Hansard' :

But I find that section 3 of this draft Bill, which was prepared by the Northwest government in 1901—and these provisions were repeated in 1903—is almost word for word with section 2 of the Autonomy Bill which is before the House and as a matter of fact is a reproduction of the similar section in the Act admitting each individual province into the Dominion. It reads:

Now, before this matter could be discussed, or even fairly understood, I presume, it would be necessary to make sure that we realize the difference between 'continue' and 'perpetuate.' Does the hon. member for Edmonton propose that creating new provinces in the Northwest, we should get along without any law at all until the legislature can meet ? Surely not. And this section 3 simply perserves for the time being the laws in existence on the 1st of July next. A section similar to this has been put in every law creating a province, simply to provide a body of laws until the legislature can meet and pass laws to continue the laws that have been handed over or repeal or amend them. Yet, the hon. member for Edmonton tries to construe this Bill as simply giving to the people of the Northwest what they asked for in their draft Bill. But I have already indicated the difference—we may have asked for it for the time being; but we do not ask to have the present system of schools perpetuated or the power to repeal the existing system taken away. We have a law with regard to brands. Does the hon. member for Edmonton want to discontinue that and have no law? We have a law with regard to bulls. If there was a law in the Northwest with regard to strikes, no doubt the hon. member for Edmonton would like to have it kept on the statute-book until the legislature could meet and pass such a law. He says also :

I say that in view of the fact that these separate schools have been in existence for 20 years absolutely at the disposal of this parliament, without a word of objection from the legislature of the Northwest Territories——

But I find that on reference to the Journals of the legislative assembly, for 1889, page 65 and for 1890, page 129, that there were certain proceedings of that assembly of which the hon. member for Edmonton did not inform the House. Now I find that the Act of 1875 deals with education, and I am going to trouble the House while I read a few words from one section, as it is necessary for the point I desire to make. Section 14, the much-discussed section says:

14. The Lieutenant Governor in Council shall pass all necessary ordinances in respect to education but it shall therein always be provided, that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the Territories or of any less portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name the same is known, may establish such schools therein as they think fit, and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor ; and also that the minority of the ratepayers therein, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic may esta-

blish separate schools therein—and in such case, the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assessments of such rates as they impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

I find that in 1889, a petition was sent to the Dominion authorities by the local legislature at Regina, of which the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) was then a member, praying to this effect:

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General in Council, the Senate and the House of Commons, praying for the amendment of 'The Northwest Territories Act' by repealing that portion of subsection 1 of section 14 after the word 'education' in the second line.

And the hon. member for Edmonton supported that. So did the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), then a member of the assembly. Thus they prayed this administration that everything that had to do with education should be shut out of the law, which would leave the province a free hand with the matter of education. In view of that point, I think that hardly all the facts were stated by the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) when he said that there was no feeling in the Northwest with regard to this Bill and no objection taken to it. If the prayer of the petitions had been granted, I think these gentlemen would have been in nearly the same position as the amendment of the leader of the opposition would place them in. Apparently, their opinions have changed. But it did not stop at the point I have indicated. In the following session of the legislative assembly, they repeated their prayer. And the hon. member for Edmonton and the hon. member for East Assiniboia supported that contention, that education should be left entirely to the provinces. Now, apparently, they have changed their mind as they did with regard to the land policy. Now, Mr. Speaker, in proceeding to discuss these educational clauses of these Bills, I cannot say that I shall be able to show, but shall contend, that the amendments presented to this House to-day do not differ in the slightest degree from the original Bill as brought down. But, before I proceed to discuss the amendment and the original Bill let me point out the contrast between the position taken by the right hon. leader of the government and the ex-Minister of the Interior, the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton).

The right hon. the First Minister has said in introducing the Bill that it was obligatory upon this government to preserve certain rights and conditions which by reason of good faith were inviolable, and lest I should misquote him I shall read what he said. These rights and conditions are inviolable because they are given under the Act of 1875, and he says:

It is open to any man to break his word, it is open to any man to violate his engagement, it is open to any man to trample under foot his plighted troth. Now if it is open to any man to do that, it is also open to parliament; and if it be the view that parliament is not bound by the acts of any preceding parliament, that parliament may violate its plighted troth, then we have a double opportunity on this occasion to signalize ourselves.

Proceeding further in reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway exemption:

But does anybody in this House think of removing from the Canadian Pacific Railway the powers and immunities which have been granted to that company? Does anybody in this House think for a moment of giving to those new provinces the power to levy taxation upon the Canadian Pacific Railway? No, we respect our engagements. Then I ask if we respect our engagements in the one case, why should we not respect our engagements in the other case.

That is the position he took that certain rights under the Act of 1875 were created and were inviolable. He took the position that these rights which were created should be guaranteed to the minority. But the hon. member from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) has endeavoured to show that there is a vast difference between the rights of the minorities under the Act of 1875 and their right to-day under local ordinances. He said that under the Act of 1875 the minority were entitled to and were given a complete dual system. This is what he says on page 3239:

That was the clause in the Act of 1875. I read it because it is important in view of the remarks I intend to address to the House, that its exact terms should be in the minds of the gentlemen who are honouring me with their attention.

What followed the passage of this law? There was established in the Northwest Territories a complete dual system of schools.

Further down on the same page he says:

This system went on for some time in the Territories, and then the legislature began to interfere and to curtail the privileges of the separate schools. This curtailment proceeded from time to time until the year 1892 when what was known as the dual system was entirely swept away and that system which we have in the Northwest Territories, substantially as we have at present, was established.

So there is a vast difference in the views taken by the right hon. the First Minister and the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). There is a vast difference between the rights conferred under the Act of 1875 and under the ordinances according to the member for Brandon. The hon. member for Brandon has compared these rights and further says that these rights were conferred under the Act of 1875 and that the local ordinances curtailing them were unconstitutional and ultra vires. He will not consent to the preservation of the conditions which are inviolable, but he will agree to perpetuate the curtailed rights, although he intimated that such an invasion was an illegal and uncon-

stitutional invasion of the rights conferred under the Act of 1875. I shall cite his exact words. At page 3241 he says :

We have it that the clerical control of these schools was absolutely abolished. Every one recognizes that it was absolutely abolished and in addition to that, I desire to say—whatever we may think of the justification for the action which was taken—it seems to me perfectly clear, that in abolishing the distinctive character of the schools, the legislature of the Northwest Territories did go beyond the powers that were bestowed upon it by this section of the Act of 1875.

There is the opinion of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), that when the local ordinances abolished these rights they went beyond the power given to them under the Act of 1875. Upon that point Sir John Thompson expressed his opinion:

In making a report on one of the ordinances passed shortly before 1802 but somewhat similar in its effect—not so sweeping in its effect—Sir John Thompson in substance reported that this ordinance, contracts or diminishes the rights of minorities to an extent not contemplated by the Act of 1875, and that the Act of 1875 must nevertheless be held to remain in force notwithstanding the passage of the ordinance.

Now, there is the position. The First Minister insists upon the inviolability of that Act. The ex-Minister of the Interior finds that under the Act the minority were entitled to a complete dual system. This was taken away by an ordinance. If they had the right to have them then they have the right now in spite of any ordinances to the contrary. I propose a little further on to deal with that section which specifically continues these rights of the minority in force in that country. The position then is this, that the Prime Minister repudiates his speech and accepts a violation of the Act of 1875 and accedes to a proposition to perpetuate a violation of the inviolable. There is the position between the Prime Minister and the hon member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton).

But let us examine into these clauses for a moment, and we shall see just who has been making a compromise, who has been giving away his rights or his religious opinions. I find that the objections of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) are, first, that he objects to subsection 2 of section 16, and it is on account of this clause he says that he resigned, because he says that in that all the evils which he has dilated upon existed under the Act of 1875 in Manitoba. I wish to make myself clear, but I am not going to be dragged into the discussion of the merits or demerits of a separate school system. That is a matter of which I know nothing, and I am simply taking the argument and citing the cases cited by the hon. gentlemen opposite who have had more experience in dealing with these systems than I have had. He says that he objects to subsection 2 of section 16 because in that all the evils he has dilated upon exists, and he has persuaded the First Minister to accept a proposition that in his opinion has eliminated all the essential characteristics of a separate school system. What does subsection 2 of section 16 to which he makes objection contain? It says:

That a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the said province, or of any less portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name it is known, may establish such schools therein as they think fit.

On that he builds up what he calls his university argument. He takes the general word 'education' at the beginning of that clause and ignores the fact that this general word is followed by a number of particular words. The reading of it is:

3. In the appropriation of public moneys by the legislature in aid of education, and in the distribution of any moneys paid to the government of the said province arising from the school fund established by the Dominion Lands Act, there shall be no discrimination between the public schools and the separate schools.

He takes the comprehensive word 'education' and tries to read into that that there was some risk and danger of endowing a Catholic university, ignoring altogether the fact that the general word education is followed afterwards by the particular words 'separate schools and public schools,' so he creates a man of straw in this so-called university argument and then proceeds to demolish it. I submit that it is based upon a fallacious construction of that clause to which he raises his objection. Now, what are his other objections and why did he resign ? Now, he objects to endowing a separate university, he objects to ear-marking the public land fund. But what does the amendment do? Does it not create and endow schools from the same funds? Does the amendment make any distinction between these two sections? Now, let us deal with the position as it is. How does the amendment change the Bill, if it changes it at all? I desire to point out that if the rights of the minority to separate schools were created under the Act of 1875, and if they were entitled under it to a complete dual system, then I say that under the amendment exactly the same state of affairs will prevail. Let me read subsection 1 of the amended section:

Nothing in any such law shall prejudically affect any right or privilege with respect to separate schools which any class of persons have at the date of the passing of this Act under the terms of chapters 29 and 30 of the ordinance of the Northwest Territories passed in the year 1901.

Now I find that section 41 of chapter 29 of these ordinances reads as follows :

The minority of the ratepayers in any district, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish a separate school therein, and in such case the ratepayers establishing such

Protestant or Roman Catholic separate school shall be liable only to the assessments of such rates as they impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

Now, in that section is everything that is included in the Act of 1875, which gives these people the right to separate schools, and which gives them the rights the member for Brandon dilated upon a few days ago. Therefore, I take the position that there is not the slightest difference to-day between the amended Bill and the Bill that was originally presented to this House. Now an attempt was made by the Minister of Customs, who is not in his seat, and by a number of other gentlemen, to show that all the amendment gives to these local legislatures is the power to give a half hour's religious instruction at the end of the day. Now, Sir, there is nothing in these ordinances which pares down the rights given to them under section 41, so far as I have been able to find, except to designate at what time this religious teaching shall take place. They have attempted to make this House believe that under this amendment it is not possible to have a dual system of text books, a dual system of inspection, but that everything given under the Act of 1875 is preserved by the introduction of section 41 in chapter 29. Now, this amendment, which they argue will preserve to the people of that country what they have got to-day, simply continues the law, it does not continue the administration. The dual system of text books, the dual inspection and all that is a matter of administration. Therefore, if the argument of the member for Brandon is sound that the action of the local legislation in paring down the rights these people had under the Act of 1875 was ultra vires, then any Order in Council which was passed by the commissioner of education would be equally ultra vires.

Then the minority, under this section 41 which gives them the rights they had under the Act of 1875, and which are preserved to them under this amendment, would be able to demand that these rights be enforced.

Mr. SCOTT. Does my hon. friend understand that after the 1st of July they will not be able to do that ? That after this legislation takes effect they will not be able to do as he says they can do at present ?

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Why not ?

Mr. SCOTT. Because this legislation removes any defects that may exist in the present ordinance.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. No, it does not.

Mr. SCOTT. Does my hon. friend say that this Act, when it passes, will not confirm chapters 29 and 30 as law ?

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. Then that is the end of your argument.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman may think so. Let him take chapters 29 and 30 and show the section to this House where the rights under the Act of 1875 or of section 41 are pared down by them.

Mr. SCOTT. Are not those the ordinances which abolish the ecclesiastical schools in the Northwest Territories ?

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. The hon. gentle- you will see that if you cannot take rights away by legislaton you cannot take them away by Order in Council. If the opinion of the hon. member for Brandon is correct, that the local ordinances which pared down the Act of 1875 were ultra vires, then any Order in Council which is passed paring down the rights which are continued to them under section 41, would also be ultra vires, and they would have a right to insist upon their privileges.

Mr. SCOTT. He will not contend that these ordinances will be ultra vires after these Bills have passed this House.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. You will find that this amended Act does not preserve the administration, it simply preserves these ordinances, and all there is in these ordinances paring down the rights given under section 41, would be identically the same rights they had under the Act of 1875. The only thing that is pared down is the half hour I have mentioned.

Mr. SCOTT. My hon. friend is mistaken. One of the conditions that was pared down was the existence of dual management and dual boards, one board managing the Roman Catholic schools, and the other board managing the public schools.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Is that not under the regulations of the Commissioners of Education ?

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly not, it is a provision of the ordinance.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I differ from the hon. gentleman entirely and I want to impress upon the House the fact that this amended Act continues these ordinances only, and it does not continue the administration of them ; and if the Commissioner of Education passes certain Orders in Council which contravene the rights given under section 41, then this Order in Council will be just as much ultra vires and unconstitutional as the ordinances that were passed paring down the Act of 1875.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE, How does the hon. gentleman suppose that the administration of these new provinces would formulate and try to pass ordinances that will be beyond the terms of the constitution ? The hon. gentleman makes the statement that ordinances ultra vires of the constitution

will be passed. If the hon. gentleman is making a legal argument, I would like to know what authority he has for saying that they will go beyond their rights in chapters 29 and 30 ?

Mr. MONK. I do not think it is very difficult to understand the argument of my hon. friend (Mr. M. S. McCarthy). He says that if the ordinances were invalid we are validating these ordinances now, but we are not validating the Order in Council passed by the Commissioner of Education in the Northwest Territories, and consequently the invalidity of the ordinances still remains.

Mr. SCOTT. Could they not have passed identical Orders in Council, which will be validated under this Bill ?

Mr. MONK. That is another thing ; he speaks of the Orders in Council that have been passed.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. If the contention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. S. M. McCarthy) is right, surely we are leaving it to the provincial government to pass these Orders in Council.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Does not the hon. gentleman see that if anything were done by ordinance or by Order in Council paring down the rights under the Act of 1875, then, if the hon. member for Brandon is correct, it would be equally ultra vires and could be set aside. If he cannot see that, I am sorry for him. Under the conditions existing to-day the Commissioner of Education can go back and establish a dual system of inspection and a dual system of text books.

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Then if you are protecting the rights of the minority, why not protect the rights of the majority ; you say that all you want is what you have to-day. I am assuming that all the rights created under the Act of 1875 are preserved in section 41 ; and that being so, what would a stranger coming into this House think of the picture that has been presented to us by some gentlemen on the other side of the House ? I repeat that I know nothing of the separate school system, of its merits or demerits. What I know of it has come from hon. gentlemen opposite. The Minister of Finance, although he declared himself opposed to separate schools, has gone on record with the statement that he will support this Bill. I quote from ' Hansard ' :

I am firmly persuaded that the difference is so slight that if we reach a wise decision now, if we refrain from fanning the flame of political passion—I withdraw the word political, I am not discussing this from a party standpoint, and I did not intend to use that word, and I withdraw it—If we refrain from doing and saying anything which can fan the flame of religious excitement in the Northwest Territories now, my honest conviction is that the separate schools will diminish, and the free, common, public schools will increase. I am persuaded that the difference is so small that the mass of the people in the Northwest Territories will hardly find it to their advantage to keep it up except in a few instances.

I take these words to mean nothing else than that he is supporting this legislation because it is going to kill the very thing that it is intended to create. I have spent some time of my life in the study of law, and that class of legislation is new to me. I do not know what name to call it, but if it were not unparliamentary I would suggest that it is boomerang legislation, something that comes back, something that has an opposite effect to that intended. And what can we say of the position taken by the Minister of Finance. He says that he wants separate schools abolished, but in his mind the longest way round is evidently the shortest way home. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) claims to have a great experience in matters of education, and, speaking of the Act of 1875, which I contend is continued in section 41, he says :

We had in the Northwest Territories at that time, under that Act, to all intents and purposes what are generally known as church schools or clerical controlled schools. That was the system that was built up under this Act of 1875. It went on for some time. It was exactly the same system—I do not know as to the efficiency, for I am not familiar with that—but in principle it was the same system we had in Manitoba up to the year 1890, when it was abolished by the Public School Act of that year.

Further on, at page 3110, he says :

When we, in the province of Manitoba undertook to remove what was a school system, that I said was ' inefficient to a point of absurdity ' we found ourselves confronted with many and serious difficulties.

The school system which we abolished by the Public School Act of 1890 in the province of Manitoba, was precisely the same school system as the system that was abolished by the ordinance of the Northwest Territories in 1892.

There you have the ex-Minister of the Interior saying that the Act of 1875 gives to the people of the Territories exactly the same system that they had in Manitoba, and which, according to him, was inefficient to the point of absurdity. Again the ex-Minister of the Interior says :

Although we took strong ground upon that principle, yet the attacks we made were not so much on that account as they were on account of the fact that the school system of the province was admittedly inefficient, and that children were being allowed by thousands to grow up in absolute ignorance and illiteracy. That was the ground upon which we attacked successfully that system. We said then : Your system is inefficient ; you have taken the public money and you have not applied it for the purpose of giving the children the education they ought to have ; and we pointed to the fact that in districts where this clerically controlled system had been in force, the children had grown up in ignorance and the population was

illiterate, and that fact could not be disputed.

Sir, my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, speaking last night, referred to the fact that it was said that the province of Manitoba had been harsh in abolishing that system. Well, Sir, I am here to say that you cannot abolish abuses of that kind by handling people with kid gloves. I am here to say that if there is any act in my public life I am proud of, it is the fact that I was one of those who helped to abolish that system of education in Manitoba in the year 1890.

The hon. member for Edmonton, at page 3160, places himself on record as follows :

I am one of these who pin their faith unreservedly to a system of national schools, established for the purpose of educating the people of the country, of imparting to them knowledge in secular subjects. I am one of those who believe that religion can best be taught by those whose special training is the teaching of religion, that geography can be better taught by those whose special training is for the purpose of teaching geography.

Now, Sir, we have the opinion of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) that the systems are identical. We have his view, the correctness of which I do not know, as to the efficiency of the system in Manitoba. We have also the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway), in his election address in July, 1892, appealing to the people of Manitoba for a further return to office, one of the grounds which he strongly urges being that his government had abolished the dual system. I may state to the House that the hon. gentleman has not deputed me to state what his views are ; we have been anxious for him to speak for himself. I find that among those supporting him on that occasion, were : Mr. Clifford Sifton of Brandon; Mr. Burrows of Dauphin ; Mr. Jackson of Selkirk, and Mr. Crawford of Portage la Prairie, all of whom sit in this House to-day. If these hon. gentlemen have assigned to that system its true character, I can only take the position that nothing but absolute freedom in this matter of education can satisfy the people of the west. They should be left free to legislate in years to come and to profit by the experience of the past. If the present system proves to be satisfactory, if it can be preserved ; if the time comes when it does not prove satisfactory, the people of the west desire to have reserved the right to repeal it. I desire to point out to this House that the people of that country have never had an opportunity of deciding upon that question for themselves. They differ from a colony. They are not coming into this confederation with a separate school system that they have chosen for themselves ; but I believe that if this administration had trusted the people of the west any rights possessed by minorities there would have been respected. I am not here to say that that system would be abolished, if we had the power, on the second day of July; but what I plead for on behalf of those provinces is that they be allowed to legislate in that matter as they see fit, in view of the experience they have had.

In 1875, when the Act to which so much reference has been made was passed, there were only 500 people living there ; and the hon. Minister of Finance, a few evenings ago, stated that he never would be a party to the passing of an Act to override a local ordinance or local statute—that would be a gross interference with provincial rights. But to my mind there is not a very great distinction between overriding an Act in existence to-day, and picking out of our ordinance a certain portion and saying that suits us, and we will adopt it so that you cannot repeal it for all time to come. It seems to me that the one is no greater infringement or invasion than the other. The hon. Minister of Finance holds up as a model of tolerance the province of Nova Scotia, which I have no doubt is all that he claims for it ; but it did not strike me that the attitude he took in passing legislation which was going to kill what it was going to create was a very tolerant attitude. I think I can say for my own constituents that they will exercise as much tolerance and give as much fair-play to the minority in that country as any class of people that can be found in Canada. If you come with me to the foot-hills of the Rocky Mountains, you will find there public school boys from Eton, Harrow and Charterhouse ; Cheltenham and Clifton in city of Calgary ; those for whom I can claim just as much intellect and spirit of fairness as can be found in the people of Nova Scotia.

I have been surprised to hear the statement made by some people that many immigrants have come into that country on the faith of that Act of 1875, or of these ordinances existing in the Territories at present. Well, Mr. Speaker, while I believe that the people of that country are as good and as law-abiding as they are anywhere else, I am convinced that it is not the condition of the schools out there which has attracted the young men to it. What has attracted immigration is the land and the great possibilities in that country, and the settler always knows that if the educational facilities do not suit him, he is at liberty to return home again. If you will take the statements issued by the land agent giving replies to the many inquiries sent to them, you will not find in any one of them any reference to the schools, separate or otherwise, which is most convincing proof that the school question has nothing to do with the influx of settlers. Let me also point out that if people are coming into that country under misrepresentations regarding the schools, then the literature issued by the Department of the Interior must be misleading because it states

the schools out there are non-sectarian and national. In this connection, I would also draw attention to the fact that the great mass of immigration to-day is from the United States, where there are no separate schools. Therefore, the argument that certain people have come out there by virtue of representations regarding a system of separate schools, is not borne out by facts. The hon. the Minister of Finance stated that he would be quite willing to accept the views of seven out of the ten representatives coming from the Territories. Let me congratulate him and the government on their change of front, because they have not always been ready to accept these views. If they had, we would like to know whether the seven gentlemen from the Northwest Territories are responsible for this legislation, because it is generally understood that they stood out against it until it was amended. But if there are seven gentlemen from the Territories who say that the people out there are satisfied with a separate school system and want that system to be continued and are in favour of having the right to establish any system they please taken from them, let me tell you that that has not always been the case, because the hon. members from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) voted in the local legislature up there to cut out everything in the Act of 1875 after the word 'education,' which would have the effect of handing that matter entirely over to the local legislature. I would also suggest that if the government desire to feel the pulse of the people on the question, let them open up a constituency there and appeal to the electors.

I see that the hour is getting late and I do not desire to trespass too much upon the time of this House, but there are certain matters which I feel bound to bring to its attention; and if I am transgressing the time allotted a new member, I shall only have to appeal to the indulgence of the House and point to the fact that there are none but new members on the Conservative side from the Northwest Territories. There are certain other important features in this Bill to which I wish to refer. There is first the placing of the boundary line at the fourth meridian. A few days ago I called attention to a resolution passed at a public meeting in the town of Medicine Hat which pointed out the objections to this line. My hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) let the cat out of the bag the other day when he said he was of the opinion that the dividing line should be sixty miles further east. Thus we see the disadvantage of not having in this cabinet a representative from the west. I was accused of having indulged in ill-natured criticism the other day when I said that the minister who was in charge of the Territories should have been consulted, but I certainly did not intend to make any ill-natured reflection, and shall continue to call the attention of the government at every opportunity to the injustice they are inflicting on the Territories in not filling the vacant portfolio. To-day we are in this position that there is not a man in the cabinet west of the city of London, Ont., except one, and that gentleman is only half in. And the result of having no man in the cabinet charged with the supervision of the task of dividing that country has been that local interests have been allowed to prevail. The boundaries have been fixed to suit particular localities without regard to the ranching industry or anything else. It will be found, on examining the map published by the Department of the Interior, that only a very small amount of the ranching country remains to-day in the eastern province, and the danger will be that the ranching industry, which is a very important one, will not be sufficiently represented in the local House to have its interests properly looked after. That industry in the eastern province will be a mere side issue. Take, for instance, the difficulties which will probably arise out of conflicting branding laws. That may seem a very small matter to the man in the east, but it is very important to the west. The other day it was pointed out, in the discussion of an Order in Council passed by the Department of Agriculture, that 411,000 cattle, were treated under that order in an area practically abutting this dividing line. The badge of ownership to-day in that country is the brand, and the result of drawing this line and so splitting up the ranching country will be a conflict of brands. One province may or may not enact a branding law. One province may declare that cattle and horses not branded may be sold irrespective of the owner, and you will have a conflict in that way, whereas if the line went a little bit further east, where the Minister of the Interior says it should go, that difficulty would not arise and you would include practically all the ranching country in the western province.

Again, one province may adopt a free open range, while the other may make restrictions. We have the same difficulty to-day on the international boundary, although there is the same grazing country on the boundary as we have at the dividing line of the two provinces, and although we have customs officers and the mounted police who assist in keeping matters in order. Yet difficulties have always arisen. Another difficulty we are creating is that you will leave such a very little portion of the irrigated land in the eastern province that it will be hardly worth while passing legislation respecting it. While that difficulty may be got over by the provisions of the Bill under which the matters are left with the federal administration. But, if I understood the ex-Minister of the Interior

(Mr. Sifton) correctly, he stated that it was only for the time being that this was going to be retained, but that in time to come, after certain international difficulties had disappeared this jurisdiction would be handed back to the provinces. As the dividing line runs now the area of the two provinces will show a considerable difference. As I figure it the area of the eastern province will be 258,400 square miles and that of the western province 249,600, or a difference of 8,800 square miles. So, this line must have been crowded west for some purpose and perhaps I may be able to point out before I sit down what that was for. I desire also to call attention of the advisability of including in the new provinces the great northern country. I pointed out that no man in the west but would hope that their great expectations would be realized, yet to-day in view of what the Prime Minister has said we cannot consider that an agricultural country. I have already shown that the census of 1901 shows that the population of Athabaska was 242 white people, 2,395 half-breeds and 3,700 Indians, and 262 unspecified. Now, there may have been people who have gone in there since 1901, but there are also people who have come out. To my mind the very best evidence that there is not much permanent settlement in that country is seen in looking at the map published by the Department of the Interior only a year ago. We find that land does not appear to have been surveyed. There may have been preliminary surveys, but from the map as it stands, we do not find any township subdivisions. And a man cannot go very far wrong in saying that there will not be much permanent settlement where there is no assurance of title. Settlers do not squat to-day in advance of survey. And the conditions of the country are not such as will make the administration cheaply handled by the provincial government. It is not that the people of the new provinces are desirous of shirking the duties of administering it, but the district to the north of the provinces will be still under Dominion administration. It would cost practically very little to administer this through the Dominion government. The questions that will arise will be mainly interprovincial. Take the regulation and preservation of the fur trade, for instance. Suppose that one province establishes a certain close season for certain animals while the other does not; and the Dominion government may have a different law with regard to the same matter further north. If the inland fisheries are handed over to the new provinces, the same difficulty is likely to arise in regard to these—there will be the same conflict of jurisdiction. I have spoken of the boundaries not having been fixed with a view to economical and efficient administration. It seems to me that political considerations have had a great deal to do with the making of the eastern boundary. If we look at the map and see the dividing line; it will be found, if you take the Rocky Mountains out of the western province, the western province is practically a triangle with the apex at the south. And, if you look at the election returns, you will find that the south elects two Conservatives and the north two Liberals. Now, I submit, in all fairness, that considerations of this kind should not interfere when you are creating limits to provinces for all time to come. It seems to me that the fathers of confederation sat down in a spirit of give and take and tried to make a compact free from political consideration; and I think that is an example that might well be followed. The result of making these boundaries for the western province is that the further north you go the greater the Liberal majority. And that is the reason why the line is fixed sixty miles west of where the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) thinks it ought to be.

There is only one other question I wish to refer to for a moment, and it is the selection of the provisional capital. The First Minister when he introduced the Bill stated that this was a matter that gave them some trouble, but they looked at the map and selected the centre. Well, if that is the principle that governed and they are selecting the centre, why did they not select Athabaska Landing, for that is the centre and it would be more convenient for the population of Athabaska to whom I referred a few moments ago. If he wishes to consider the convenience of the people let him take a point half way between Edmonton and any point on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and he will find in the southern portion there are constructed 980 miles of railway, and in the northern only 150 miles. I introduced the deputation from Calgary who interviewed the members of the government and asked them to select a non-competitive point as the provisional capital. They suggested the selection of Medicine Hat, Banff, Lethbridge, Macleod, Red Deer or any other point that would be near the centre of trade and the centre of population, and that would meet the convenience of the people whose business called them to the capital and the convenience of the members of the first legislature. But, for some reason, I cannot say what, the government has seen fit to select the point at the end of railway construction and away from what I hope to be able to show when the clause comes up in committee is the centre of trade and the centre of population. If it is the convenience of the people that is being considered, I would ask the First Minister to look at the map again and to look at the distribution in the local House for Alberta. In the local House there are

35 representatives; 14 of these come from Alberta and of these Alberta constituencies only three, and but a small portion of these three, run north of Edmonton, while 11 are south of Edmonton. I must ask the Prime Minister to again look at the map if the convenience of the people is being consulted. But, in conclusion, let me say that I desire to congratulate the government for being original for once, because surely if the convenience of the people had been consulted in the choice of a site for the capital it would have been placed at the centre of population and trade. The government's manner of selecting a central point is an original one. The method adopted in this case would not have led the people of Ontario to select Toronto instead of Whitefish or some other point on Lake Superior, the people of Quebec to select Quebec, the people of Manitoba to select Winnipeg, or the people of British Columbia to select Victoria on Vancouver Island.

There is but one other question on which I wish to touch, that is the financial terms. I am glad in that to be able to agree with the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). It seems to me that in discussing these terms it is not fair to make comparisons with the terms of eastern provinces. The conditions are altogether different. In the west school houses and roads have to be provided, matters which are done in Ontario and Quebec by local taxation which it is practically impossible to do in that country by reason of the great distances. The financial terms in comparison with those granted to the other provinces are none too generous, and the development of that country is proceeding at such a rate that it is impossible for us to sit here and calculate what its future needs will be.

Mr. CLEMENTS moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 29, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. H. GERVAIS (Montreal, St. James) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 128) to amend the Canada Temperance Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. GERVAIS. Mr. Speaker, the object of this Bill is very simple. As every one knows, in the Criminal Code of Canada, 1892, it is provided that there shall be an appeal from any judgment or any verdict given by any court of criminal jurisdiction, whether this court has an inferior or a superior jurisdiction in criminal matters. If hon. gentlemen will look up articles 742, 743 and 782, they will see that there is an appeal from any verdict or judgment given by a court having superior jurisdiction in criminal matters. There is an appeal in cases of jury trial, summary trial and speedy trial, whether the case is proceeded with under articles 742, 743 or 782, or under articles 659, 765, 782, 783 or 842 of the Criminal Code. Then, in cases of summary conviction, under article 879, there is an appeal under certain conditions and in accordance with certain formalities. All the litigants who have had anything to do with the application of the Canada Temperance Act have been complaining about the denial of an appeal. This feature of the law is enacted in section 119 of chapter 106 of the Revised Statutes of Canada as amended by the Act 51 Victoria, chapter 34. We think, and everybody thinks, that it is most unfair and unjust that the right of appeal which is given under the criminal law in any case should have been denied under section 119 of the Canada Temperance Act. Even in a case of summary conviction, in which the accused is condemned to pay a fine of $5 or go to jail for one day, he has the right of appeal, while, on the contrary, under section 119 he has no such right of appeal in most cases, though he may have been fined heavily or condemned to a long imprisonment. We desire this amendment so that the law giving the right of appeal in ordinary cases shall be made applicable to the Canada Temperance Act. Moreover, by this amendment, we wish that no litigant having to appear either before a criminal court or a civil court, be denied that useful remedy, the British writ of 'certiorari.'

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

LACHINE CANAL—LEASE AT COTE ST. PAUL

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Is there in existence a lease to John Frothingham, or to the estate of the late John Frothingham, from the government, of water-powers at Côte St. Paul on the Lachine canal?
2. What is the amount of the annual rent payable under said lease ?
3. What is the period of duration of said lease ?

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

1, 2, 3. There is no such lease.

LOUISIANA PURCHASE EXHIBITION—EMPLOYMENT OF MR. N. J. GILLIS.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked :

1. Was N. J. Gillis, said to be a member for Cape Breton county in the legislature of Nova Scotia, employed as an official of the government of Canada at the St. Louis Exhibition ?
2. How long was he employed, and in what capacity ?
3. What were the terms of his employment ?
4. How much did he receive, and what amount, if any, is due him ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. Mr. N. J. Gillis, a member for Cape Breton county in the legislature of Nova Scotia, was employed as an official of the Dominion government at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition.
2. From the 8th day of May to the 8th day of October, 1904. He was assigned to the mineral section. He was employed in a general way, his particular duty being to give information to the general public in regard to minerals.
3. $7 per day, with transportation to and from St. Louis.
4. For services, $1,078 ; for travelling expenses, $130.80 ; total, $1,208.80. He was paid in full.

SAVAGE HARBOUR, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked :

1. Is the government doing anything to improve the entrance to Savage harbour, Prince Edward Island ?
2. If so, what is the nature of the work done or proposed to be done ?
3. Has a government engineer made any report on the work ?
4. If so, what is his recommendation as to the cost and feasibility of improving this harbour ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (for the Minister of Public Works) :

1. Yes.
2. The works now being constructed consist of brush-work placed on the beach for the purpose of accumulating the drifting sand, to prevent high tides from washing over said beach.
3. Yes.
4. The engineer considers that the present works will cost $2,000.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved :

That from this date to the end of the session, Government Orders have precedence on Mondays, immediately after Private Bills and questions to be put by members.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know whether or not there are any other Bills or orders on the order paper. If so, we might at least pass those.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think there are any orders except those for the production of papers. If there are, we have no objection to taking them up.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I have some objection to this motion carrying to-day. I and some others in the House have public Bills that we would like to have discussed. Some of them have been called up on one or two occasions. I think that the hon. member who has a Bill on the order paper in connection with the Exchequer Court has it nearly through, and probably he would like to get it through. I have a public Bill that I would like to have discussed, on which I have been collecting information, and in connection with which I hope to get some information from the committee of the House now investigating the telephone question. I am ready to go on with that measure if I had another day. I can accomplish my purpose, however, if the Prime Minister will say that it is the intention of the government to go on with their Bill to amend the Railway Act ; and if on that Bill I am allowed to discuss my proposals, I promise that I will not take up a great deal of time. Will the Prime Minister say that the government Bill to amend the Railway Act shall come up this session ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, the Bill will come up.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Will the Prime Minister consent to my discussing my Bill in connection with that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Personally I have no objection, but, of course, any member can object who wishes to.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I will bring it up to-morrow.

VACANCY.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I promised my hon. friend opposite that I would make a statement to-day about the vacancy in Centre Toronto. A writ has been issued and the nomination will take place on Tuesday the 11th of April. I said yesterday that we might have to take a registration vote, but on inquiry I find there is no necessity for that as the registration of last election will do.

VACANCY IN THE CABINET.

Mr. R L. BORDEN. Has the right hon. gentleman any information to give to the House as to when the vacant portfolio of the Department of the Interior will be filled? The right hon. gentleman promised to give information at an early date.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not to-day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. To-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, some time, if not to-morrow.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 69), to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta, and the amendment of Mr. R. L. Borden thereto.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, the proposition which is at present under the consideration of the House, and the discussion which has so far ensued upon it, have not lacked for variety and dramatic incident. No legislation introduced into this parliament in my time has been more prolific of change and of the unexpected. Changes in principle and in policy and in modes of thought may be discerned comparing the present with the past. Time was when gentlemen who within a few years made an entire change of front in regard to their method of thinking and acting upon any given subject, thought it was at least worth while and in a certain measure necessary that they should endeavour to satisfy the desire of the House and of the country for reasonable explanation. In those days consistency was somewhat prized, but in the later days of the new Liberalism cabinet ministers have grown too practical for that consideration and do not even deign to give an explanation for a complete and entire change of front brought about within the space of a very few years. A time there was when principle was considered as something somewhat precious and not to be repudiated; a time there was when responsibility attached to principle was considered to be of weight and importance. But, this new Liberalism which is confronting us, seems, when it starts for parliament, to put into its valise every other thing necessary or utilizable, and the last thing thought of is principle. Party fealty and party attachments are carefully stowed therein, and these gentlemen think that these fill the bill—or at all events fill the valise. There was a time when the constitution of this country had something stable and sacred about it. The fathers of confederation who met in Quebec and modelled our constitution, the palladium of the rights of the provinces and the Dominion alike; they believed the constitution to be an important, a stable and sacred thing. But to-day the constitution is thrown idly aside, relegated to the garret of the archives, and ministers are too practical to think of the constitution stopping them when they want to carry out their desires. And, although the Prime Minister had courage, and old-fashioned thought and method enough to bring it out and lift it to something of its old-time importance, the ministers who spoke after him kicked it as a football from floor to ceiling, and where we are to-day we scarcely know. Changes of principles once cherished are apparent to the most casual observer, but they are treated with so delightful a carelessness as to consistency and consequence, that it makes it interesting to the mere spectator, even though it is somewhat painful to the man of thought.

Let us take into consideration for a moment the circumstances which have preceded and up to this time have accompanied the introduction and discussion of this matter in the House. Weighing these circumstances, would not the unimpassioned spectator come to the hypothesis that some time ago the Prime Minister of Canada, smarting under events which took place in 1896 and since, had determined that with reference to the great Northwest the situation should be retrieved from a certain point of view, and that in the constitution which should be given to the new provinces the principle of separate schools should be embodied, cost what it might. Would that be a violent hypothesis? Let us see how the circumstances fit in with it. For two, or three, or four years previous to the election of 1904 in the Northwest, in this parliament, and to a certain extent in the whole Dominion, the question of autonomy for the Northwest Territories was to the front. It was particularly to the front in the Northwest Territories; in 1901 a draft Bill was prepared and resolutions which met with the approval of the Northwest Legislature were adopted.

Negotiations were undertaken; the matter was pressed; the matter was considered, as we know from the speech made here by the ex-Minister of the Interior, and considered often, and to a certain extent carefully and on all sides. But the Prime Minister had determined that to that creative body whose duty it should be to give substance to the constitution of the new provinces, no possible mandate should be given by the electorate of this country before they came to this parliament and were asked to consummate the creative Act. That is important to be remembered. The Prime Minister himself refused to undertake the erection of provinces two years ago, although there cannot be any sufficient reason given as to why, if the Territories to-day are equal to the work and the duties that follow therefrom, they were not ready to an almost equal degree to be constituted two years ago, or one year previous to the elections of 1904. But it did not suit the purposes of the Prime Minister to undertake the erection of those provinces before the general election. Little less did it suit him to have the subject mooted during the time of the election of the responsible and representative body which was to be asked to consummate the Act of creation of the provinces. And so the word went forth. His own minister of the Interior, long a resident of the country, one of the most prominent if not the most prominent men from that district, one who prob-

ably knew more about the circumstances and the history of that country than any other man he had in his cabinet, and probably than any other man in this country, went to the Northwest, if not under seal and pledge not to open his mouth with reference to the conditions of the creation of those provinces into an autonomy, yet certainly practically carrying out such instructions by absolutely refusing to be led into the utterance of a single word which would go to show the people of the Northwest under what probable or possible conditions autonomy should be given. But it cannot be said that the question was not mooted. The premier of that country, speaking in Regina one week before the Minister of the Interior spoke there, challenged an expression of opinion from the Minister of the Interior; left a certain number of questions to be answered, if the Minister of the Interior would have the goodness to answer them, as to the information to be given to the people of the Northwest just then, when they were about to elect representatives who would be called upon to consummate the Act of formation into provinces, as to the conditions, with reference to territorial division, lands, education and finances, under which the new provinces would be brought in. Was it not a subject which might well have engaged the attention of the Minister of the Interior? Were those points of information which it would not have been right and proper for the minister to discuss before the people whose interests were chiefly to be affected? But the minister's only reply was: You must trust the government; and to the gentleman who put the question his only reply was, you are a mischief-maker, that is what you are. The question was also put to the candidates who were running in the Northwest. They were challenged. They had one reply—the reply of the drilled and the taught: You ask us what the probable conditions will be; we trust the government; we have faith in the government. The cry of the minister was: Trust the government; and the declaration of the candidates was: We have faith in the government. But from neither minister nor candidate was there a single intimation as to what would be the probable conditions. So much with reference to that. Carrying out my hypothesis, when the elections were over and the first of the probable five years of the government's term commenced, with those incidental advantages which every one knows quite well, immediately negotiations were taken up, immediately the government set to work, immediately the Northwest candidates who were elected were called into council, immediately the representatives of the government of the Northwest Territories were called to Ottawa. Negotiations were undertaken, conferences took place, and in the course of a few weeks or a few months parliament was called together and the Bill was introduced. The creative instrument was formed, and it was presented to parliament. That creative instrument, as it was brought down on the 21st of February, was accompanied by a certificate of parentage given to it by the premier. He himself as premier, his united government, the representatives of the Northwest, on that side of the House at least, whose advice he had the advantage of, and the representatives of the government of the Northwest Territories, all had had their part in consultation or information; and this child was brought forward with the certificate of parentage of a strong and united government, having had full consultation with the representatives of the Territories to be affected. Shortly after that was brought down, something occurred. A trouble arose, disruption took place, and within a few days one of the most considerable ministers of the cabinet handed in his resignation, and gave as his reason that he had not been consulted with reference to the educational clause, that he dissented from it on the record of his life, and on account of the principles so often and so loudly professed, and that on that account he could not remain longer a member of the government. We immediately asked explanations and we soon found out that another minister of the government,—if not the most important at least one of the most important—had not been consulted upon the measure. Absent from the city and absent from the country, he had not been allowed an opportunity—why such haste?—of reading the clause of the Bill before it was brought down to this House. There were then two facts of importance. There was the fact that the government, as a united body had not formed that measure and there was the additional fact that there was displayed a haste almost undignified to get the Bill before the House and the country before those two important members of the cabinet should have an opportunity of being present in Council and expressing their views. What was still more remarkable was this, that on the most important clauses of the Bill, two members of the cabinet, who had been the strongest in their opposition to the principles embodied in that clause, were the very two members in whose temporary absence the Bill had been passed by the Council and submitted to parliament.

Other facts came out. It became known in the course of time that if the members from the Northwest supporting the government had been consulted and if they had been aware of the import of the clauses in question, they had not been careful enough or had been too indifferent to make their opinion felt. These hon. gentlemen, every one of them, so far as I know, expressed his dissent immediately after the Bill was brought down and the

Minister of the Interior had returned, and went into, if not open yet secret revolt. Something else came out. It came out that the representatives of the only government which the Territories have—there are three members in that government—based on the agitation of the subject in their country and their legislature, based on a draft Bill which they themselves had drawn, based on a desire and agitation for autonomy—it came out that two of the three, backed and supported by the third member of the government, came down to Ottawa, as the authorized negotiators on behalf of the Territories, to confer with the Dominion government. Was it not to be expected that these properly authenticated representatives of the legislature of the Territories and the people of the Northwest would have been given an opportunity to say something in a matter which meant everything to their people, which meant everything to the country which they governed, and governed under large representative institutions? Was it an unheard of thing or was it too bold a thing to ask that these representatives should have been loyally met and conferred with? Yet what came out? It came out that with reference to the most important clause of the Bill, the only clause which to-day, you may say, is claiming the attention of this House and the country—the representatives of that government were casually informed about it on a Friday and were given an opportunity to confer and discuss just exactly three hours before that Bill with that clause was submitted to parliament. What reason was there that in the case of a territory containing half a million people, with immense interests at stake, represented by its own government, the choice of its own legislature, the legislators in which were the choice of the constituents of that same broad territory—what reason was there that the representatives of these Territories should not have had some kind of determining voice in what was to be their constitution? Was it not to be expected that they should at least have had the courtesy of constant and frequent and loyal and thorough conference? Was there any reason why the First Minister, who in previous times has been always foremost and loud in his assertion of the rights and duties of provinces in these compacts that are made and are merged into a constitution, should have treated them so cavalierly as to have mentioned the subject on a certain Friday, and only within three hours before the Bill was introduced into parliament sent a sub-committee to talk over the matter with these representatives. Two excuses have been made, both by members of the government. The first was made by my hon. friend the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding). What was it? Oh, said he, Mr. Haultain is only the premier of that province, Mr. Bulyea is a member of his government,

Mr. Bulyea has expressed his satisfaction with these clauses, and Mr. Haultain only represents his own opinion. Did I say a while ago that there used to be such a thing as a fair deference for constitutional methods? That evidently does not exist in the mind of the Finance Minister to-day. That hon. gentleman thinks that when the representatives of a local government are accredited to carry on negotiations with the Dominion government, and when one of these representatives is the First Minister of that local government and the other a member of its cabinet, if the one who is a sub-member, so to speak, signifies his adhesion to the measure, the other who is the First Minister, does not count. It is the tail that swings the body according to the Finance Minister. I wonder why the tail from the Northwest, in the person of the Minister of the Interior, did not swing the Prime Minister? But another member of the government had a still more ingenious excuse. He said that Mr. Haultain was a very estimable gentleman but only a Tory gentleman and it was his duty and purpose to oppose this government. Delightful constitutional doctrine, that is, especially coming from an almost member of the cabinet, the Solicitor General. If Mr. Bulyea has signified—and I do not know that he has—his assent to that clause, it seems to me that the First Minister of the Territories is still left as a man to be accounted with and negotiated with. Is it true or is it not that during the course of those negotiations—if you can call them such—which took place before the 21st February, the First Minister had frequent conferences with Mr. Bulyea when Mr. Haultain was absent, and unknown to Mr. Haultain.

Is it true that the Liberal members from the Northwest collogued with Mr. Bulyea and the Prime Minister unknown to Mr. Haultain and without any invitation to Mr. Haultain to be present? That can be answered; it is either true or not true. But, if it is not answered, and therefore we take it to be true, it is another odd illustration of the strange metamorphosis that has taken place in our constitutional methods. These things are a part of what has occurred. But something more strange and startling and dramatic even than all this has occurred. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) stood in his place in this House and said that he had resigned because clause 16, introduced without his knowledge and without his consent, was in contravention of his principles and of his life-long political record, and consequently he had nothing to do but to resign from the cabinet. And, after three weeks of fightings within and rumours without, of multitudinous midnight parleys and countless journeys by noonday, the Minister of the Interior came down and told us that at last he had been able to put the ring into the nose of the government

and bring it to its knees. He had lassoed a wild steer of the prairies and brought it up to the ring-bolt. Now, a strange, a luminous, in some respects a lurid, light is thrown upon this whole transaction by this speech of the Minister of the Interior.

An hon. MEMBER. Ex-minister.

Mr. FOSTER. He was minister before he resigned.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And he may be minister now.

Mr. FOSTER. We do not know. This may be the last day he will be out. What did the Minister of the Interior say ? He stated that he had dissented from clause 16 because he was opposed to the principle of it. And what did the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) say the other day ? He said that the moment he read that clause, he went to the Prime Minister and discussed the matter with him and laid before him his objections to it. Did the Prime Minister meet him in any way ? We only know that the result of that conference was that Mr. Sifton, the Minister of the Interior, resigned because he could not accept clause 16. And, now, a strange thing happens, and one most difficult to reconcile with all that has gone before. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself, in his place in parliament, declared : I never intended that in that legislation any more should be granted than is at present enjoyed under the ordinances of the Northwest. And the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) from his place in this House declared that it was never the intention of the government that anything more should be put into the constitution of the new provinces than absolutely what was enjoyed under the ordinances I have spoken of. Now, it is to be presumed—at least, it ought to be presumable—that when the Minister of the Interior, an intelligent man, went to the Prime Minister, another intelligent man and, as we suppose, told him that because of his reading of clause 16 he was obliged to dissent and leave the cabinet, it ought to be presumable in that case that the other intelligent man the Prime Minister must have said to him : Mr. Sifton, I never meant what you read in that clause ; all that I meant, or mean to-day, is that the Northwest shall enjoy, as to separate schools, only the privileges that it has at the present time. Did that conversation take place? The moment it did, Mr. Sifton, and the Prime Minister were at one, and there was no cause for resignation. Did that conversation not take place, at least so far as the Prime Minister is concerned ? Then, if the Prime Minister's statement, made in this House, is correct and he never intended anything but what is in the present ordinances, it was clearly his duty to state that fact to his Minister of the Interior and so make the resignation of that minister unnecessary. But the Prime Minister does not appear, so far as the records show, to have done either the one thing or the other—or else there is a mystery, a most mysterious mystery, as to why the Minister of the Interior resigned. Was it on the cards that he should resign anyway ? And was this misunderstanding allowed to continue in order to give him a chance to resign? For, what happens at the end of three weeks time? The clause is brought down exactly to the liking of the Minister of the Interior. If the Prime Minister did not wish to get rid of his Minister of the Interior, why did not he agree with him in the way and before the breaking out took place. Can there be any explanation of that mystery? I leave it to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House.

But, Sir, something else happens. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), the other day, gave us the reason why it was impossible for him to agree to clause 16. I am not going to make a scrap-book of myself in these remarks, because it is not pleasant to the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to hear scrap-book quotations. But let me give, in effect, the reason why the Minister of the Interior could not assent to clause 16, as that reason was given by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) himself. He said, in the first place, that the Prime Minister had been very ill-advised to bring down that clause without giving him a chance to impart his knowledge and opinions concerning it. It turns out that that was correct on the part of the Minister of the Interior anyway. But the reason why the Minister of the Interior could not swallow clause 16 was this—that in the verbiage, compact, well thought out, put together by the hand of a master, there was something concealed. Not altogether concealed from himself, the Minister of the Interior said—he knew too much for that. But what was concealed in that verbiage ? There was an irrevocable constitutional ear-mark upon the public funds devouring them for ever to a separate school minority in those Territories, an ear-mark which made one of the greatest endowments in the whole history of the world for sectarian institutions and sectarian purposes, in the fifty million dollars' worth of Northwest lands. That is why the Minister of the Interior could not swallow clause 16. Now, it would be a pity if we could not take the Minister of the Interior at his own valuation.

But we have endorsements, for when the Minister of the Interior stated that in no unequivocal language, in face of his former leader, his former leader assented by utter silence, the Minister of Justice assented by utter silence, and the Postmaster General applauded to the echo, as did also the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Fin-

ance. Now the further question that arises is this: What potent and soporific drug had been administered to the Postmaster General, that lynx-eyed man of business and reader of constitutional law, what strange mixture had been administered to the Minister of Finance, generally clear-headed and long-sighted, and to our incomparable Minister of Customs—what had been administered in order to put them into a sleep of months, whilst that aptly-worded, finely phrased clause concealed within its innocent outside the foundation and formation of an irrevocable constitutionally ear-marked sectarian endowment, than which there has been none greater in the history of the world? The Postmaster General was a member of the sub-committee that framed the Bill. The Postmaster General has only one of two alternatives: Either he did not know what was in that clause, and consequently he is unworthy of his position; or he did know it, and he assented to it; and if it had not been for the superior nerve of the Minister of the Interior, this country would have been no wiser to this day, that clause might have gone through, and the Postmaster General would have had to father the responsibility of it. Now has the Postmaster General any excuse to offer? Was he on that sub-committee? Did he help to frame that clause? Did he assent to what the ex-Minister of the Interior said the other day? He applauded his utterance, silent under the lash, but he assented to it. What excuse has he, with his former record staring him in the face, read and known of all men in this country? What excuse had he for attempting to ear-mark with a constitutional and irrevocable ear-mark, such an endowment as that for sectarian purposes in the great Northwest? That is a question which the Postmaster General must answer. The same question may be put to the Minister of Customs and to the Minister of Finance.

But I thought I noticed—am I wrong, Mr. Speaker?—I thought I noticed that when the ex-Minister of the Interior was flourishing that lash, lead-loaded, and bringing it down on the backs of certain former colleagues, and when he mentioned casually the existence of a draftsman, he was most particularly—not with a tear in his eye, not with a mournful countenance, but it seemed to me with something like a manly glee—watching the effect of the tip of the lash on the back of the Minister of Justice. May be I was wrong in my supposition. If so, I give it just for what it is worth. But other things aside, the Minister of Justice, I am sure, will not shelter himself behind the back of a draftsman, the Minister of Justice will take the responsibility for that clause, and in common parlance, it will be up to him to explain why, surreptitiously, shall I say, concealed in fine legal phrase, he got ahead of the Minister of Customs, got ahead of the lynx-eyed Postmaster General, got ahead even of his premier, it may be, and concealed in that verbiage the potency and power of a most wonderful, and remarkable, and enduring instrument. It is for the Minister of Justice to explain that matter.

Now, either the Minister of the Interior is right or he is wrong. Why do I conclude that he is right? Because he has absolutely forced the government, after he had gone out of the government, to come to his terms, and they had three weeks afterwards to employ another draftsman—I am glad to say they did not get another Minister of Justice—but certainly to employ another draftsman, and to take out the concealed virus that was in section 16, No. 1, and substitute for it the plain and easily read verbiage of section 16, No. 2. Now the Minister of the Interior made his protest on these grounds. Three weeks brought him back into this House triumphant, leading the premier and his colleagues in leash, and administering the lash to those sleepy, or incompetent, or careless ministers who allowed such a thing to get into clause 16, No. 1, and came near doing it to the everlasting death of the sturdy yoeman of the Northwest. This last incident is the most dramatic of any that has occurred so far. But we live in a time and we are in a House where we may expect almost anything. Does anybody suppose that this is the last dramatic incident that will take place? To-morrow, may be, we will have the anonuncement that the Minister of the Interior, formerly the victorious man in his three weeks contest, will be re-seated on the government benches and in possession of his old portfolio. It may be—the premier was not ready to answer the question to-day, but he thought that he might to-morrow. By the efflux of time I believe it will be a pretty near to-morrow if it is to be in the affirmative.

But here is another thought that comes up at the same time. All this, as I said at first, is in pursuance of an hypothesis that the Prime Minister had determined to put this thing through, cost what it might, and these are the methods he has taken to put it through—the autocratic methods. What is the inducement that brought back the Minister of the Interior and joined him again to his colleagues, his leader and his party, in the advocacy—no, not in the advocacy, but in the voting support of this measure that is now before the House? What was the inducement—because there were strong inducements on the other side. On the other side were his principles, on the other side was his record from the old Manitoba times up to the present; on the other side was his reputation before the country as an adherent of principle. What was on this side in order to induce the Minister of the Interior to come back and put himself en rapport with his leader and his party on a question and

upon a clause to the principle of which he still declares he is opposed, and to which his whole record is opposed ?

Well, Sir, we have seen things. We have seen in this government three of its ablest ministers go out in the prime and vigour of their years. One, the former Minister of Railways and Canals, heralded, lauded, declared to be the strong man of the government, took a stand upon principle upon a certain most important measure and handed in his resignation as a protest because he believed that the measure which was introduced would be a measure fraught with incalculable injury to his country and he could not give his assent to it. The only logical course for a man who did that was to see that a measure so fraught with evil was fought to its latest and did not become part of the statutes of this country. But, Sir, the Prime Minister knows a thing or two. He approached the Minister of Railways and Canals, pistol in one hand, soporific in the other. It is not on record, because these negotiations were verbal largely, as to whether the trigger of the pistol was pulled or not, but it is on record that the soporific was taken and taken effectually. With a fine disregard of the principles of the hon. Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) that public offices and public emoluments should not be used for purely and solely party interests the right hon. First Minister used the money and public offices of this country as a soporific to lull for the time being and until his purposes were accomplished the dissent and protest of one of his strongest ministers. To-day he meets his former Minister of the Interior, pistol in one hand and soporific in the other. Here again the communications are verbal, there is no written record, we do not know whether the pistol had to be drawn positively or not, and we do not know yet what the soporific is, but it is to be powerful and effective. One other minister remained, not by any means the least strong or the least active. On what principle he went out, or assumed to go out, I do not quite know nor do I quite know how he views it. The pistol was evidently applied but whether there is a compensating soporific yet to come or not we shall have to wait for time to reveal. Let me hope and express some confidence in the hope that out of the three there will be at least one minister who will have the manliness to stand firm, and having gone out on principle will stay out on principle.

Now, Sir, having got that far, let me put a question to the Northwest members who are supporting the government in this House. They were like sheep without a shepherd. Their shepherd was sporting peacefully and pastorally in the far off southern hills and his sheep here were without an efficient shepherd, without what we call the leading one—I will not say the leading sheep, it is only a simile anyway. While the leading one was away the others unled fell into an artful design, a trap, laid —shall I say by the hon. Minister of Justice ?—No, not perhaps laid, but that facility of verbiage, that savoir faire way of putting a thing so that it shall be preserved and yet not seen was too much for the members from the Northwest in the absence of their lynx-eyed, keen and well informed leader. They all fell into the pit, they groaned in the pit and tumbled about in the pit until their leader came back and gently led them by paths out of the wilderness back to firmer and higher ground. But, for ever and for ever, say what you may, or think what you may, to the seven members from the Northwest who were conferred with, who gave their advice to help to formulate this Bill, who knew what was in it—for ever and for ever have they to bear the onus either of ignorance of what was in the Bill, or of indifference as to what was in it or of complicity in what the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior declared was the purpose of the clause. Now, this ought to give food for thought not only to the people of the Northwest but to the people of this country through and through. Then, I put this question to the right hon. Prime Minister : If, before the last election, he had made known his intention to develop two provinces out of the Territories and in giving them autonomy to withhold from them the power over their lands and the unlimited power to control their educational interests, how many men would he have had back here from the Northwest ? I ask the right hon. gentleman what would have been his status in this country to-day ? Is it to his credit that he kept back from the people that information or even an intimation of it and secured a following absolutely unpledged and without a mandate on this subject ? My hon. friend knows that there is only one answer to that. I will put another question to him. If the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior had stood out on his principle as he called it, would one single member from the Northwest have dared to go against him ? If he had stood out and if the rest had stood out with him would the right hon. leader of the government have dared to have attempted to put through his Bill ? That is the question. Therefore, there was an incentive and a motive either for the use of the pistol or the soporific. One or the other has been used undoubtedly as no man would have repudiated his principles and the record of a lifetime on a most grave question, unless there had been some further inducement than the ex-Minister of the Interior declared before us here the other day.

Now, sir, let us go a little further. We heard yesterday an interesting speech from the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). I do not propose to undertake the ungracious task of criticising that speech as every speech, the Prince Minister's and my

own included, has its defects, I suppose, and this speech certainly had its defects as well as its beauties. As I listened to that speech, whilst many thoughts coursed through my brain, two or three might be mentioned this afternoon. The first one was this: what a mild and erudite and tactful pleader for toleration and national unity the hon. member proved himself yesterday! How helpful it is, when we come to the decision of a constitutional question in the twentieth century, to have a very fine, a very learned discourse offered to us as to the wonderful, enduring and preservative power of the church in the far gone centuries in keeping the light of knowledge and science burning! But we live in the 20th century; we cannot decide now as to the merits of a common school system on what were the excellencies of the repositories of learning two, or three, or four centuries ago; we have to take the conditions as they are to-day and by weighing these conditions come to our own best conclusion.

One other thing came to my mind. I could not help but look alternately from the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) to the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton); the member for Labelle chock full of religious fervour and enthusiasm, a fervour and enthusiasm that does him infinite credit, declaring, as the culmination of his argument, that it was impossible for Catholics to thoroughly enjoy their religion unless they have complete control of their education. If that is the belief of the member for Labelle, or of any other good Catholic, I quarrel with no man's belief. It has been the fashion during this debate, and it follows from good feeling, to disclaim any personal bias when we speak of each other as Protestants or Catholics. I do not want to enter upon that apology, or to even affirm it is necessary, but I want to say this in justice to myself. I have been in public life since 1882, I have been on the back benches and on the front benches, I have spoken considerably often in this House (gentlemen opposite think quite too often), I have spoken a good deal through the country, and my speeches have been reported; if any man can put his finger on one single sentence spoken here or spoken elsewhere in which I have uttered one illiberal or bigoted thought with reference to my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, I would be thankful for him to do it. I don't think any man can. There is one circle which envelops every man that is sacred ground, it is the circle in which his God and his conscience meet. Against what occurs in that inner circle I have absolutely no right to intrude, and I claim the same treatment for myself. But this is what I mean: If these were the opinions of the member for Labelle, and undoubtedly they were, what kind of education does he want in these provinces? What else can he want but one that will do him good from his point of view, a thing that is absolutely essential if he is not going to have a mere sham. The half hour privilege at the end of the school day to permit a priest in the school room to teach the dogmas of the church—will that satisfy him? Is that the culmination of his depth of belief and his power of argument all verging towards the one conclusion? Evidently not. Beside the member for Labelle sat the ex-Minister of the Interior, who, the other day, whittled it all down to the one half hour of religious teaching; whittled it down to only that and nothing more. There, near the member for Labelle, sat the Prime Minister, who, in 1896, had the opportunity to prevent what the member for Labelle deplored as the robbery of the rights of the minority in the province of Manitoba. Never before in the history of confederation had such an opportunity arrived; it is very probable it will never arrive again. The Prime Minister told us, with a convenient forgetfulness of the whole clause 93: I was opposed to remedial legislation in 1896, because the law of the province of Manitoba had been declared to be a valid law, and I was against forcing Manitoba to relinquish what Manitoba had the right to enact. Is that the worship of the constitution that my right hon. friend has; is that the only part of the constitution he reads? There were two things in the Manitoba case in 1896. They had a right to their law and it was valid on one count, and that count was, that before Manitoba became a province there was no system of sectarian or denominational schools by law or practice. But there was another point which was covered by the British North America Act, and for which most especially the British North America Act was framed to cover. When Manitoba became a province it enacted a separate school law, and in 1890 it repealed that separate school law, and, under such circumstances the British North America Act, section 93, came in, and it is the only way in which it possibly could come in. Does my right hon. friend deny the fact; does he deny the constitution?

Then, Sir, the Roman Catholic minority came to him in 1896 and said: True, we were thrown down on the bad drafting or the insufficiency of the law, whichever you choose, but the Privy Council have declared that we have the right to get to the federal parliament through the federal government and to appeal as a last resort, if parliament considers it best to give us remedial legislation in order to restore, as far as possible, the rights of the minority. When that appeal was made to the hon. gentleman, could he take a part of section 93 and relieve himself from the duty, because that particular part of the section did not apply, whilst right before him was the other and pertinent part of the constitution which absolutely did apply?

Now, Sir, I never was a separate school adherent, I never believed in separate schools as against national schools. In 1896 I stated my belief, as I state it now; I knew it was not politically to my advantage, I knew it was not politically to the advantage of the Liberal-Conservative party; but, Sir, without thinking of ulterior things, I said to myself: There is the constitution, there is the pronouncement of the highest judicial tribunal in this empire, there is the minority coming with a grievance and having the right to appeal to the Dominion government and the Dominion parliament, the only power that has jurisdiction to right their wrongs; I said to myself: I believe it is right, I believe in the policy of attempting to carry out the constitution. Let me ask this question: If my right hon. friend, in 1896, had thrown his forces with the forces that made for remedial legislation, who can doubt that we would have carried it in this parliament. No one can doubt it. And why was it not carried? The ex-Minister of the Interior told why when he said here the other day: The member for North Toronto wished to restore the schools, but he failed, and he failed because the right hon. the leader of this government threw himself across the way and prevented it.

Why should not the member for Labelle save some of his argument that he so generously distributed yesterday, and apply it to his own chief, the right hon. gentleman who leads the government, and tax him for two things. When he said that they had been robbed of their rights in Manitoba and were suffering from injustice there to-day, why did he not add: and that, Sir, was due to the action of the present Prime Minister, my own leader. More than that: when in clause 16, as brought down on the 21st of February, his leader had provided for sectarian education in these provinces for ever with an endowment from the fund, why did he, at the beck and call of the Minister of the Interior, who was their enemy, looked upon in that light, who destroyed their schools system in Manitoba, who prevented them from obtaining and retaining their rights there—why did he take out the clause that gave them something, and substitute the clause that which according to the Finance Minister, the Minister of Customs and the ex-Minister of the Interior, gives you absolutely nothing but the last weary half hour of instruction at the day's end and the name of a separate school. I am carrying out now strictly the argument of the ex-Minister of the Interior, acquiesced in by all the members of the government who have spoken; and no one who has not spoken has deemed it necessary to rise and express his dissent from that argument. If his argument is correct and his facts are right—and they are assented to by the members opposite—what, may I ask the member for Labelle, does the Northwest Bill provide at present, under those ordinances that are put into the constitution, and that are to become the measure and standard for all time to come? Listen to what Archbishop Taché says:

> Nothing essential now distinguishes the Catholic schools from the Protestant schools but the designation, now ironical, of separate schools.

There is the church authority. Judge Rouleau says:

> If separate schools exist now in name, they do not exist in fact.

There is the legal side of it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is that in Manitoba?

Mr. FOSTER. No, that is in the Northwest. We have those two, the one representing—shall I mention the word?—the hierarchy. I do not think hierarchy is an objectionable name; I think it is an honourable name, and I am quite sure it is an honoured name, and I venture to use it, and to use it in that sense. The one the representative of the hierarchy, the other the representative of the bench, both of them strong Catholics, both speaking the French language, and both on the spot and able to speak from knowledge, thus express themselves. Now, may I ask the member for Labelle, if he is absolutely convinced of his theory and if he drives it to its logical conclusion, why did he sit still and not open his lips when the malign influence of the Minister of the Interior and the ex-Minister of the Interior was dragging out of the Bill clause 16, No. 1, which gave to the Northwest minority that which they demand, and which was conclusively demanded by the argument of the member for Labelle? Must we again and again come to the conclusion, that with the member for Labelle it is the same as with the member for Brandon—they are both strong in the enunciation of their principles, but both very lax in carrying them out. On principle I am with Borden, but when it comes to a vote, I am with Laurier—that is the cynical and outspoken declaration of the ex-Minister of the Interior.

Now, let me come back to the Manitoba case. I was finishing that by saying that section 93 has two parts, and that the Prime Minister cannot get out of the obligation of the constitution by quoting only one part, in which he is relieved by a judgment of the Privy Council, and ignoring the other part, in which he is absolutely bound by the judgment of the Privy Council in so far as having a clear case for the action of this body under its jurisdiction. So much with reference to that.

One other point might be brought up. The ex-Minister of the Interior, speaking of the Manitoba question in 1896, said from his place in the House the other day:

The member for North Toronto and the cabinet to which he belonged endeavoured to put back on Manitoba a useless and inefficient and expensive system of education.

I deny it. All that we proposed to do was to embody the principle of remedial legislation to the largest extent to which it could be embodied ; but never with the idea that we should make permanent there a system of schools which should not be up-to-date, well inspected, well grounded and well carried out. We were not advocates of an inefficient school, neither do I think that the gentlemen who represented the cause of Manitoba were advocates of that kind of a school. No, it was not that. 'But,' said the ex-Minister of the Interior, 'when the commissioners came from Sir Charles Tupper's government, we offered them a compromise, which they refused to accept.' 'After the 1896 elections were over,' he added, 'we offered to the Laurier government, the right hon. gentleman's government, the very same compromise, ipsissima verba '—the very words he used—'and they accepted it.' What does the First Minister say ? When fresh from that settlement, of which there was no written but only a verbal record, he went down to the city of Montreal, and, standing up amongst his own people there, he said :

Yet after we have accepted from the provincial government of Manitoba much more than the commissioners of the late government asked last spring, we are now to be denounced none the less in the name of religion as traitors to our race and religion.

There was the statement made by the ex-Minister of the Interior, and here is the statement made by the right hon. gentleman himself. Which is true, which is correct ? —the prime actor in the one case, with his memory fresh, with all the scars and all the laurels from the conflict still fresh upon him, and the Prime Minister of this country, who could not have gone through those negotiations and that contest of 1896 without having his memory also fresh with reference to what had happened. There is what the Prime Minister says in December, 1896 ; here is what the Minister of the Interior says in March, 1905 ; which is correct ? Did the theory that was put forth by the Solicitor General exercise its malign influence then, and did a responsible government in Manitoba, with important interests and grave issues at stake deliberately make up its mind that it would not give to a Tory government what it was prepared to give to a Liberal government ?

Now, Sir, look again at what takes place. The Prime Minister comes down and makes his argument absolutely on the constitutional phase of the question. He disclaims the breeding of strife, the letting loose of the demon of discord in this great parliament where different races and religions are represented. He says : Though I believe in separate schools, yet I argue this out on the constitution. His statement, is in so many words, that the constitution binds us, compels us, to give to the minority in these provinces that we are forming in the Northwest the same rights that are given under the constitution to Quebec and Ontario minorities. That is his exact statement ; it is in the unrevised 'Hansard'; it is in the revised 'Hansard'; it has been quoted before ; it has not been denied ; he will not deny it. Well, Sir, I do not commend that version of the compact of confederation to this House, and I do ask the House and the country to look into that for a little. So much has been said about toleration in Quebec, so much has been said about the binding power of the constitution, that, if my hon. friends opposite will allow me, I want to reason that out with them for a moment. I do it in the broadest and kindest spirit. You say you are tolerant to the Protestant minority in Quebec. I am glad to hear it. I am not going to stand here and deny it. But, when you say that you are tolerant to the minority, I ask you, ought not you so to be? They are your fellow-citizens. They are not your wards ; they contribute to your finances ; they build up your country ; they live side by side with your families ; the weal or woe of the province of Quebec must be shared equally by them and you. Ought you not to be tolerant toward them ? But, will the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) allow me one word to show why he should be a little self-contained when he makes this the plea for any extraordinary toleration for those of his own faith and race in other provinces. Here is a Protestant child in Quebec. He goes one morning to what is called the Quebec school. You may call these your national schools if you like ; but am I wrong in saying that, from the time that child enters the school at nine o'clock in the morning until he leaves it at four o'clock in the afternoon, he is under the direct, impressive, constant, inculcatory spirit and teaching of the Roman Catholic church ? I am not mistating the facts in that. For, the hon. member for Labelle, speaking on behalf of his people, says : We believe we cannot properly exercise our religion unless we have the right to teach our children our religion as and when we please. So, does it not come to this, in all reason—that your schools in Quebec are not national schools; they are Roman Catholic schools ? The influence of the church, in the books, in the teachers, in the adornments in the positive dogmatic teaching is there from nine o'clock in the morning until four o'clock in the afternoon. And the Protestant boy has no other school to go to, unless you make provision for him. Is it extraordinary toleration that, having no national schools, no schools that are undogmatic and unsectarian, if there is a Pro-

testant minority in the province of Quebec, you are bound, to make provision for the Protestant—who is just as honest in allegiance to his creed and maintenance of his religious belief as is the Catholic—to give to him a place where he will not be constantly under the watchful and persuasive power and teaching of the Catholic Church. I am not going outside of the record in saying that. When you talk of toleration, I want you to think of that. And, now take the other case. Here is a Protestant child in Ontario. He goes to the public school. From the time he enters the school at nine o'clock in the morning until he goes out of it at four o'clock in the afternoon, there is no vestige of denominational or clerical teaching or influence. The Catholic child comes from the bosom of a Catholic family and returns to the bosom of that family at night absolutely unassailed and uninfluenced by any dogma denominational or clerical which is against his belief or against the course of his religious training. That is to say, in Ontario there are national schools. Now, the only ground you have to stand upon in objecting to this system in Ontario, is that it is the very absence of dogmatical teaching that you object to. Then, if you object to that, but not to any direct teaching or persuasion, that is the limit of your plea. But you cannot say that the Catholic child is under perverting influenee. In the province of Quebec it is absolutely different from what it is in Ontario ; do you not see that ?—and consequently you must not stretch this claim of your toleration too far.

Mr. BOURASSA. Will the hon. gentleman allow me a word ?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly.

Mr. BOURASSA. I would like to impress upon the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Foster's) mind the point of view we take ;—we say that it is as unjust to compel a Catholic child to go to a non-sectarian school as it is to compel a Protestant child to go to a Catholic school. And that has been acknowledged by the highest Protestant authorities in England.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not dissent from the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Bourassa's) statement of the Catholic position. But what I answer is this : Is it as unjust to have a child forced by necessity, or by environment, to go to a national school in the province of Ontario where he is not perverted, as it would be if these national schools taught Methodism or Presbyterianism from morning until night and perverted your child ? We must take all these things into the consideration.

Now, we go back to the compact. And I may say that whatever may be the similarity of words, I see a difference between the compact of confederation and the British North America Act. By whom was the compact made, and where ? The compact was made in 1864 by the representatives of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island. These representatives met together to form a confederation. They made what we call the constitution. In that constitution you find two divisions of powers. One division puts certain things exclusively under the control of the province, and the other puts certain things exclusively under the control of the Dominion. Now, read these over, and do you find anything in the list of powers given to the exclusive control of the Dominion which has the remotest relation to or connection with education ? You cannot find it. What was the dominant idea in the minds of all the representatives ? The dominant idea was that education was a local concern, and the Dominion must keep its hands off.

And that was Mr. Oliver Mowat's original resolution, what was afterwards added was only an incident. Do not let us confuse the incidental with the essential. One is the powers themselves. The other comes from an after thought, viz: Granting those powers, can they be used to prejudice the rights of the minority? If so, let us put on a check. That is the incidental, but the other is the essential. Now the essential thing is that the province should have exclusive control of its education. But those wise men sitting there in Quebec city said : Here is Ontario and here is Quebec : we have separate schools for Catholics in Ontario and for Protestants in Quebec, and a suggestion was made by Mr. McGee to this effect : Yes, we will give the exclusive power, but we will add this rider to it, 'save and except the minority rights of the two Canadas.' That is all that was done at Quebec. That is all to the very letter, and that was passed by the legislature of Upper and Lower Canada. There were present representatives from the maritime provinces and also the representatives from the two provinces of Upper and Lower Canada. That was their compact, and that was all of it. But this gave no right for anybody to say that, because they saved by that compact the rights of the minorities in those two provinces, when forty or fifty years later you make provinces out of the Northwest Territories, you are obliged on account of that compact, to establish separate schools for the minorities in those provinces. Not in the least. This compact in order to become law went to London. The Protestant minority, voiced by Mr. Galt, said : That compact does not suit the Protestants in Quebec; we are peculiarly situated ; we have been trying to get certain amendments to our Act to better protect us ; these have been promised us, but you have not been able to carry them out ; now we cannot willingly go into confederation unless we

get those. In the last analysis, it came to this: The Protestant minority could not get the legislation until after confederation. Then Mr. Galt said at London : Very well, then we must make that promise binding by the constitution ; we must add that other clause that not only if at the time of confederation separate schools exist but if legislation is had after confederation giving separate school privileges and then that these should be taken away, and the rights of the minority thereby be prejudiced, there will be an appeal to the sovereign power, the parliament of the colonies. That is the history of it and the whole history of it. You may search the whole history of it from first to last and that is a fair statement of the case. For New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, not by compact, but in London, was this united Upper and Lower Canada saving clause extended into a saving clause which applied to all the provinces at the time of the union. It was generalized, it was the compact principle extended to the other provinces. That is the Confederation Act. When you come to the British North America Act, you can get all there is in that Act and you have a right to get it. But I say to the right hon. gentleman who contends that he is bound by the Confederation Act to give to these Northwest provinces the same rights that are possessed by Ontario and Quebec, that he has pushed the contract beyond its absolute and reasonable meaning, and in the opinion of lawyers equally as good as himself he has no warrant for saying that he is compelled by the British North America Act to place into the constitution of the Northwest Territories such a principle as he proposes to embalm in that constitution.

One point more with reference to the Manitoba case. I have said that the Catholic or any minority in this Dominion never had a case so clear for remedial legislation as had the Manitoba minority in 1896. All the legal difficulties were out of the way, all the decisions were given, and the path was absolutely clear between that minority with its grievance and the power which had jurisdiction to remedy it, namely, this parliament. But the right hon. gentleman threw himself across the way and prevented it ; and if my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) complains that the Manitoba minority is suffering from injustice today, it is because his leader threw himself across the path of the Remedial Bill and prevented its enactment. More has happened since that. I regret in no single jot or tittle my act in 1896. Under similar circumstances, I would do the same thing, but I do not at all say that I will ever do the same thing under the circumstances that may arise after this. Why ? Because there is a power which after all is mightier than the constitution. We invoked the constitution in 1896. We tried to give it its full force in a clear case and we were prevented by the leader of a great party. After we were prevented, that leader and his party went to the people in 1896, 1900 and 1904, and the people declared that they did not want remedial legislation. In the interests of the 41 per cent which has been talked about in this House, in the interests of the province of Quebec which was specially interested, we on this side tried to get for the minority their rights in the only way we possibly could under the constitution. We were prevented from doing it by the Liberal party, and during three successive elections the Liberal party have endorsed the contention that no hands be laid on any province even though it deprives the minority of that province of the rights guaranteed it under the constitution. And I make bold to say that as long as grass grows and water runs, I shall not feel disposed to contravene that will three times expressed by the people of this country. Aye, Mr. Speaker, three times expressed, and expressed especially by that very 41 per cent we hear so much about, and in the province where it is strong set. To the man who says that this agitation is on to-day simply because we are opposed to a French premier—to the gentleman from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) I have no answer to make. A statement of the case is quite sufficient. To the same gentleman who said in another part of his speech that this is on because it is a party agitation, I have no answer to make. His statement answers itself. We read the newspapers, we scan the petitions, we know what is going on in this country, and if this is a party agitation very suddenly the Tory party must have greatly enlarged its sphere. Sir, I want to state one other thing. Whatever may have been said in 1896, I approached that question, and the government of which I was a member approached it, against the wishes of many of our best friends, not because we thought we had a political cinch in prospect, not at all ; but knowing that in all probability we were going down to our political death, and doing it because we thought we were under a constitutional obligation.

Now, Sir, I had intended to address an argument to the Minister of the Interior, but that hon. gentleman is not present ; perhaps it will be better to keep it for another time. But there is one point I cannot afford to let pass, because it is a point made by the Minister of Finance as well as by the ex-Minister of the Interior. It used to be good doctrine, good constitutional doctrine, it is yet—it used to be good Liberal doctrine, I don't know that it is now—but it used to be, formerly they coincided,—that if there was a member of the government who, on a grave question of principle, did not agree with his party on a measure involving that principle, he had no other hon-

ourable course than to go out from the government and voice his opposition to that measure. Is that a good Liberal principle to-day? Is it, or is it not? That is the only raison d'être that the Minister of the Interior had. He has not abjured his principles, he keeps them still. He declares that it is with reluctance that he will vote for the measure. He says, "section 1 is an interference, and he wishes it were not there; but on one consideration he will vote for that interference. Why? Because it is supplemented by a subsection which declares that money shall be put behind the interference to make it effective. There is consistency for you. He hates the plague, he says it destroys the family, it decimates society, but if only you support it by a money vote by which you can scatter the plague far and wide, then he welcomes it. That is the argument, that is the reasoning of the Minister of the Interior, if he has any left at all. He declares that his principles are not abjured, but he straightway repudiates them by his vote. The man who cried for freedom from slavery, cried it from 1890 to 1896, through all the concessions and counties of the west, and of Ontario, cried for unshackled limbs in the provinces, comes in to-day, and while declaring that he has not abjured his principles in the least, he votes to do what he declares himself shackles and creates an interference with the free life of two great provinces in the west, enduring and irrevocable. Time was when a man who held a principle as strong as that on so grave an issue, would not have dared to stand before the public an instant after having gone back upon his principles. Why does he do it? Why? I am not going to search for any reasons at all, I am going to give the reason that he gives—the King's government must go on. The Finance Minister says, the King's government must go on. Do they not mean in their heart of hearts that the Liberal government must go on? It is the Liberal government which must go on, and principle, consistency, constitution, everything must be sacrificed, but the King's—to wit, the Liberal—government must go on. The Minister of Finance used it as a threat—I never heard a more unworthy argument in this House, and hope never to hear such an argument again. If that principle and that method is adopted what government can be pure and well conducted; for never, if not in this case, will men go out because they do not agree in principle with the legislation which is proposed. Yet the King's government must go on, that is to say, the party must be kept in power, principle and constitution may be thrown to the winds.

But the Minister of the Interior has wonderful knowledge from his acquaintance on the street. He has been too much on the street. Too close a connection with the man on the street is apt to becloud the moral sense, is apt to throw a pall over principle, it is not conducive to the highest and clearest thought. What is his argument? The constitution orders this, says the right hon. premier. The constitution does not compel it, says the leader of the opposition. So the ex-Minister of the Interior says that the man on the street gets confused. He hears both say that they are correct, sees both stand on the same rock. The man on the street says, he cannot understand the constitution, but wants to know what you are going to enact. But there are men on the street and men on the street. I can conceive of a man on the street who cultivates a very valuable farm out in Carleton county. I go to him and say: My good friend, you think you own that farm.—Yes.—Well, I think I own it. Let us sit down now and let us discuss what is the best method of cultivating that farm. What does the man on the street say to me? The first thing he says is, Sir, don't you think I had better know first how the title reads? If the title in in me, I wil take your advice, but I will not take your domination; if the title is in you, I may give you advice, but I will not try to dominate you. My first duty is to ascertain the title of the property. I will discuss the details of the business afterwards.

So there are men on the street and men on the street, and it is not the better class of men on the street from whom the Minister of the Interior has received his inspiration. Forty-one per cent of the people of this country, the Minister of Finance says, bids us put this article into the constitution. Forty-one per cent of this country in 1896 seemed to be up in arms against remedial legislation in the province of Manitoba. What right has the Minister of Finance to say that forty-one per cent of the people of this country demand it? But does he pay a compliment to the forty-one per cent of the intelligent, educated, law-abiding, patriotic Catholics in this country, if, when a question comes up and has been fought out in the high court of parliament, and the majority is against them, he makes them say that they will make government impossible in this country

What Catholic says that? No intelligent, patriotic Catholic says it. Every patriotic and intelligent Catholic throws that back in the teeth both of the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior and the hon. Minister of Finance and that when they want an excuse for going back on their principles and their records they should get a better excuse than to say that 41 per cent of the citizens of this country, if they cannot get what they want, will cause anarchy and revolution. The Minister of Finance ventured something else, and I commend it to the hon. member for Labelle. He said: Oh yes, we can afford to be tolerant; we must recollect that 41 per cent of the people are

Catholics. They have some rights and we must not be too hard hearted. Let the constitution go; let us be tolerant; give them a large and tolerant measure, and what is the measure? All they get up there is their half-hour of the spent day; all they get up there is a decrease in their separate schools instead of an increase. Oh, the generosity, the lofty, wide toleration of the Finance Minister! I did not blame the hon. member for Labelle at all yesterday when he put that little quiet spoke in his wheel and said: Oh yes, Mr. Finance Minister you are quite tolerant down there but you were not always so. You are so now because there is a very respectable number of Catholic votes in your province. What more right has this parliament to put separate schools under the constitution in these two great provinces out there in the interest of the minority than it has to bid the province of Nova Scotia, or the province of New Brunswick or the province of Prince Edward Island to give separate schools to the Roman Catholic minority of those provinces? When you come down to the essence of the thing and leave forms aside what more right has parliament to do it in one case than in the other? Would even the hon. member for Labelle introduce a proposition looking to an interference with the province of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island or New Brunswick, or to force them to give a legal separate school system to the minority? No, and why not? It is more manly, Sir, to attack a full fledged province able to defend itself and say to it: We will make you respect law and justice; we will make you respect the rights of the minority and we will put a law in force in your province which will compel you to do it under pains and penalties. You have a man to fight then. It is a fair battle, but in this case you take the child, your own ward, the infant in your arms growing up to his maturity who will by and by attain a mighty estate, with powerful, untold possibilities stretching out into the endless future and while he is a child in your lap you bind his limbs with an irrevocable bond, so that however strong he may grow he never can get rid of the bond or the badge that marks him as inferior. The plea for toleration is a good one, the argument for separate schools, as strong as it can be made, may be a good one, but you are in the wrong court when you come here. That is the only mistake. How did you get your separate school privileges in the province of Nova Scotia? Not by the hard letter of the law. It was the good, tolerant sense of the majority which gave you there all you asked. How did you get your privileges in the province of New Brunswick? New Brunswick fought the minority, fought it out in the province, went to the elections on it, fought it out in the courts, made no change in jot or tittle, but when it had ascertained and maintained its full rights the majority turned around and said to their brethren that lived in their midst: We are not so intolerant as you thought, we give you those privileges and to-day, in the city of St. John and in every portion of New Brunswick, you have practically better separate schools than you will have in the Northwest. Why cannot you trust the Northwest?

Mr. BOURASSA. Not the same kind.

Mr. FOSTER. Not the same kind? I do not respect very much that judgment, which, standing on the small pivot of the present, cannot look out into the future with its progress, its advancement, its increasing light and knowledge and its ever growing generosity and tolerance and be broad enough to say: Men will be men when I am dead and gone, with the same generous impulses in their hearts as those which they have to-day. Men will treat their brethren as brethren then as they treat them now. The argument of the hon. gentleman carried to its full extent is an argument for tyranny, and a bondage complete and enduring.

Now, let me reason for a moment with my friends. You say: We want a separate school system; we believe in it. Will you look for a moment at the Protestant view? I do not know whether I am able to speak for all Protestantism or not, but I think I can fairly and reasonably outline the view of that Protestantism which stands behind the national schools. What it it? That the schools shall be national, shall be free, shall be non-sectarian, busying themselves with education alone, not leaving out education in morals and on the general lines of right and religious conduct, but absolutely free from all sectarianism.

Mr. BOURASSA. That is the American system.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not the American system alone, it is the Canadian system in every province except Quebec. Where did the right hon. leader of the government get his information when he stated in parliament here the other day that in the schools of Canada religion and religious dogmas were taught from morning till night? Has the right hon. gentleman ever looked into our school systems? Go to the province of Ontario, go to the province of Manitoba, go to the province of New Brunswick, go to all of them and that is absolutely the wrong explanation and the wrong interpretation. These schools are free, non-sectarian and consequently national. They do not allow dogma to be taught whether it is dogma of the Methodist, the Presbyterian, the Anglican or the Roman Catholic. All are treated alike. Is there no reasonableness in the proposition, that, if the great majority of the people of the country feel that the best kind of a system is such a system as that, so

long as it in no way offends against the religious belief, the teachings and the dogma of any class or creed, it shall be a national system to which we shall all contribute ? In that way they declare that the children meet together and that there are no distinctions between them. In their sports, in their studies, in their social growth they mingle and commingle, they learn to know each other, they grow up with a common bond and a common interest in their country and the affairs of their country. That is their view. It may be wrong or it may be right. Then they say that by that system we avoid the divisions into separate districts with their consequent inefficiency, and increased cost. Therefore, they say, we have a more efficient system and we have also a less costly system. That is their point of view. Let manners and morals, let the bases of right conduct be taught in the schools, let those be inculcated, but no dogma of any sect. Let each class teach their dogma where they please ; it may be in the Sunday school, or in the church, or in some other place, but if there is any sect, Presbyterian, Methodist, Church of England or Roman Catholic which wishes to teach their own belief and their own religion in any institution governed by themselves, there is no law which forbids them to do it in this country. There is no prohibition. These are in broad terms the distinctive characteristics of the national school system. Suppose the Presbyterians were to say : We want dogmatic teaching. the answer to them would be : Provide for it as best you may: you have your churches, you have your Sunday schools, teach religion in them : you can have your colleges and your seminaries and your institutions which are entirely under your religious domination, teach religion in them. And the same answer is given to every body, Protestant sect, Catholic sect, any sect. Where is the tyranny in that ?

Mr. BOURASSA. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. BOURASSA. The very agument which the hon. gentleman now makes was the argument presented by the government of Manitoba on the second appeal in the Barrett case, and the judgment of the Privy Council was that such a system of national schools was a glaring injustice to the Roman Catholics, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was in favour of passing remedial legislation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. I would advise my hon. friends not to applaud before they hear the answer. The assumption of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) is not correct. There were other circumstances in that case, and one was that the Manitoba legislature had given rights to the minority under their full powers, that under the same full powers the Manitoba legislature had revoked these rights, and it was on account of the prejudicial effect of what has been given being taken back that the question came before the federal parliament. That was the principal idea that came into the case and upon which the decision rested.

Mr. BOURASSA. I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend—

Mr. FOSTER. Go on.

Mr. BOURASSA. I simply wish to say that my interruption was not to discuss the legal question, but with the object of refuting the argument the hon. gentleman has made that such a system of national schools ought to be satisfactory to Catholics.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not suppose we can see eye to eye about that, but as I wish to finish before six o'clock I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) will not think me discourteous if I do not follow the point further. For the few moments that are left me I wish to take my last point, not to treat it as fully as it deserves, but simply to throw out a few thoughts by way of suggestion. I want to ask in the first place why there should be any attempt to inject into the constitution of these new provinces the principle of separate schools, without authority from them, against the disposition and against the feelings of the people of the Northwest so far as we can judge ? Why is this attempt made to cripple these great provinces? Each of the other provinces, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, British Columbia, Manitoba, is absolutely free and sovereign in so far as such legislation is concerned. Each one of these provinces of her own good will may enact a separate school system and it may also abrogate that law, but if it does abrogate it it has to show cause before the jurisdiction of the federal parliament and with the possible consequence of remedial legislation. And if we can trust all these other provinces what reason in the world is there that we should for ever tag with a badge of inferiority these two great coming provinces of the Northwest? When every other province stands clothed in the majesty of provincial rights, why should we single out Saskatchewan and Alberta, and because we happen to be the guardian of the children put upon them for ever a badge of inferiority ? Is it not a retrograde step in thought and in practice to stand on our small platform of 1905 and to hold up a statute of limitations for ever in the face of two provinces, in which, as the centuries roll on changes must inevitably come, systems come and systems go, new methods take the place of old. But the right hon. gentleman stands up here with his small statute of limitation and he declares against the whole possible progress of these great

parts of Canada with their coming millions of population, and their conditions in years and centuries to come, as diverse from this year and this century as the human mind can imagine. It is a task which is unwise to essay ; it is absolutely impossible of successful accomplishment. The right hon. gentleman may tag on this badge of bondage; he may put on his restrictions; he may utter an irrevocable decree of tutelage, but I tell him that against the free thought and free will of these two provinces with their coming millions of people, his statute of limitation will be as waste paper and his chains of bondage as weak as thread of fibre. There is no hand which can fashion the chain and drive the rivet that will encompass and restrict these young giants of the Northwest in years to come. You may carry your project through and the Finance Minister may cry peace, peace, but the moment it is carried through and made irrevocable, that moment begins against it the warfare of an unwilling people. The feelings of free men that their right to freedom has been outraged and denied will not long lie dormant. Tolerant, if you appeal to his love of tolerance, the free man will forswear tolerance if you attempt to force upon him by superior and to a certain extent foreign and outside force, a measure which he believes restricts his freedom. Do not run away with the conclusion that we here are able to shackle the millions of the future in the Northwest.

What answer have you in face of the fact that every other province has this liberty, and has treated with remarkable toleration the minority within its boundaries—vaunted and boasted in every part of this House ? What right have you to say to the people of the Northwest : We can trust our fellow-citizens in the other provinces, but we cannot trust you. More illogical still, the member for Labelle said : We could trust the people who are there now. Trust the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), who voted over and over again for resolutions to destroy the rights of the minority in the Northwest? Trust the member for Brandon, who has abandoned his principles for the sake of his party's success, but who, in the very moment that he abandons them, still plucks up courage to say, I believe in them still, I am proud of my allegiance to them ? You can trust these, but you cannot trust the coming peoples of the Northwest. Never was there a more retrograde doctrine taught by the greatest Tory of the ages than is taught in that sentence by the hon. member for Labelle.

Mr. BOURASSA. The hon. gentleman is stating just the contrary of what I said.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman say what he said ?

Mr. BOURASSA. I said that even if I trusted the people at present in the North-

west, no one could tell what would happen in the future, when large numbers of people from the United States and other countries settled there ; and, so far as the present rulers of the Northwest were concerned, I said I could not trust them in the light of their past legislation.

Mr. FOSTER. If the member for Labelle said that, then I misunderstood him, and my argument does not apply to him. I want only fair argument. There was an argument which somewhat cut the ground from under the feet of the member for Labelle. He said : Put separate schools into the Northwest and treat the French people well and the French people will flow into the Northwest and become your most stable settlers, lovers of the soil, as the French people always are, lovers of their home, as they are wherever they settle. But does the hon. member recollect that into the country to the south of us, with its Godless schools, its secular schools, its denial of the French language and all other rights of the minority, hundreds of thousands of the choice youth of the province of Quebec have gone and go from year to year to make their homes ? Will the restriction, if you put it upon the Northwest, in principle unjust and in practice irksome, be worth the paper it is written upon ? Under the ordinances as they are to-day rules are made by the commissioners. You do not crystallize one of those regulations into law. You simply provide that the ordinance shall stand, and the ordinance with reference to separate schools is absolutely the same as the provision in the law of 1875. Why is it that to-day those schools are not the same as they were twenty years ago ? Because with the power to make regulations which the commissioner has under these ordinances, regulations have been made which have transformed those schools into what they are to-day. Pass your ordinance and put it into the constitution, and if the people of the Northwest, in their provincial assemblies, are opposed to the principle, are opposed to reverting to the old form, they will make their regulations as they please, and I would like to know how you propose to stop them. It is absolutely impossible.

All this discussion, Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to say so, seems out of place in this House. To discuss the school systems of the United States, of Spain, of Germany, of France, of these provinces, to try to settle which has the greatest merits in all its principles and details, is something that is absolutely foreign to this House, and that never should be brought here—has no place here legitimately. As I said before, the plea may be good, but you are in the wrong court. To the province you should go for these tolerant privileges, these rights which you wish to have by law. The province alone can give them, and, as the ex-Minister of the Interior said the other day : 'I

am still strongly of opinion that if the Catholic minority will trust to the legislatures of the Northwest, in the end they will be better off thereby.' If that is done, we can bid farewell to these discussions in this House, where different races and creeds are represented, and where the active passions, good or bad, are always aroused when you come to questions of religious belief and dogma. These questions will then no longer intervene to disquiet and paralyze the business of this country. Let these questions be fought out in the province, which is the ultimate tribunal; and again I plead for absolute, unrestricted freedom and confidence in the tolerance of the Northwest people, now and in the future, for fair treatment to all their fellow-citizens.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

OTTAWA ELECTRIC COMPANY.

Mr. GALLIHER moved third reading of Bill (No. 12) respecting the Ottawa Electric Company.

Mr. ROBERT STEWART (Ottawa). I beg to move:

That the said Bill be not now read the third time, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole with instructions to amend the same by providing that section five be struck out and the following be substituted therefor: Provided that the power to acquire shares in the capital stock and debentures or securities of other electric companies possessing powers similar to those of this company will not apply to the capital stock, debentures and securities of the Consumers Electric Company, Limited, or the Metropolitan Company, Limited, or their successors or assigns.

I desire merely to say a few words. The other day a statement was made by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) to the effect that the city of Ottawa had violated its contract with the Ottawa Electric Company. In making this statement, I presume the hon. gentleman had in his mind the resolution passed by the city council of Ottawa some years ago. A motion was then presented in the council asking that a monopoly be given the Ottawa Electric Company, and that motion was carried. But, of course, in order to become effective, it was necessary that it should be put in the form of an agreement and that a by-law should be adopted by the council ratifying that agreement. This was never done. There was considerable feeling at the time, and no sooner was the motion carried than a notice of reconsideration was given. The following day it was pointed out by the city solicitor that it would be a violation of the common law to carry through any arrangement of that kind. Of course, the mere adopting of the motion by the council could have no more effect than the first reading of a Bill by this House. There was simply a resolution passed by the council, but that resolution was never put into the form of an agreement, and it was pointed out by the city solicitor that no corporation could have any power to enter into any such agreement. No contract having been made, it is not correct to say that the city has violated any agreement it has with the company. I think it is only due to the city that I should make this correction of the statement of my hon. friend, who, I am sure, would not willingly do any injustice to the Ottawa city council. Another statement to which I wish to draw attention is that made by the Minister of Justice to the effect that the city of Ottawa was endeavouring to trespass on the rights of the Ottawa Electric Company. I wish to give that statement a positive contradiction. The city council of Ottawa are not endeavouring to trespass on any vested rights. It is the Ottawa Electric Company which is asking for this legislation, and the city council are simply asking to be guarded against any injustice. The feeling in this city is very strong against the passage of this Bill. We consider it to be an invasion of our municipal rights. My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) evidently misunderstood another statement which I made. I was pointing out that members of this House, who are not residents of the city of Ottawa, cannot have the same interest in this matter as the city representatives. We do not dispute the right of any member to make up his mind as to how he will vote on the Bill, but it is only fair that the members from outside the city should pause and consider the effect which this Bill will have on the rights of the municipality. I have nothing more to say on this question. The arguments are before the House. The people of this city consider that it would be an injustice to them to pass this Bill, and I appeal to members on both sides to vote against it.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). I think that my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Stewart) has made out a very good case. The more we discuss this measure, the more it becomes evident that it is a raid on the revenues of the people of Ottawa, and that this parliament ought to refuse to pass it. This parliament has no reason to occupy itself with the domestic affairs of the city of Ottawa, especially in a matter so extremely local. The question never should have come to this House, and the Bill is evidently an invasion of the municipal rights of the province of Ontario. The matter should really be dealt with in the Ontario legislature. In Toronto this Bill is regarded as an invasion of municipal rights. We have had produced here the testimony of the two members represent-

ing this city, and a petition signed by a large number of the citizens of Ottawa has been laid on the table, in which this Bill is denounced as an invasion of the rights of the city. But this House, for some reason or another, proposes to override the rights of the people of Ottawa. What we see here to-day is a parliament prepared, not only to invade municipal rights, but public and provincial rights; and the people outside are taking observations of these things. If parliament will persist in doing this, they will have to account to the common sense of the public. This proceeding cannot be justified on any pretext that it is in the interest of the Dominion. It is not in the interest of the Dominion that parliament should be used to break down the rights of any municipality. We find that the interests of great private corporations are protected and advanced here, and these corporations enabled to evade their obligations.

There was a solemn obligation on the part of this company not to amalgamate. It is seeking power to-day to make an amalgamation, and its object is nothing else than that it may be in a position to increase its charges for electricity to its consumers the citizens of Ottawa. This parliament is setting an example to the legislatures of this country to leave out of consideration the rights of the people wherever those rights are opposed to the interests of private corporations. I object to this, as I have objected to it; and I shall vote against it. I believe that when the people realize what this movement on the part of corporations means, they will put it down. I should like to see the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Stewart) make a fight to a finish. And I should like to hear from the other member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) that we may know what he says about this interference with the rights of the people.

Mr. BELCOURT. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) permit me? He surely will not say that he does not know where I stand in this matter. I have expressed myself clearly.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes, but in these cases you have to do a good deal of talking too. Persistent talking and presentation of the case of the people must have a good effect. I believe that this Bill could be blocked; it could be prevented from going through. I can say that I have done my best to put in a word for the rights of the people of Ottawa. The effort may not succeed now. Hon. gentlemen opposite make fun of municipal rights, and members from one province in particular like to take part in the invasion upon municipal rights. But the day is coming soon, when this parliament will be taken to task for the way it has treated the municipal rights of the people not only in this province but all over the country. These companies may lobby this House and make themselves great friends of the people in power; but I say it is a shame that the political debts of hon. gentlemen opposite should be paid at the expense of the municipal rights of the people of this city.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey). I saw in the funny column of the Toronto 'World' the other day a statement to the effect that the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) had stirred up supporters of the government to vote against this Bill. I have been voting against this Bill on every occasion, and I intend to vote against it to-night; but not because of, but in spite of the eloquent tirade of the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean).

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I am glad to have the opportunity of putting myself on record against the principle of this measure, against the interference by parliament in contracts made by two parties outside. I said the other night, and I repeat, that parliament should not assist one party to a contract to dishonour that contract at the expense of the other party. But that is what we are doing in this case. I am opposed also to parliament playing into the hands of a monopoly, as it will be doing by putting through this Bill, for there can be no other object on the part of this company than to become possessed of the stock of competing companies in order that it may establish a monopoly in its line of business in the city of Ottawa. This is the tendency of the age, especially in commercial life, and parliament should not assist or endorse it in any way, but should rather fight against it and maintain the rights of the people. The people of Ottawa are plainly opposed to this measure. They gave evidence of that as strongly as any people could in the petition sent to the Prime Minister. Over 2,000 citizens of Ottawa begged of him to oppose this measure on the ground that it was against the interest of the city. I take it that that means that the representatives of 2,000 families signed this petition, because I assume that it is only the heads of families that would be likely to sign it. The average family is said to be composed of five, so that this means that over 10,000 people of the city of Ottawa have petitioned against this measure. Yet, I am sure that not one-fifth of the people of Ottawa were asked to sign the petition, or that petition would have had many more signatures than appear upon it. Is not this an evidence of the desire of the residents of Ottawa that this Bill should not be passed? Is not this plain evidence that we are going contrary to the will of the people of Ottawa in a matter in which they are deeply interested? It is said that this company cannot earn a reasonable dividend. And the evidence given of that is their own statement, not verified or analysed to ascertain whether it is correct or not. We who have been in the House any length of time have often heard this

argument put up by corporations who desire to get rights that should not be granted them. Therefore we take this statement with some suspicion; and, before acting upon it, we should at least verify it by inquiry. Then, we are told that this Bill is one that, on its merits ought to pass. And in one of the newspapers of Ottawa we see arguments in support of the Bill. Naturally we ask ourselves. is this an independent authority? Is this a disinterested party giving advice to the parliament of Canada as one of the ratepayers of the city of Ottawa? And when we inquire into the facts, we are told that this same paper is controlled by the corporation that desires to get these rights from parliament. What dependence can we place upon advice from such a source?

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) allow me a word? He says that the Ottawa 'Free Press' is controlled by the Ottawa Electric Company. It is only fair to say that the 'Free Press' stated yesterday in its editorial column that it was not owned or controlled by the Electric Company.

Mr. SPROULE. I can only say that my information is from one of the aldermen of the city of Ottawa whose truthfulness I have no reason to doubt.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Name.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not the hon. gentleman's business to get the name.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) allow me——

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. Johnston) inquired with a view to adding to his knowledge, it would not be so bad, for I am sure no member of this House needs it more. But his interruptions are invariably for the purpose of interfering with the hon. gentleman who has the floor for the time being. In the face of all the facts, should we accept the statement of this newspaper as independent evidence that what is proposed in this Bill is right? I do not think we should. Nor do I think we are doing our duty here in interfering with a contract that was honourably made between this corporation and the corporation of the city of Ottawa. We are helping one of the parties to violate the contract they entered into with the people of Ottawa, the result of which must be to impose a very heavy tax upon the people of Ottawa who must use electric light in the future. Is parliament doing its highest duty if it permits that to be done? I do not think it is. I think we are going into a domain which does not properly belong to us, and we are doing a great injustice to the people of Ottawa. We are doing an improper thing if we enable one of the parties to the contract to dishonour their own contract that they made with the city some years ago, and agreed to abide by. I think we should not do that, and I shall vote in favour of the amendment.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Stewart).

YEAS.

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Kennedy,
Ames,	Lalor,
Barr,	Laurence,
Belcourt,	Lennox,
Bennett,	Lewis,
Blain,	Loggie,
Bland,	MacLaren,
Boyce,	Maclean (York, S.),
Brabazon,	McCarthy (Calgary),
Burrows,	McIntyre,
Campbell,	McKenzie (Bruce),
Chisholm,	Martin (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Christie,	Martin (Wellington),
Clarke,	Miller,
Clements,	Mulock (Sir William),
Cockshutt,	Oliver,
Daniel,	Paterson,
Elson,	Ratz,
Foster,	Schaffner,
Gallery,	Sproule,
Gordon,	Staples,
Gunn,	Stewart,
Henderson,	Talbot (Strathcona),
Herron,	Thompson,
Hyman,	Walsh,
Ingram,	Wilson
Jackson (Selkirk),	(Lennox & Addington)
Johnston (Lambton),	Zimmerman—56.
Kemp,	

NAYS.

Messieurs

Archambault,	Lavergne
Beauparlant,	(Drummond & Arth.),
Béland,	LeBlanc,
Bergeron,	Lemieux,
Bickerdike,	Léonard,
Boyer,	Logan,
Brodeur,	Lovell,
Brown,	Macdonald,
Bruneau,	Maclean (Lunenburg),
Bureau,	Macpherson,
Caldwell,	McCarthy (Simcoe),
Calvert,	McColl,
Carney,	McCool,
Carvell,	McIsaac,
Cash,	McKenzie
Copp,	(Cape Breton, N.),
Cyr,	McLennan,
Delisle,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Demers (St. John),	Mayrand,
Derbyshire,	Meigs,
Desjardins,	Monk,
Devlin,	Morin,
Dugas,	Parmelee,
Fielding,	Parent,
Finlay,	Piché,
Finlayson,	Pickup,
Fitzpatrick,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fortier,	Riley,
Galliher,	Ross (Rimouski),
Gauvreau,	Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Geoffrion,	Rousseau,
Girard,	Savoie,
Hall,	Scott,

Harty, Sinclair,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.), Talbot (Bellechasse),
Hunt, Telford.
Johnston Tobin.
(Cape Breton, South), Turgeon,
Lachance, Turriff,
Lamont, Wilson (Russell),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid), Wright (Renfrew)—80.
Laurier (L'Assomption),

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

GOLD MEDAL MANUFACTURING COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 102) respecting a certain patent of the Gold Medal Manufacturing Company.

On section 1,

Mr. FOSTER. What are the facts with reference to this extension of a patent ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. This Gold Medal Manufacturing Company acquired this patent some time ago, but through an oversight they allowed it to lapse, without paying the fees to renew the patent as they had a right to do. This was done through some oversight, I do not know whether it was their own fault or the fault of their solicitor, at all events it was done ; and they ask this parliament to allow them to renew the patent.

Mr. SPROULE. I think there should be some provision in this Bill for companies or individuals who may have commenced manufacturing in the meantime. I see no provision in the Bill before me for any such case. We have made that a rule for a good many years, and I see no reason why it should be departed from in this instance. There may or may not have been any parties starting manufacturing in the meantime, but if so, their acquired rights should be protected.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. These parties represented to the committee that they had invested a large amount of money in that business, and that their time was going to expire, that they have only one year more. Since that patent was obtained, in 1891, I think it was, the law has been changed, and instead of giving fifteen years for the patent to run, now it is eighteen years. They represented to us that under the circumstances they had incurred great cost, and that having received only a poor return it would be only fair to give them an extension of six years. The objection was made that they should get only three years in order to put them on the same footing as a new patentee, but it has been represented by the department that the fees were usually paid for six years.. It is under these circumstances that the committee has considered that the Bill should be adopted.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 115) respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 116) respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 127) for the relief of James Arthur Pryor.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 126) for the relief of Edward Albert Murphy.—Mr. Galliher.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST.

House resumed consideration of the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 69) to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta, and the amendment of Mr. R. L. Borden thereto.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). Mr. Speaker, for three hours this afternoon the House had the advantage of hearing the views of the hon. gentleman, not upon the subject under discussion, but upon many matters totally foreign to the measure that the House is now considering. If, this afternoon, a stranger had been in our galleries, and many there were, and had not in advance been informed of the subject under debate, it would have been impossible for him to have known what the subject was that was properly in order before the House. For three hours this afternoon the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) occupied the attention of the House ostensibly in order to aid by some useful contribution in the solution of a very important public question, but instead of bringing to the aid of his country his great talents, I think it will be found on a careful perusal of his words that his efforts were rather to sow the seeds of discord to the injury of his country. He began by giving us, as he has on many occasions and as he also has given to the public, his views on the question of political principles and political morality. It must be extremely elevating to the people of Canada to take their inspiration of political morality from such a source. He entered politics with principles. He describes the Liberal party as conveniently packing their principles in a remote corner of a small valise, and he states that they are able to get rid of them as conveniently as they can put them in or take them out of the valise. What about the principles of the hon. gentleman ? I can recall many of his professed principles, for perhaps his principles are not very deep-seated, and, like old garments, they are

easily disposed of in favour of new ones. I remember the first principle he advocated when he entered public life. He came here with a valise, and I suppose he had his political principles in the valise. What was the first principle he had in his valise? It was a principle which served a useful purpose. His great political principle, and before it all other great questions faded into insignificance, was prohibition. The welfare of the country demanded that the first consideration, higher than that of party, should be given to the question of prohibition. That was his political capital for many a year; that was the only article in his political valise. He arrived in Ottawa with his political valise. Perhaps I am wrong in saying that he had only one principle. He had another stowed away which did not take up much room and did not occupy a very long time in that valise, but he entered this House pledged as an independent Conservative to stand up for all good measures. Party was a secondary consideration for him; his country demanded his first attention. He had these two principles when he entered public life. What became of them? The independent Conservative principle could not be allowed to stand, because it stood in the way of preferment, and so the first thing that happened his little valise was to deprive it of the presence in it of his principle of political independence. It stood in the way of his entering the cabinet. It was thrown overboard and he got a portfolio. But it was not enough to get a portfolio. It is one thing to get a portfolio; it is another thing to retain a portfolio. He has had some experience in both of these. He had to get rid of his other principle, and prohibition was thrown overboard, and with it his little valise. As time advanced he deemed it necessary to avow his being devoutly possessed of another principle. What was that principle? He had taken office. He had become a strict party man. It was essential to him an apostate now but then a party man, that he should stand by his party, that he should be true to the government of which he was a member and true to the premier under whom he enlisted. His principle was—and it was a right one; it was a principle that he was bound to live up to—that he should be true and loyal to his chief.

That is one of the principles he made profession of, but how long did that principle remain in his valise? It was there until it suited his purpose to dispose of it, and when was that? Sir John Macdonald, who first took him into office, had disappeared, others had been his chiefs and had disappeared also, and at last he enlisted under the banner of Sir Mackenzie Bowell. The history of Canada tells what then became of his principle of loyalty to his chief; the scenes that took place in this chamber and in the ante-rooms and lobbies of this House tell what he did with that principle. Lastly, in 1896, on the eve of an election, the hon. gentleman evidently believing that it was good politics to stand by the minority, declared his undying allegiance to the cause of minorities. In 1896 he advocated the cause of minorities, he talked of respect for the constitution, but he found it didn't pay and to-day he seizes the opportunity to sever himself from the last of his political principles. No longer has the hon. gentleman any use for a political valise; hereafter a carpet bag will take its place.

Mr. FOSTER. A steamer trunk.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman spent part of this day attacking ministers and ex-ministers and in one of his outbursts he said that he hoped for once some minister would go out of office for the sake of principle and would remain out of office for the sake of principle. The thought of going out of office and remaining out of office is a disturbing dream to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). He cannot address a public meeting nor can he speak in parliament without talking of ministerial explanations and the principles of public men. Let the hon. gentleman be frank and tell us if he resigned on principle. A few months ago he told the electors of North Toronto, if he is reported correctly in his own organs, that he resigned office on a question of policy. I was present in this chamber when he stated to this House the reasons why he resigned office, and in those reasons there was no question of principle involved. He then declared that there was no difference between himself and his leader on any question of principle or of policy, but what is the sequel? That has been told us of late, and it is an extraordinary explanation. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) told us in 1896 that he had resigned not from personal ambition of any kind, but for the good of the party and of the country. But, a few weeks ago, the Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell, his late chief and leader, speaking in another chamber, told us why he had resigned. Perhaps he will now admit or deny the accuracy of Sir Mackenzie Bowell's assertion. Sir Mackenze Bowell declared that the resignation of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was not on account of any difference of policy or principle, but because of the overweening ambition of the hon. gentleman to become Prime Minister of Canada. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) smiles. I will make it clear to him. The hon. gentleman is setting himself up as a standard for the guidance of the public men of this country, but let us see whether he is a safe guide. Sir Mackenzie Bowell said (I quote from Senate 'Hansard,' 1st March, 1905):

When he told the people of Toronto at the last Dominion election that he left the government on account of differences of opinion, on questions of policy and that His Excellency

the Governor General knowing the facts called them back into the government.

I do not like to read the words, but here they are:

He knew he was telling what was not correct.

Sir Mackenzie Bowell continues:

I have in my hand copies of the report of speeches delivered by him in Toronto during the last Dominion election as reported by the 'Globe,' the 'News' and the 'Mail,' in which I find that in reply to questions put to him he said amongst other things, when asked why he left the government, that he did not purpose to answer the question that belonged to the Privy Council, and that his mouth was shut.

We never find it in that condition in this chamber.

But added that on all points of importance they must have a union of ideas and that any one disagreeing must resign. That, he said, was all they had done. Continuing, he said, 'When a member of the cabinet or members disagreed with their leader they had done as they were bound on their honour to do—resigned.' In another speech he said: 'The Governor had been quite satisfied with the reasons for the resignation of six ministers on a question of policy, and had shown his confidence in them by reappointing them later.' That did not satisfy his hearers, one of whom exclaimed: 'That still leaves the question unanswered. Why did you resign?' To which Mr. Foster replied 'I don't intend to answer. I am not at liberty to reveal the secrets of the Privy Council.' An ingenious way of evading an answer. The fact is, the reasons given in the House of Commons for his resigning were never discussed in the Privy Council before he resigned, therefore, he had no oath to respect in that particular.

Again, speaking in this chamber not very long ago the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) said:

Am I not to be allowed to leave the government if I differ from it on points of policy or principle?

That was the statement of the hon. gentleman in this House during the present session, but how does that fit in with the statement he made on the very occasion of his resignation when he was probably most likely to give an accurate account. Speaking from his seat in 1896 he said:

I may say in the first place that there is no disagreement between ourselves and the premier upon any question of public policy, trade or constitutional, with regard to which action has already been taken, or in respect to which attitude has been assumed by the government under the present premier.

I leave my hon. friend to struggle with these two conflicting statements. He goes on to give what he deems to be the reason, namely, the desire to serve under a gentleman of perhaps greater power. In fact he describes the cabinet as beyond the control of the First Minister. He was unable to keep those unruly members in order. There was disorder in the cabinet, and the hon. member for North Toronto added to the disorder by trying to break up the cabinet. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman seems to be troubled when any retiring minister returns to the cabinet, and he seems to be troubled when any retiring minister remains without the cabinet. He takes exception to Mr. Blair not having returned. No person can take exception to his conduct in that respect. But when the honourable member for North Toronto went out of the cabinet, he took precious good care that no one should get into his place. He rendered the reconstruction impossible except by his readmission to the cabinet. Does the hon. gentleman set up that method as a standard? Is that his idea of political morality? Is that his conception of what should be the conduct of hon. gentlemen who take office to serve their country? Surely it is time for him to throw off this hypocritical garb in which he seeks to give moral lectures as to how public men should be loyal to their principles.

To-day, running through the whole of his speech, I thought I was able to discover one distinct line of policy. The Bill before the House is one to deal with a very important question concerning the Northwest. It is a question upon which the people may be honestly divided in opinion; but it is the bounden duty of every loyal citizen and of every member of this House to render such assistance as he can to bring about a satisfactory settlement of this question. What was the action of the hon. gentleman? If I have correctly read his policy, if I have discovered the object he had in his speech, it was not to be a messenger of peace and harmony, but if possible to light the incendiary fires of religious and racial discord from one end of this Dominion to the other. The hon. gentleman represents North Toronto. In olden days he came from the east. He stayed there as long as the people would keep him. In olden days, Mr. Speaker, I doubt if he would have professed the principles that he has professed to-day. But, Sir, he has rested in another place, and his new principles of to-day are appropriate and fashionable in North Toronto, and he put them on, and with a great deal of force throws off the old discarded ones. What object had the hon. gentleman in asking the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) whether or not he was content with the amendments of the government? The hon. member for North Toronto, holding up these amendments to the member for Labelle, who is as we all know a devout son of his church, said to him in triumph: All the comfort and consolation you can get from these amendments is that at half-past three o'clock in

the afternoon, when practically the school day is over, a half-hour of religious training will be allowed; and he asked the member for Labelle if he was content with such a meagre provision as that. What was the object of that? It was too transparent—perhaps the hon. gentleman thought no one could see it. The object of that was to tell the people of Quebec: Sir Wilfrid Laurier is giving you, not bread, but a stone; he is not giving you any measure that will meet the views and feelings and perhaps the prejudices of the people of Quebec; he is deceiving you, and I want to convince the member for Labelle of that fact, and I trust to his being a missionary to disseminate that doctrine in Quebec, and to stir up the good people of the province to demand more from Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and perhaps to embarrass his policy.

When the hon. member for North Toronto comes to deal with the Territories, what does he say? In loud language and in violent terms he says, why bind these young giants in this way? And he goes on to say: If you give this measure to the Territories, Nova Scotia is entitled to the same, British Columbia is entitled to it, all the other provinces that do not enjoy it are entitled to it. He appeals to the Territories practically to rise in revolt against this measure if it becomes law, and, if possible to make it a great political question; and at the same time he appeals to the minorities in the other provinces, saying to them: The minority in the new provinces have got something—you demand it too. He thus appeals to one class and another—to the French Catholics of Quebec, to the Irish Catholics in another province, to the Protestants in another, trusting that by raising these fires in each of these provinces, he may at last involve this whole Dominion in one huge, far-reaching religious conflagration. Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the hon. gentleman is here to voice the sentiments of his constituents. But, Sir, I regard them as taking a higher view of the duties of their representative than to demand of him that he shall play the role of the political incendiary on the floor of this House.

The hon. gentleman assailed the ex-Minister of the Interior. Whenever, for a moment, any other line of thought failed him, he turned to the ex-minister, who seemed to be the special object of his poisoned shafts. Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity of judging of the services rendered to this country by the ex-Minister of the Interior for the last eight years. He assumed the most important portfolio having regard to the needs of this country, that we have. Other men before him had held it, and had failed. For years our great prairies had remained almost a solitude. The late government had an opportunity for eighteen years to make an impression there, and failed; and when the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) assumed that portfolio, and the Manitoba school question disappeared from the vexed question of the day, a complete change came over the conditions of this country. I venture to say, what I have said before—and I say it without seeking to discredit any person—that of all the ministers who have held portfolios since confederation, none has rendered as valuable services to Canada as the ex-Minister of the Interior, and his withdrawal from our cabinet is a national loss. The hon. member for North Toronto asked me if I was a member of the sub-committee that had had to do with considering the terms of the constitution of these Territories. I was. He asked me if I had discovered the meaning of section 16, containing the educational clauses, which he has described as worded in such a subtle way as really to conceal their true object. Had it not been, he said, for the disclosure made by the member for Brandon of the meaning of those clauses, they would have passed into law, and then this country would have been for ever under the obligation of maintaining an enormous endowment for the Catholic church. I do not admit, nor does the government, the correctness of the construction placed upon the original clause 16 by the ex-Minister of the Interior. Lawyers may differ, and according to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) 213 members of this House would have been deceived but for the ex-Minister of the Interior. Does the hon. gentleman think that I am more astute to discover the weak points of the clause than the other 212 men?

Mr. FOSTER. As a matter of fact, I did not say that. I said that the clause was so worded that had it not been for the disclosure given of its meaning by the ex-Minister of the Interior, it doubtless would have passed through this House and its true meaning would have been undetected. That is what I said.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Well, I do not pretend to be more astute than, or even as astute as a very large number of the members of this House, but when the hon. gentleman admits himself that he would not have discovered the hidden meaning in this clause and that all those around him would not have discovered it, surely he will be charitable to another weak member of humanity who was likewise not able to discover it.

Mr. FOSTER. He was on duty.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I only plead that if the other 212 members of this House were as blind as myself, I am in very excellent company. May I not ask, after this question has been debated for three hours to-day, the House to come back to the real issue?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes; it is sometimes necessary to go outside the record, but I would ask the House to allow me to return to the real issue. The hon. gentleman from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) spoke of the Quebec compact, which is to be found in the British North America Act, and declared that that compact, crystallized into the Confederation Act, did no more than secure separate schools to the minorities in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. He denied that any other part of this Dominion was entitled to separate schools under that Act. Let me remind him that he gave the contrary view to this House nine years ago. Then he was arguing in favour of the constitution. Then everything outside the constitutional argument was, in his judgment, out of order. When the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) ventured to interject something that did not appear to have any strict bearing on the constitution, he was immediately rebuked by his colleague from North Toronto. He was immediately told by him that the subject was one solely of the true construction of the constitution. To-day he tells us that under the British North America Act, and the compact out of which it grew, no province, except the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, is entitled to the benefit of the 93rd section of that Act. Speaking on the 13th March, 1896, in this House, as reported in 'Hansard,' page 3476, he made use of the following language:

> The first question then for me to solve when I approach the consideration of this subject is this: Is there any compact or agreement arrived at in this country and embodied in the constitution under which we live which has first to be considered before we can give our decision upon this question? The answer is plain and definite. There is a compact in the constitution of the confederation; there is a second compact in the constitution of Manitoba, ratified by the British parliament, and under which she became a part of the Dominion.

Then he proceeded to say, in answer to an interruption by the late Mr. Wallace:

> If the hon. gentleman will allow me to proceed I will answer that question in due course, and I will answer it thoroughly. Arising out of long years of sectarian and religious strife under united Canada, opinions and convictions in reference to this matter became gradually modified, and when the representatives of the four provinces came together at Quebec to take up, discuss and settle articles of confederation, these convictions rapidly and definitely resolved themselves into the determination that it should be laid down in the constitution of the country that whatever rights and privileges religious minorities had in the provinces at the time of confederation should maintain their status quo and shall not be changed. And so the first paragraph of the educational clauses of the confederation resolutions gave by general consent to the provinces the power to deal with respect to education:
>
> Saving the rights and privileges which Catholic or Protestant minorities in both Canadas may possess as to their denominational schools at the time when the union goes into operation.
>
> The only change which took place in that clause was this, that instead of its being confined to both Canadas, it was broadened to include the provinces which entered confederation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not matter very much; but if the hon. gentleman will pardon an interruption, I would remind him that what he has just read is exactly what I stated to-day.

Sir WILIAM MULOCK. In that case, I think that on a perusal of his remarks the hon. gentleman will find that he did not give expression to the ideas which were in his mind. If he repeats and affirms what he said in 1896, we start from that ground instead of the new ground which, I think, he was taking to-day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. However, what is the isuue now? Once to-day the hon. gentleman said it was a question of provincial rights. His leader moved an amendment, and in supporting that amendment said that the question was not, with him, one of separate schools, but of provincial rights, and he proposed to take his stand on that ground. And it is argued by some gentlemen that the proposed legislation would be a violation of provincial rights. But there can be no violation of a right until that right is created. First you must show that the province has a right, and then that the right which it possesses, is being violated. The first question in my judgment, therefore, is: What are the rights of a province when it is created? There we immediately enter upon debatable ground, because there are two conflicting views as to how a province may derive its constitutional power and rights. If I understand my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, his contention is that the moment a territory acquires provincial status, that moment it automatically becomes possessed of certain rights under the British North America Act, that it inherits these rights that moment without more being done, without any act on the part of the Dominion parliament or the Dominion government, and without any imperial legislation—the moment you give the provincial status to a territory, that moment, according to the leader of the opposition, it acquires its provincial charter, and its rights are there set forth or may be found. He takes the literal interpretation and makes that the rock of the constitution. He would have us believe that the rock of the constitution is the letter and not the spirit of the British North America Act. Here we see the lawyer—he looks to what is nominated in the bond. I care not, he

says, whether it works well or ill; I care not whether it is to the public good or the public injury—every province has the same constitutional charter the moment it becomes a province. The opposite view is that the province does not derive its charter automatically from the British North America Act, but that the spirit of the British North America Act must be considered, and so much of its provisions as may be reasonably adapted to the provincial status is given to the new province. The British North America Act, in conferring upon the people of Canada certain legislative powers, has set forth in a general way a scheme for the distribution of legislative powers to be exercised by the Dominion or the provinces. It suggests in a general way that some of these powers, of which it gives a list, may properly be given to a province, and the others may properly be left to the Dominion. But the British North America Act, according to those who look at its spirit rather than its letter, does not in itself contain a model constitution that automatically attaches, without the variation of a word or a letter, to every province the moment it becomes the province. If the reasoning of the leader of the opposition is right, there is no reason why, when a province is established, parliament should trouble itself to declare any of these powers. And yet, if you trace the history of the several provinces of Canada from their creation up to the present, you will find that, in every instance, the parliament of Canada, or the government of Canada, or the imperial parliament, has conferred upon each province powers somewhat different from those that the Confederation Act would suggest. If each province gets its constitution automatically from the British North America Act, we in this House cannot in any way frame or limit the constitution of the new provinces. But if we interpret the British North America Act, not by its letter, but by its spirit and by the manner in which it has been applied in the creation of every one of the provinces from confederation down to the present time, we fail to find a single instance where the doctrine of the leader of the opposition has been adopted, where any province has been given a constitution exactly in harmony with the general scheme of the British North America Act. There are no two provinces whose constitutions are the same, though all derive their constitutions from the British North America Act. It is the spirit that suggests how the constitution shall be framed. So, where is the model? And how can it be argued that when a province acquires the provincial status it acquires immediately certain rights and powers without any intervention or exercise of discretion on the part of the Dominion parliament or any other legislative body? To illustrate what I mean, consider the character of the British North America Act. Sections 91, 92 and 93 cover the distribution of powers, some powers to be exercised by the central parliament and others by the provincial parliament. Take, for instance, the important subject of divorce. Under the British North America Act, divorce is assigned to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Dominion parliament. If the literal wording of the British North America Act is adopted in giving a constitution to another province, you would not find any province entitled to maintain a divorce court unless it was so authorized by this parliament. This parliament has never established a divorce court in any province. And yet to-day there are divorce courts in several provinces—in Nova Scotia, in New Brunswick and, I think, in British Columbia. How comes it that the subject of divorce, which, under the British North America Act, is assigned to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Dominion parliament, is dealt with by several provinces? Simply because, when it came to the creation of confederation, certain provinces had at that time this institution. Nova Scotia had a divorce court and desired to retain it. The British North America Act allowed it to be retained in that province. In that respect it allowed a departure from the British North America Act. The province of Quebec had no divorce court, and no divorce court was given it under the British North America Act—the Act recognized the status quo as respects that subject in the province of Quebec. New Brunswick had a divorce court and wished to retain it, and the British North America Act recognized the wish of that province and allowed it to retain the divorce court, thus making an exception from the letter of the Act. Ontario had no divorce court and was given no divorce court by the Act. Later on British Columbia came into confederation. As I understand it, British Columbia had a divorce court then, and it was left in the employment of that institution—the letter of the law was departed from, but the spirit was observed; the general scheme of confederation was made applicable, but, with exceptions, recognizing local peculiarities and local institutions. Then—going rapidly over the subjects of special importance to the provinces—take the subject of languages. This is an English-speaking country; and it was assumed, doubtless, that English would be the prevailing language throughout the country. The use of language in the courts and legislatures of the provinces is a civil right, and, as such, is under the exclusive jurisdiction of the province. Yet, turning to the constitution as affecting the province of Quebec, you will find that, unlike the other provinces, Quebec was not left to determine what languages shall or shall not be used in its courts and legislature, but the British North America Act declares that the English language, along with the French, shall be lawful in the courts and legislature of that province.

The letter of the constitution was departed from as to the subject of language in the province of Quebec, and was made suitable to the local conditions, needs and interests of that province. Yet if the letter of the law is to be regarded, you have no justification for this departure from the constitution which is to be found in the British North America Act. Take the subject of education. At the time of confederation it was found that the minority in the province of Quebec had separate schools, the British North America Act preserved separate schools to them; it was found that there were separate schools in Ontario, and the British North America Act retained separate schools in Ontario; there were no separate schools in Nova Scotia, and the status quo was recognized there; there were no separate schools in New Brunswick, the status quo was recognized there. But although the British North America Act in its general scheme declared that the subject of education should be under the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces, it made two exceptions in the case of Ontario and Quebec, as my hon. friend admits to-day, and that exception extends to other provinces as well. Yet, if you were to adopt the strict letter of the law, you have no right in a constitution resting on the bed rock of the British North America Act to make these exceptions in the constitution of any province. Take the subject of finance. Although this is not strictly a constitutional subject, you will find that whilst the general scheme is to treat all the provinces alike financially, in the case of Prince Edward Island there was a material departure made from the general scheme of finance. In fact, you do not find the same corresponding financial arrangements made in any two provinces. In fact, there are just two ways of looking at the British North America Act; you may look at it from the standpoint of a lawyer, or you may look at it from the standpoint of a statesman. If you look at it from the standpoint of a lawyer—and I submit that is the standpoint of the leader of the opposition—you take the letter of the constitution without regard to its bearings and its application to the time being, and apply it literally, whether the application fits the time and occasion or not. But taking the spirit of the Act on each occasion of creating a new province, you adopt the constitution, as far as possible, to the new province, having due regard to the conditions then prevailing.

Take the case of Manitoba to which my hon. friend has referred. The province of Manitoba was established in 1870, prior to that it had been under the jurisdiction of the Hudson Bay Company. There were no laws there except the old common law of England. There were no schools established by law, but it was thought that there were some schools established by practice,

and, therefore, when it came to creating the province of Manitoba the educational question arose. What was done? They did not even adhere on that occasion to the language and to the provisions of section 93 of the British North America Act dealing with the subject of legislation. The language of the British North America Act dealing with education reads as follows:

> In and for each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions:
>
> Nothing in any such law should prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the union.

'Have by law.' The British North America Act only protected the rights of minorities which they have by law. When it came to creating a province out of Rupert's Land, the words 'by law' would have afforded no protection to the minority, and accordingly those who were engaged in framing this legislation sought in some other way to secure to the minority in Manitoba their right to whatever schools they might then have; and so the words 'by practice' were introduced, and the province of Manitoba was secured in its separate schools in these words:

> Nothing in any such law should prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or by practice.

Now, the words 'by practice' are a radical departure from the letter of the British North America Act. Why was that departure? How do we account for that departure? Simply because the strict letter of the British North America Act would not have met the case of Manitoba, and it was necessary to apply it in spirit, and in that way the legislators of those days felt justified, within the constitution, in so modifying section 93. Now, what happened after that? Manitoba was carved out of Rupert's Land, the Territories we are about to raise into provinces are part of the remainder of Rupert's Land. The Manitoba Act was confirmed by imperial legislation, and that same imperial legislation which confirmed the Act creating the province of Manitoba proceeded to confer upon the Dominion parliament power to grant a constitution to new provinces. Section 2 of the amendment to the British North America Act, 1871, is as follows:

> The parliament of Canada may from time to time establish new provinces in any territories forming for the time being part of the Dominion of Canada, but not included in any province thereof, and may, at the time of such establishment, make provision for the constitution and administration of any such province, and for the passing of laws for the peace, order and good government of such

province, and for its representation in the said parliament.

The very same Imperial Act that recognized the change in the words from the British North America Act to the words used in the Manitoba Act, gave to this parliament for the first time the power to give a constitution to new provinces. Now, what is the meaning of section 2 of this Act if it is not to give to this parliament discretionary power as to the kind of a constitution we may give to a province? If it was intended that this parliament should do no more than mark out the limits of a province and declare that it was made a province, the Act would have said so; but instead of that the Act proceeds to say that we may establish a province and make provision for its constitutional administration, for the passing of laws, for the peace, order and good government of such province and its representation in this parliament.

In mentioning these exceptions to the general scheme of confederation another instance occurs to my mind, the case of British Columbia. Under the British North America Act, representation by population in this parliament is the general scheme. The provinces may lose representation if their population falls, but as far as British Columbia is concerned its minimum representation is guaranteed by the British North America Act. No matter what the population of British Columbia may be, its representation here cannot go below a certain minimum—another departure from the letter of the Confederation Act. Under the British North America Act each province is given a legislature, but as regards the province of Quebec it is not permitted to control its own local provincial constitution as far as its parliament is concerned, for the British North America Act declares that there shall be two houses and it does not leave it in the power of the province of Quebec to alter that portion of its constitution. It does more. Take the matter of representation of the house of assembly in the province of Quebec. All the other provinces have the power themselves to alter their electoral districts, making boundaries as they see fit, but in the case of the province of Quebec it is entirely different. There are twelve constituencies in the province of Quebec that the legislature cannot interfere with. In the province of Ontario our legislature can, if it sees fit, alter the boundaries of all the electoral districts, and so it is in all the other provinces of the Dominion, Quebec alone excepted. Why was the exception made in the province of Quebec ?—simply to meet local conditions and thus we have from ocean to ocean all these provinces, deriving their constitutions from the British North America Act, but not one of them having the same constitution, all varying in some respects and yet all in substance formulated in accordance with the true spirit of the British North America Act. There are seven provinces in this Dominion. Four of these provinces were created at the same time and created by the same instrument, the British North America Act, which declared the constitution of all the provinces. But that very same instrument, that very same Act of legislation that gave life to our British North America Act gave four distinct kinds of constitution to the four different provinces that formed the original confederation of Canada. Yet, we are told that there is a model to be found within the four corners of the British North America Act, or in the constitutions of the different provinces created under the British North America Act, which furnishes to us full information as to what are to be the powers of each province when it becomes a province. For forty years parliament has been interpreting the meaning of the British North America Act and in no one instance has parliament taken the view that the hon. leader of the opposition now presents to this House. In no one instance has parliament up to this moment felt that it was bound by the letter of the constitution, or that it was at no time to modify according to the local conditions the general scheme of confederation in applying that constitution to a particular province. I ask you then, if, up to this present moment, all who have been engaged in creating these seven provinces, if all the parliaments either here or in England have been disposed to look not to the letter but to the spirit of the law, do you not think that the bed rock of our constitution is the spirit and not the mere letter of the British North America Act. Why, Sir, is it common sense to suppose that when the British North America Act was passed forty years ago the parliament of that day intended that that instrument which for all time was to form the constitution of this Dominion, with its changes and with its future, was literally to be applied, not having regard to the conditions of new provinces when its application was to be made but having regard to the dead past ? I can imagine a hundred years hence some question arising in this country ; perhaps it may be the question of taking away from a province some of its powers, or it may be a question of taking away from the Dominion some of its powers, or it may be a question in some way or other of rearranging legislative powers, and I can understand that it might be thought of vital importance to the safety of the country that some change should be made. Under these circumstances I can almost anticipate a lawyer of that day rising in his place in parliament and saying : You propose to alter the constitution for the public welfare. I admit that the public welfare may call for a change of the constitution, but I take my stand on the letter of the constitution and I interpret it in the light of 150 or 200 years ago. Is that the spirit

in which laws are to be construed, or should they be construed as living and moving laws to be construed so as at all times to meet the altered conditions of the occasion ? I sympathize with the view of the premier and I put him in contrast on this occasion with the attitude of the leader of the opposition. In one case, you have an interpretation of the constitution by a lawyer ; in the other case, may I be permitted to say, by a statesman ? Which view is the more likely to be correct ? Which view is the more likely to be in the best interests of the country ? I take this view of it then ; I began by arguing that there could be no infringement of a right until it has been created. A province possesses no rights until this parliament has declared what its rights are. According to the spirit of the British North America Act and according to the letter of the amending Act of 1871, it is in the discretion of this parliament to-day to say what constitution we shall give to these two new provinces.

How have we dealt with education in the seven provinces of this Dominion ? We have left education as we found it when we came to legislate. Nova Scotia had no separate schools ; the British North America Act gave them no separate schools. In New Brunswick there were no separate schools ; when they joined confederation the Confederation Act gave them no separate schools. In Quebec at the time of confederation there were separate schools ; the Confederation Act recognized that condition of affairs and left them in the enjoyment of separate schools. In Ontario when it entered confederation there were separate schools ; the British North America Act recognized local conditions and left Ontario in the enjoyment of her separate schools. At the time Prince Edward Island joined the union there were no separate schools ; the Orders in Council, ratified by the imperial government, left Prince Edward Island in the condition it was in when it entered confederation, without separate schools. When we came to carve a new province out of the territory of Ruperts Land, when we came to establish Manitoba we found a peculiar condition there. They had separate schools but these schools did not fall within the language of the British North America Act. They were not there by right or law because there were no laws. The country was almost uninhabited, no constitution had been declared, it was working under the old law of England, and the legislators of that day, endeavouring to recognize the condition of affairs as they found it, when they were going to make Manitoba into a province said that although there are no schools in Manitoba by law there are some by practice and we will give you a constitution and allow you to retain whatever you had by law or practice. So, they departed from the letter of the law in the case of Manitoba. In British Columbia it is the same. There were no separate schools in British Columbia, but when British Columbia came into the confederation the Confederation Act recognized the status quo and did not establish separate schools.

Thus, in the case of the whole seven provinces that now constitute this Dominion, each province was left either with or without separate schools just as the condition was at the time of its entering into the union. But what do we find in the case of the Territories ? In 1875, thirty years ago, this parliament passed an Act authorizing the legislature of the Territories to establish separate schools. The Act of 1875 did not declare the character of these schools ; they might be under church control or they might be under state control. I frankly confess that I disapprove of separate schools under church control, and on one occasion when I had the opportunity I recorded my vote against the maintenance of the status quo of 1875. I object to that feature of it which admits of a school under church control, but the Act remained on the statute-book and it is on the statute-book to-day. It is quite common practice in this House to belittle the jurisdiction of the territorial legislature, but within its limits and as to be subjects in respect of which it can legislate the territorial legislature is as supreme as is the legislature of any province. For thirty years the people of the Territories have been in the enjoyment of rights under the Act of 1875, and they have made clear their views on their educational system in the form of laws passed by their legislature. The ex-Minister of the Interior correctly described the educational laws of the Territories. He pointed out that under the ordinance, chapter 29, which we propose to accept as the standard, the separate schools as they are to-day are really national schools ; that the teachers must be qualified equally with the teachers in the public schools, that the schools must be organized under the state and not under the church, that the text books are prescribed by the state, that the inspection, the examination and the whole control of these schools called separate schools, is with the state. We have been assailed indeed by people opposed to us because these schools are not sufficiently under church control. The existing school system in the Territories is the outcome of thirty years of legislation by the people of the Territories. Their educational laws have reached the present status, and they give supreme satisfaction I understand throughout the Territories. Although some gentlemen on the other side of the House are endeavouring to induce the people to rise in revolt, we do not find any such hysterical appeals made by the people of the Territories who are most directly concerned. I see before me the minister—I beg his pardon I was only anticipating a little perhaps—I see before me the member for East Grey (Mr.

Sproule). He is deeply interested in this question and from one standpoint is an authority upon it. I have something here which may interest him. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) went to Montreal a year ago and he was entertained by the Jacques Cartier Club of which we have heard a good deal of late in connection with the sending of petitions gotten up in the province of Quebec. I do not know how intimate are the relations between my hon. friend from East Grey and the Jacques Cartier Club, but let me remind him of a pleasing incident: a banquet to his leader and himself. The day after the banquet, the Montreal 'Gazette' did itself the honour of reporting the hon. gentleman's speech, and I will do him the further honour of reading the report to the House. I may observe that on this occasion the member for East Grey was accompanied by his leader the member for Carleton. The Montreal 'Gazette' of the 20th of June, 1904, reports:

Dr. Sproule, M.P., the well known Orange leader created loud laughter as he called those present his 'brethren.' He was loudly applauded as he told of his impressions on seeing Cartier for the first time. He wanted more French Conservatives at Ottawa to help carry out Mr. Borden's policy. Ontario, he said, had no desire to rule this country without the help of French Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. Nothing wrong in that.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Does the hon. gentleman express himself that way up west?

Mr. SPROULE. Exactly the same.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Well, we will see what happened after that.

The one province was necessary to the other.

Oh, here is something rather interesting:

He said that the much decried Orange lodge was nothing more or less than a Conservative committee room.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to correct the Postmaster General if he has read that as he finds it in the paper. There were two reports out, and I want to say that this is an incorrect report. What I said was that it was allegel by our opponents that it was nothing more or less than a Conservative committee room.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Well, I am reading the Montreal 'Gazette.'

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the Postmaster General ask the hon. gentleman who sits immediately behind him if the member for East Grey said so.

Mr. FINLAY. I am the only one sitting immediately behind the Postmaster and I do not know anything about it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There is something more that can be contradicted perhaps. At all events this is what the Montreal 'Gazette' says:

He said the much decried Orange lodge was nothing more or less than a Conservative committee room where Catholics and Protestants met to do the good work of the Conservative party.

How far is that correctly reported?

Mr. SPROULE. Not correct at all.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The report proceeds. Oh. Here is a dreadful threat, I wonder if it is correct.

Dr. Sproule received another cheer when he declared that if Quebec did not do better at the next election he would come down and establish Orange lodges throughout the province.

Mr. SPROULE. I admit that.

Sir WILLAM MULOCK. That is correct?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, that is correct.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Has the hon. gentleman carried out his threat?

Mr. SPROULE. I think I will carry it out.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman says that the 'Gazette' report is not correct. I have the Montreal 'Star' here and we will see what it says.

Dr. Sproule replied first for Ontario. He recalled the first time he had seen Cartier and the deeds of that distinguished Canadian with his twin brother Macdonald.

There is internal evidence about the genuineness of that, because the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is rather fond of the subject of twins.

He hoped to see the people of Quebec rally to Borden, as they had in the past to Macdonald and Cartier and Tupper and Pope. He asked them to rally to their Pope.

An hon. MEMBER. Which Pope?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The leader of the opposition. I can fancy the hon. member for East Grey making his confessions to the leader of the opposition when he came back from this gathering so unlike the gatherings which he is accustomed to assemble in the west.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is entirely out in his reference there.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Did not the hon. member for Grey ask them to rally to their Pope?

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will explain. I was facetiously making reference to the fact that we had in our ranks a Pope, pointing to the member for Compton, who was near by, and I said that if they were willing to sup-

port their Pope, surely they were willing to support our Pope.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman has two Popes—his Pope and the leader of the opposition. It applied to both. Let me proceed :

The two nationalities were planted here together, and must live side by side, and work in harmony to build up a great and lusty young country. Mr. Borden had the people at his back, as did Macdonald and Cartier in the old days.

Yes, a long way behind his back.

The wise men had come from the east, and of late had saved a Daniel from the lion's den, Dr. Sproule raised a great shout of laughter——

I wish he would do the same here occasionally——

——when he jokingly referred to the old story that every Orange lodge in Ontario was a Conservative committee room. He would not take the trouble to deal with that theory. Suffice it to say that in Ontario the Orange and Green were working together as they had in the past, for the return to power of the true party of united Canadians.

A beautiful sentiment.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there anything wrong there ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Nothing wrong at all. Let us see now how they are working together.

Mr. SPROULE. Will you be good enough to inform the House now what clause of the Bill that refers to ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, this House is being favoured with petitions. The hon. gentleman says that the Orange and the Green are working together for the good of the Conservative party. He is doing his share in one way, and the Jacques Cartier Club, his host, appears to be doing its share in another way ; and thus the Orange and the Green are getting in their work. I hold in my hand a copy of a communication signed by Elie Maurault, Secretary of the Jacques Cartier Club. I do not know the gentleman ; but the writer of this communication does not appear to share the sentiments of the member for East Grey. The member for East Grey has been promoting one line of campaign, while his club in Quebec has been promoting another line. It is all right if it stirs up strife, so long as both get in their work for the good of the Conservative party ; the Orange and the Green, as he says, working together ; two fishermen out, he with his hook baited with the orange, and some one else with the green. May I ask the member for East Grey what part he took in getting this communication and these petitions from the province of Quebec. Fancy the Conservative party, through the Jacques Cartier Club, rallying to the support of the premier of Canada against the member for East Grey. This letter is dated Montreal, 8th March, 1905, and it reads as follows :

Dear Sir,—Referring to the important matter which is at present being discussed in the House of Commons re the separate schools to be established in the new provinces in the Northwest, reliable information shows us that the opponents of those schools are doing their utmost to prevent justice being done to our compatriots and co-religionists, and are flooding parliament with petitions against the school system which is so dear to us.

Mr. LENNOX. We have had it before.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Since you have had it before, I will only state the tenor of it. This is a letter from the Jacques Cartier Club of Montreal, sent broadcast throughout the province of Quebec, appealing to all parties to resist the action of the member for East Grey. The hon. gentleman may have had suggestions from the Jacques Cartier Club that he should put his fighting forces in order in Ontario, and so the two forces are working in harmony for the good of the Conservative party, the member for East Grey rallying one party and the Jacques Cartier Club rallying the other.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I ask the hon. gentleman a question ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Certainly.

Mr. SPROULE. A large number of petitions have been received in favour of this Bill from Reformers in Quebec. I hold one in my hand containing twenty-one names marked Liberals and fourteen marked Conservatives. These Liberals are asking that the Bill may not pass, while Liberals on other petitions are asking that it do pass. Were they working in concert ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. May I ask who marked them Liberals ?

Mr. SPROULE. The gentleman who went around with the petition. I will pass it over to the hon. gentleman.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. What is the name of the gentleman who marked them ?

Mr. SPROULE. I take it that it was the gentleman who went around with the petition.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If the hon. gentleman does not know who marked them, I do not think the evidence amounts to much. I would like to show how the work is being done. The hon. gentleman is making his appeals to passion on the floors of this House.

Mr. SPROULE. No.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes. He delivered an address in this House a short time ago, ostensibly on the school question, but the most of his speech was taken up with pointing out the infirmities of the

Roman Catholic church. What did the hon. gentleman mean when he said that certain races, such as the Galicians and the Doukhobors, had come to Canada to escape the tyranny of their church in the old land.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Doukhobors are not Catholics.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. What did the hon. gentleman mean when he said that we were seeking to make use of the old cast-off tattered garments of the church in the old world as the swaddling clothes of these young giants in the west? Was that not an attack on the church and an appeal to passion?

Mr. SPROULE. It was an appeal to history.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That was not the occasion to give us history. It was an occasion for an appeal to the constitution. At all events, it is interesting to see the methods pursued in different parts of this Dominion.

We have in the province of Ontario a campaign denouncing these amendments as being concessions to the hierarchy. On the other hand, in the province of Quebec, the Liberal party is attacked by the Tory newspapers because the government are doing nothing for the Roman Catholics. Surely both these contentions cannot be well founded. Let me read from a couple of the leading Tory papers published in the city of Quebec in what terms they speak of what they declare to be a surrender of the rights of the minority. In 'L'Evenement' of the 10th March, 1905, which is one of the organs supporting the opposition in the province of Quebec, I find the following article:

The Northwest Territory Schools—A deep treason.

The rights of the Catholics of the Northwest are shamefully sacrificed.

The Liberal press has just received from Ottawa the pass-word and is cleverly preparing the electorate to accept and approve what Mr. Laurier and Mr. Fitzpatrick are asking parliament, the shameful sacrifice of the rights of our fellow men and co-religionists in the Northwest Territories. Mr. Laurier and Mr. Fitzpatrick are giving away before fanaticism, and in a retreat without glory they cowardly abandon rights which they themselves declared to be inalienable fifteen days ago. We ask our readers to read attentively what follows, and to seriously study the question which we will treat, and to open their eyes and see the deep treason of which French Canadians and Roman Catholics in the Territories are victims.

It is Catholic Laurier and Catholic Fitzpatrick who, for the purpose of retaining power, do not fear, do not hesitate, powerful as they are, to crush under the heels of their boots the French Catholic minority of the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan.

That is a Tory opinion for consumption in the province of Quebec, and the article proceeds in equally violent language to the end. Another paper of the same kind, published in the city of Quebec, 'La Verité,' in its issue of the 18th March, has the following editorial:

Trebly deplorable.

In our article of last week we qualified as truly deplorable the letter of Sir Wilfrid Laurier to an old friend of George Brown, the full text of which we published at the time.

This letter is trebly deplorable, disastrous, heart-rending, we say, after having re-read this document calmly.

From a political point of view, a national point of view, from a religious point of view, it is all that; and it is inconceivable that a chief of a party, a French Canadian and a Roman Catholic could have made up his mind to make public such a document.

Then it proceeds to say:

By his cowardice and blindness, Mr. Laurier is on the way to depriving for ever his co-religionists in the west, of separate schools, thoroughly Catholic. No, there is no possible comparison between the work of George Brown and that of Wilfrid Laurier, as political men on the educational question. The former has done for his people a work as durable as granite. The latter, of his own free will, places his co-religionists in a position of manifest inferiority. Such was the work of both men from a purely political point of view.

Further on the writer says:

The separate schools of the far west will be so little separate, so little French that the teaching will be in English.

Lastly, a word as to the religious aspect of the question; it is clear that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, as a Catholic statesman, is perfectly satisfied of practically neutral schools for his co-religionists. Read over again attentively the discription which he makes of the so-called separate schools which exist in the west, which his Bill proposes to maintain, which our people must accept, and which the Protestants are humbly requested to tolerate, and you will see that they are really neutral or national schools, because, in the mind of Sir Wilfrid Laurier the two terms are synonymous.

Where is the separation in these schools from a religious point of view? It does not exist more than it does from the national point of view. They are institutions which are neutral, neutral, absolutely neutral.

The famous half hour of religious teaching at the closing of each class does not change the essentially national and neutral character of the class itself. Mr. Laurier proclaims this with persistency, and he is perfectly right.

Instead of this measure being a surrender to the Roman Catholic Church, which is the charge made against it in the west, it is denounced in the province of Quebec by our opponents because it simply allows the minority to enjoy what we call national schools. Both these contentions cannot be true. Either the contention of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), that we are surrendering to the Roman Catholic minority, is wrong, or the contention of his allies in Quebec that we are not doing justice to

the Roman Catholic minority is unfounded. Both cannot be correct. Perhaps my hon. friend from East Grey, in his supreme desire to do justice, will, in talking the matter over with his western friends, point out to them the view which the Quebec Tories take of this measure as compared with that which he and his friends take. But what is the attitude of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition? He simply takes his stand on provincial rights. The hon. member for East Grey does the passion part of the play. He acts the tragic role and appeals to passion; other members of the party opposite indulge in melodramatic appeals to sentiment; others attempt more or less skilfully to excite prejudice, but one and all they are working to the same end, and that is the success and glory of the Conservative party, no matter by what means that may be secured. But there is one thing which these gentlemen might well bear in mind. It is that the welfare of this country depends on our people living in harmony; and let this question be once settled in a broad spirit of tolerant justice and we will continue in that career of progress in which we have been advancing for the last eight years. For several years during the agitation accompanying the Manitoba school question, the progress of this country was stopped, and stopped it would be again if the opposition could have their way and succeed in throwing this question into the arena of political strife. But the good sense of parliament, I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, will prevail, and the country will breathe a sigh of relief when this question is settled for all time, without any sacrifice of principle on either side and in a manner which will enable all classes to live in harmony. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition said that because the Act of 1875 was passed when there were only 500 people in the Northwest it should now be done away with when there are 500,000 people in that country. But it seems to me that if 500,000 people have gone into that country, knowing the law and the conditions which prevailed, they furnish us with 500,000 arguments in favour of the maintenance of the status quo. Why should we deal with the people of the Territories when we make them a province in a different manner from that in which we deal with the people in other provinces when they were brought into confederation? What we propose now is in harmony with the unbroken practice in similar cases, respected in every part of this broad Dominion. Therefore, I am unable to understand why, when we are raising these two Territories to the dignity of provinces this agitation should be excited. Some time ago, in reading a history of India, I came across a passage which might very well be brought to the attention of this House. Speaking of the treatment by Great Britain of the many nationalities throughout her broad empire—races without number and creeds without number—the writer said that he had yet to find an instance of the mother country having ever oppressed a minority or failed to recognize the beliefs and feelings and sentiments and even the prejudices of that minority. And when at the close of the great mutiny in India, it was said that the imperial government might interfere with the religious views of the people, Her Majesty herself caused a proclamation to be issued to the people of India in which she pointed out that she had derived so much comfort and consolation from her own religion that she would never allow hands to be laid on the religions or creeds of the various great tribes that composed her loyal citizens throughout India.

And, go where you will throughout this broad empire, with its four hundred millions of people of different races and different creeds, you find all left in the enjoyment of those things that they regard as sacred. It is that policy, that method of treating the people, that has made Great Britain's empire, what it is to-day—widespread, powerful and stable, resting upon the affections of the whole people and holding the people together by the bonds of affection and not by force or coercion. If our own Dominion is to be held together we cannot do better than follow the example of the mother of nations and yield, if need be, occasionally to prejudices or sentiments involving no sacrifice of principle in order to enable the different classes that are coming to our shores to live in peace, in harmony and in the enjoyment of those institutions to which they attach great importance and the enjoyment of which by them makes them more loyal citizens, yet does no injury to the common welfare.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). Mr. Speaker, I do not know who is to apologize, unless I do—for I suppose the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) will not—for the time that hon. gentleman has taken up in what was supposed to have been a discussion of Bill (No. 69) now before the House. I must say that I sympathize with those gentlemen supporting, or supposed to be supporting, the Postmaster General who have been brought back this evening to hear, as they supposed, a reply to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and who, after trying to listen for half an hour or so, were obliged to leave the Chamber because they could not understand where the Postmaster General was or what subject he was dealing with. I sympathize with them, because we cannot blame them for thinking the Postmaster General would give them some information or some light—something which they could take to their constituents and offer as an apology or plea for forgiveness for their vote against the contentions of the hon. member for North Toronto. And what has the Post-

master General done? He has occupied the time of this House from nine o'clock until twenty minutes to eleven. And evidently he has tried to say something. Several times he has said: 'What is the question before the House?' But he never told us what that question was. I do not know whether he was discussing the Manitoba remedial legislation of 1896—whether he was dreaming that he was out in the province of Ontario abusing Sir Charles Tupper for granting that remedial legislation,—or whether he was trying to offer some plea for interfering with the autonomy of the Northwest. He did say at the opening of his speech, that there was a Bill before the House. But he did not read a single section of it. He evidently does not know the provisions of the British North America Act. He has never read that Act or he would not have made the wrong statements about it that he has made. He has simply wasted the time of the House for an hour and forty minutes—I say this with all deference; but I have as much respect for the members of this House as I have for the Postmaster General, and I think that some one ought to apologize. So, as one of the members constituting this House, as the Postmaster General does not apologize for wasting our time, I can only hope that the House will accept the apology I offer. The House has as much right to accept my apology as the Postmaster General has to propose, in the name of autonomy, a throttling piece of legislation for the Northwest Territories. This House has as much and more right to say that the member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) should apologize for the Postmaster General as to say that the provincial parliament of the Northwest shall not control its own affairs. At nine o'clock the Postmaster General began to address this House. I have kept track, as well as I could, of his wanderings about the question—if it can be said he was so near the question as to be wandering about it—and the discussion—if you can call it discussion—that he has inflicted upon the House. He spent half an hour in abusing the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster.)

Mr. LENNOX. He apologized.

Mr. LANCASTER. I have no doubt he will apologize if somebody makes him do so, but he will not apologize out of the goodness of his heart;—he might to save a libel suit if a libel suit could be taken against him. Then for forty minutes he was supposed to discuss this Bill, if you can call it a discussion of the Bill to tell us over and over again that the British North America Act had dealt differently with different provinces—and I am in the judgment of the House when I say that that is all this discussion amounted to. Then, for the next thirty minutes he gave kind advice to the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) about his duty in regard to toleration. He talked about intolerant speeches in this House and about vehemence. And what was the other word he used?—I have a note of it here;—some word that, I think, we hardly understand as coming from the Postmaster General. He spoke once of brotherly love. He spoke also of inflammatory and impassioned speeches—but he did not tell us at which side of the House he was directing his lecture. I have been in this House throughout this debate, and I am not in the habit of sitting here and not listening. I have not heard one impassioned sentence in this debate coming from this side of the House, and neither has any other hon. member. The Postmaster General seems to think he has heard that kind of thing from this side. I heard the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), before the Bill was read the second time, make what I suppose the Postmaster General would call a speech of brotherly love. The Minister of Justice said in effect: If my brothers of the Dominion of Canada will not give me something to which I have no constitutional right; if they will not give me justice and let me be the judge of what is to be considered justice, there shall be no peace in this country. That is the style of speech we get from the King's chosen representative of justice in this House, the occupant of what ought to be the highest and grandest of cabinet positions. He told us that forty-one per cent of our people demanded this legislation. I take issue with him there. All the Roman Catholics in this country are not in favour of this legislation.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Oh, oh.

Mr. LANCASTER. But I tell my young friend from Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne), who has interrupted every speaker in this House since this question began, that he has got a lot of things to learn yet, and some things to learn about his own race in the province of Quebec. I will tell my young friend that if he wants to get any standing in this House, if he wants anybody to listen to him, he must be more tolerant, he must not take his lessons of tolerance from the Postmaster General and he must make less inflammatory speeches, and exercise more courtesy to hon. gentlemen who have just as much right to their opinions as he has.

Now, Sir, I say to all these gentlemen that in the county of Lincoln, which I have the honour to represent, I do not believe there is a single Roman Catholic who wants any thing done that is unconstitutional or contrary to the spirit of the constitution. When the Minister of Finance spoke on this question he sneered at the constitution. The Minister of Finance, acknowledging, I suppose, that the constitution was dead against him, tried to make out that the constitutional aspect of this legislation was of no

consequence. What did he say? I am going to read it from the 'Hansard' lest I make any mistake:

> I do not propose to go into that constitutional question, not because I say it should not receive any consideration, but because I say it is not the great question involved, and I prefer to go on and deal with the practical questions which are before us. If it is a constitutional question above all others, then perhaps the best thing we can do will be to request the legal members of this House to adjourn to the Railway Committee room and thresh it out, while we who have not the good fortune to belong to that learned profession will stay down here and discuss the practical question involved, or proceed with the ordinary business of the House.

And further on:

> Now the first question is whether or not the time has come when we should give a provincial constitution to these new Territories in the west.

But before saying that, and having been interrupted by the leader of the opposition, to whom he was apparently speaking, he said:

> I believe the people of the Dominion to-day are not going to have their minds engaged with an elaborate analysis of constitutional questions which nine out of ten will never read, and which the whole ten will fail to understand. I believe that the people of Canada, since this unpleasant question is brought before us, will expect us to meet it plainly and openly, and discuss it with the hope of finding a happy solution.

Now, on behalf of the Catholic citizens of the garden county of Lincoln, I tell the Minister of Finance, who is now in his place, that they will resent as much as the Protestants will resent any such imputation on their fairness. They do not want things to be done that are unconstitutional. No true citizen of this country, be he Catholic or Protestant, wants legislation to be put through this House on the ground that it may be wise and practical, if it is not constitutional. If it is not constitutional, it cannot be either wise or practical. In saying this, I speak for three or four thousand Roman Catholic inhabitants in the fair county of Lincoln, and I speak for the Protestants as well. The Minister of Finance thinks that this educational section of the Bill cannot be supported on constitutional ground. He thinks, according to his speech, that the law is also against the government if they undertake to force this legislation through, for he says: I will not discuss it, I will let the lawyers discuss it. But does he say he will leave it to the new provinces to do as they like? Oh, no; but he says: I will butt in and take the provinces by the throat, while the lawyers may study the legal question. I think he ought to wait until the jury comes in; I think he ought to keep his hands off these provinces until he finds out whether he had a right to put his hands on them. Now, let me suggest to the Minister of Finance, to the Minister of Customs, and to all those gentlemen who have spoken on this question: Supposing you do not interfere with the power of these provinces to deal with the educational question, are you doing a wrong thing or not? The lawyers say there is a doubt whether we have a right to interfere with the provinces, but nobody says there is a doubt about the provinces having a right to deal with this question of separate schools. Now, if separate schools can be dealt with, as it is admitted they can be, by the provinces, why not let them deal with it? Nobody suggests on either side of this House that these new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan cannot deal with the question of separate schools as soon as this Act is passed in any way that they like; the whole dispute is as to whether there is power in the Dominion parliament to deal with the subject. But there is no question about the fact that the provinces can do it if the Dominion parliament does not interfere. Now, have hon. gentlemen made a good case for separate schools or have they not? I am not going to discuss that question. I believe in provincial rights. If this question was up in the province of Ontario I would claim the right to record my vote upon it, and in the same manner I do not wish to take away the right of the people of the North west Territories to record their votes on the subject if they want to. I am willing to give my fellow-countrymen in the Northwest Territories the same right to do their own voting on this school question that I claim for myself. So in regard to every other question, they should be treated in the same way. Can it be suggested that if this was not an educational and, incidentally, a religious question, there would be any wrenching of the constitution to interfere with the provinces? Everybody knows the answer. Everybody knows that if this was not a question that affected education and, incidentally, religion, nobody would dare to suggest that we should wrench the constitution of those provinces, that we should undertake to throttle them in regard to their right to say what system of education they shall have. Of course, if we are going to give provincial autonomy to the Northwest Territories, let us give them something that will be autonomy, and not a mere pretense. Why are the government dealing with this question of provincial autonomy? Does the Prime Minister believe that these provinces have reached the stage where they are entitled to have autonomy? If he says they are entitled now to have autonomy on all the subjects mentioned in the British North America Act, then are they not entitled to exercise the same judgment with regard to education? If they have brains and intelligence enough, if they are far enough advanced to deal with all the other subjects

that are assigned to the provincial legislatures under section 92 of the British North America Act, surely they are intelligent enough and far enough advanced to deal with the subject of education? That section gives the provincial legislature exclusive jurisdiction to deal with the subjects of direct taxation, borrowing money on the credit of the province, management and sale of public lands, the establishment, maintenance and management of reformatories and prisons, establishment and maintenance of hospitals and asylums, licenses, local public works, marriage, property and civil rights, administration of justice, and generally all matters of a merely local nature in the province. Now, if the Prime Minister thinks that the people of those Territories are sufficiently advanced to deal with all these subjects I have mentioned, surely he must believe that they are sufficiently advanced to deal with the subject of education.

It is idle for the right hon. Prime Minister or any person else to pretend that there is any other reason for excluding education from the operation of this Act or taking the question of education away from these provinces except it be on the religious ground. I say this and I say it forcibly because it is necessary as we are drifting away back into the dark ages. When we are dealing with this Bill this question ought to be dealt with exactly on its merits, the same as any other question would be, and if there is no meritorious reason for butting in the question of religion, or for sticking it in the Bill at all, if there is no logical, sound, businesslike reason for putting it in, there is no excuse for putting it there any more than there would be for putting in any other question that had no business to be there? Are we not sufficiently intelligent to deal with this question of education calmly, deliberately and as business men? Can we not ask ourselves the same question in regard to this question as in regard to any other question? Cannot we say: Does this properly come within the subject of this Bill, is it proper that we should deal with this question any more than that we should deal with any other question? There is not an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who has made up his mind to record his vote for the government on this question, but will admit or will conscientiously say to himself that a judgment of this kind should not be forced upon him more in respect to the religious question than it would be in regard to any other question. I venture to say that if the British North America Act were attacked in regard to some other of its features, if it were proposed, for instance, to give the Northwest Territories control of post offices instead of leaving it to the Dominion parliament the hon. Postmaster General would say: No, that is unconstitutional; that is one of the subjects that the British North America Act exclusively leaves to the Dominion parliament to deal with, and you cannot change the British North America Act in that respect. But, the Postmaster General does not mind taking from the provinces the right to deal with the subject of education although it is exclusively assigned to the provinces except in the cases that he has mentioned to-night. If a province after it was a province, being of age and able to do it, deliberately knowing what it was doing, inflicted upon itself a system of separate schools it could not abolish that system upon joining the union. There is no warrant whatever for dealing with this question except upon the lines of the British North America Act. And section 92, containing an enumeration of the different classes of cases which I have mentioned, lays it down that these cases are to be dealt with exclusively by the provinces.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. Do they mention education in clause 92?

Mr. LANCASTER. Not in that section. Section 92 which I have just read says, and I have used that for a purpose, that:

> In each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated.

And so on. Section 93 says that the 'legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education.' These provisions are exactly the same in the operative parts of these two sections. Section 92 dealing with matters which neither the Prime Minister nor any one else has dared to interfere with, which are subjects which are admitted to be exclusively within the jurisdiction of the province and which are always to be dealt with by the province, contains exactly the same phraseology as section 93 does in regard to education:

> In each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated.

Is one section, and

> In and for each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education.

Is the other section. Exactly the same operative words are used in both sections. The province may make laws exclusively in relation to education

> Subject and according to the following provisions.

Exception No. 1 no one but the premier pretends has anything to do with this case; exception No. 2 no one pretends has anything to do with this case. Exception No. 1, is as follows:—

> Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the union.

In the province at the union ! In the province at the time that it joined the union, as for instance, Ontario and Quebec as the hon. Postmaster General admitted to-night. He said we have these schools here because we had them when we came into the union, and he then proves our case further by saying that Nova Scotia and New Brunswick do not have these schools because they did not have them when they came into the union, and that British Columbia did not have them when they came into the union. That was the reason why they did not have them. Now, here is where I begin to disagree with him. He says it is fair to say to the people in the Northwest : You are not a province, we are about to make you a province for the first time, we do not know whether you will establish separate schools or not but we will take you by the throat and make you do it. That is great logic. That is a wonderful argument to come from a statesman like the hon. Postmaster General, as he called himself two or three times to-night, although nobody applauded him when he did it. That was the logic that came from this would be statesman. If we apply his logic it means this : Here are people twenty-one years of age having the right to vote who have voted for a certain thing, being fully enfranchised and entitled to vote on the question, while on the other hand we are going to enfranchise another man who has not now a vote and make him vote what we direct all his life. That is a fair interpretation of the argument which the Postmaster General has made. We are going to say because we are creating a province that you shall do exactly what Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia did not have to do. Although British Columbia did not have to adopt a separate school system we say to these new provinces that if you come in you must establish a separate school system because they have one in Ontario and Quebec. No such thing was said to British Columbia. Prince Edward Island did not have to adopt the separate school system, but in regard to these new provinces we say : You have not a system of separate schools but we are going to make it certain you must have one because you cannot come into the union if you do not have separate schools as they have them in Ontario and Quebec. These other provinces were allowed to do as they liked. They were provinces that were fully enfranchised and entitled to make their own bargains. The hon. Postmaster General, the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of Customs cannot see any distinction between enfranchising a man and letting him do as he likes after you have enfranchised him and taking a man by the throat and saying : You must do so and so or we will not enfranchise you at all. Both of these hon. gentlemen who are sitting beside each other at this moment and who spoke upon this question said that in effect. They did not want to bother with the legal aspect of this question. The hon. Minister of Customs was very anxious to get away from the legal question. He said that Christopher Robinson's opinion was not quite the same as that of the hon. leader of the oppostion, that they were both excellent lawyers—he spoke correctly about that—that the hon. the Minister of Justice disagreed with the legal opinion of these gentlemen and that he was a good lawyer. But I have not seen the opinion of the hon. Minister of Justice yet. The hon. Minister of Customs may know quietly, or through some secret channel of the cabinet, what the opinion of the hon. Minister of Justice is, but I do not know what it is. But, we will assume that it was contradictory of and different from the opinion of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. What was the wise solution of the Minister of Customs ? What was the advice that he gave us in his great wisdom ? He says that as these lawyers differ about the question as to whether the Dominion of Canada has the power to go on and settle that question we should take the power.

The argument of the Minister of Customs was, that as the lawyers differed as to whether Canada has the power to enact this legislation, the wise thing to do to settle the question was for this parliament to take the power. It is an easy thing for the Minister of Customs to get away from the legal and constitutional aspect of the question, but it never occurred to him that there was a still more common sense solution, and that is that provinces could grant separate schools if they wanted to and nobody disputes that the provinces have the power—and that being so, it would be a wise thing to let the new provinces do as they like on the question of education. There is no dispute that the provinces have the power to legislate on education the whole dispute is whether the Dominion government has the right to force a particular system of education upon them. The Minister of Customs could not see that the easiest solution of the difficulty was for us to say : as there is a great difference of opinion as to whether we have the right to do this or not, and as there is no difference as to the right of the province to do it, then let us trust the province. And so these gentlemen opposite believing they have a good case for separate schools on the merits, should have no reason to fear. But that solution did not occur to the champions of provincial rights. Sir, in that beautiful garden city of St. Catharines in my fair county, early in the month of June, 1896, I heard the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier appeal to return Mr. Gibson (now Senator Gibson) to this House, and Mr. Gibson was returned by a majority of nearly 500. On that occasion I heard the Prime Minister of Canada declare, that when it came to the question of coercing a province even at the instance of people who belonged to

his own religion, he was a Canadian and a provincial rights man first and he would not interfere with the province even at the risk of being accused of disloyalty to his own religion. That argument prevailed with the people of the county I have the honour to represent, but the people soon discovered their mistake. Mr. Gibson who came to this House backed up by that pledge of his leader, four years afterwards in the same constituency was defeated by so weak and humble an individual as myself by a majority which represented a change of several hundred votes compared with the previous election. The people of Canada want public men to keep their political pledges. They do not want the Prime Minister to be in favour of provincial rights one day and against provincial rights another day when it suits his purpose. They want public questions to be dealt with on their merits whether these be religious questions or any other questions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall not do as the Postmaster General did and talk for two hours without dealing with the legal and constitutional aspect of the question except in so far as mere personal assertion is concerned. I shall quote the rest of the British North America Act which deals with the question, and leave it to the common sense of the members of this House and the common sense of the people of Canada to say whether the policy of the leader of the opposition as announced in his amendment, or the policy laid down in the redrafted Bill, is the correct one for us to pursue. The Bill undertakes to do something that is considered to be statesmanlike by the Postmaster General, but which unfortunately is not sufficiently statesmanlike to be constitutional. In the clause relating to education the Bill undertakes practically to amend the British North America Act, for it says :

> Where the expression 'by law' is employed in subsection 3 of the said section 93 it shall be held to mean the law as set out in said chapters 29 and 30, and when the expression 'at the union' is employed in said subsection 3 it shall be held to mean the date at which the Act comes into force.

Now, the British North America says exactly the contrary to this, and we have therefore the sad spectacle that these gentlemen opposite who were once so loud in their pledges to protect provincial rights, now in their efforts to assail provincial rights not only jump clean over the autonomy of the provinces, but undertake to amend a law of the imperial parliament into the bargain. Well, I suppose they have just as much right to do one thing as the other ; they have just as much right to amend an Imperial Act as to deprive the provinces of Canada of their constitutional powers. To listen to these gentlemen opposite one would sometimes think we were in the imperial House of Commons creating a new British North America Act, and at another time that we were assembled in the legislature of the new provinces debating as to whether the provinces should have separate schools or not. I notice that every gentleman on the other side of the House who spoke in this debate took good care to stop short of discussing the question as to whether the Dominion or the province should pass educational laws. Some of them ventured to deal with the question whether or not we have the power, but none of them attempted to give a reason why, even if we had that power, we could exercise it any more sensibly than could the provinces themselves. They tell us that separate schools are good here and good there and good somewhere else, but they have no business to draw the deduction that separate schools would be good in Alberta and Saskatchewan. If this parliament is going to decide whether separate schools should or should not exist in Alberta, then we are going to do exactly the opposite to what occurred in relation to the same matter in the case of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Separate schools exist to-day in Ontario and Quebec because the people of these provinces administering their own local affairs, deem it wise that they should have separate schools. We are here dictating to the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta what they shall do in this regard, but the Dominion parliament never inflicted separate schools on Ontario or on Quebec or on British Columbia or on Nova Scotia or on Prince Edward Island. The hon. gentleman who for the time being is Postmaster General of Canada—we do not know how soon he will resign when he gets to understand this educational clause ; he does not understand it yet. The Postmaster General told us that none of the statutes admitting new provinces into the confederation were alike. He told us that Ontario and Quebec had separate schools, but that in the case of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia separate schools were not established by law. I have here the statute under which Prince Edward Island was admitted into the Dominion, and that statute is silent on the question of separate schools. But the Postmaster General did not tell us why it is silent. If there is anything in the argument of the government it must be : that the province of Prince Edward Island was not entitled to have separate schools unless the Act gave power to establish such schools in that province. The logical result of the argument of the government is, that the Prince Edward Island Act being silent on the question of separate schools the question can not be dealt with at all in the case of that province.

They argue that the Bill now before us would be incomplete if section 16 were not there. It has never occurred to any of them

that you could leave out the whole of section 16 and the result would be that section 93 of the British North America Act would apply, and the power of the province to deal with the question of schools would be absolute. It is so in the provinces of British Columbia and Prince Edward Island. In the constitutions of these provinces there is not a word about education or separate schools, and therefore, according to the argument of these hon. gentlemen, the logical conclusion would be that these provinces could not deal with education at all. That is where their argument would land them. Now, what does it all mean? It means simply this—and everybody of common sense can see it—that if the Dominion parliament, in constituting a province, does not deal with the question of education, then the question can be dealt with by the province. Nobody can get away from that conclusion with the intelligent electorate of any province of this Dominion. They will say: Why did you not, as a government of the Dominion, leave that matter in the hands of these new provinces as you did all other local questions, giving them provincial autonomy in every respect? Is the case for separate schools in those provincse good or not? If I were going to-morrow to live in the province of Alberta, and made up my mind that I wanted separate schools there, I would condemn the leader of this government for the manner in which he brought this question into this House and spoiled my chance of getting them. If he is honestly in favour of separate schools, and is not simply playing the game of politics, if he is really sincere in his appeals to keep racial and religious questions out of this House, why does he bring them in? If this Bill were passed without section 16, everybody knows that the provinces would have the power to deal with education, and this question would not have been brought into this House. Does the premier understand that the new provinces are not going to give separate schools? Then, if he thinks they are wrong on that question he should not give them autonomy. But if he thinks the provinces have a right to decide the question, then he should leave clause 16 out of the Bill, because they have the power without mentioning it in the Bill. Does he think, on the merits of the question, having in view the future welfare of those provinces, that the majority will not be in favour of separate schools? If he thinks they have no right to that opinion, then, as an honest man, he should say, I will not give them autonomy for ten years yet, because I do not think they are sufficiently educated to deal with the subject of education. But that is not his position. He knows that the people of the Northwest are entitled to autonomy, and he practically says, I am afraid that in exercising their right they will or may not establish separate schools, and, therefore, I will not leave them free to decide the question. No sensible man, applying his common sense to this question as would a jury, no matter how he votes, can easily feel in his heart of hearts that the premier really wants separate schools out there peaceably or else he would leave the provinces to deal with the question. I am not saying that I would or would not be in favour of separate schools if I lived in the province of Alberta. Without living there for two or three years I could not say whether I would be in favour of them or not. For that same reason I ought not to be asked to vote upon this question; for that same reason the supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite ought not to be asked to vote upon this question; for that same reason the premier ought not to have brought this question into the House; for that same reason every man of us, whether he is in favour of separate schools or not, ought to vote against the Bill. It is a matter entirely of local concern which you are only in a position to decide after you have lived out there and understand all the conditions. You do not want to take newspaper reports, letters from friends, sketches or literature of any kind; you have actually to live in a community before you know how to deal with the educational system in that community. It may be that if I lived in Alberta two or three years, I would be a strong advocate of separate schools there, or it may be that I would think separate schools were not good things for that province; but for that very reason every hon. member of this House should vote against this Bill, except perhaps the premier, who introduced it, and who, perhaps as a matter of consistency, should stick to it.

The hon. Postmaster General, in the course of his remarks, said that if you trace the history of the constitutions of other provinces and the various changes in them, you will find that no two of them are exactly alike, and he instanced the divorce courts which he seemed to think were a wonderful instance of that fact. But he gave the whole thing away by saying that it was because the provinces with divorce courts had established them before those provinces came into the union. Although the British North America Act assigned divorce to the Dominion, yet it provided that those provinces should continue to have them. That is the constitution, and therefore there is no straining of the constitution in that provision. Yet here is the Postmaster General, a self-styled statesman, objecting to this being done on legal grounds. If I did not know otherwise, I might suppose that the Postmaster General had never been near a law office or had never seen a statute. I am told that he is a lawyer, though he does not want to be called a lawyer, and I understand why. Because lawyers are men of

common sense, if you leave them alone and do not put them into grit cabinets or on pedestals where no one can reach them.

The Minister of Finance wants it to be known that when he talks about this matter he discusses it from the point of view of common sense. But the Postmaster General takes a higher ground. He sets himself up on the pedestal of a statesman and tells us that he looks at this matter from a statesmanlike point of view and wants to have the question settled in a statesmanlike way and not in a legal way. He evidently does not believe that legality and statesmanship ought to go hand in hand in any properly constituted country, but he will no doubt find that if the people can only have a chance to see that their wishes are fulfilled, these two essentials will be joined together and not divorced from one another as the Postmaster General thinks they ought to be. Well, this statesmanlike Postmaster General or postmaster-general-like statesman—you can put it either way you like—says that because the British North America Act, which is our constitution—but which he does not seem to understand is our constitution—makes a difference between different provinces, therefore the Dominion parliament has the right to change that Act as it pleases. I am not quite sure whether the Postmaster General is not labouring under the delusion that he is really in London, England, to-day, and not in Ottawa, because he does not seem able to distinguish between the powers of the Dominion parliament and the imperial parliament. But he cannot produce, nor can the Prime Minister nor the Minister of Justice, nor the Solicitor General—lawyers though they be—produce any Act of the Dominion which has ever undertaken to say that the British North America Act shall mean something different to what it really does say in its own language. No, this Bill now before us is the first measure in which any attempt was ever made by the Dominion parliament to change the wording and the meaning of an Imperial Act. Not a single Act of a Dominion parliament has even been drawn which has undertaken to say that the British North America Act shall be read as containing language different from what it really does contain. Surely the First Minister must have known that the British North America Act did not give him the right to impose these restrictions on these provinces about to be created, or else he would never have undertaken by this measure to amend the Act of Confederation. No hon. gentleman will pretend to say that anybody ever before undertook to resort to the very doubtful and suspicious expedient of having this tribunal alter the Act of another tribunal, or having this parliament declaring that an Act passed by the British parliament shall be taken to contain a different wording to what it really does contain.

Mr. SCOTT. Does my hon. friend not know that very thing was done in the case of Manitoba ?

Mr. LANCASTER. Can the hon. gentleman show me any Act with regard to Manitoba which has the words that are used here ? I am referring to this substituted section. I am not referring to the section that lost the vote of the Minister of the Interior, but to the section which has brought him into line and which the other Northwest members supporting him are swallowing. This is the language of that section :

> Where the expression by-law is employed in subsection 3 of section 93, it shall be held to mean the law as set out in chapters 29 and 30 of the ordinances of the Northwest Territories.

There we have it set down that where the expression by-law is used in an Act of the British parliament passed in 1867, it shall be held to mean certain chapters of the ordinances of the Northwest Territories which were not passed until 25 or 30 years later.

Mr. SCOTT. I understand the hon. gentleman to argue that it was impossible for this parliament to vary the terms of the British North America Act, and I was undertaking to remind him that that was done in the case of Manitoba.

Mr. LANCASTER. I dispute that statement. That was not done at all in the case of the province of Manitoba. That province had, as a province, established separate schools, and it afterwards repealed the law establishing those schools.

Mr. SCOTT. The hon. gentleman is attempting to get away from the point.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am not attempting to get away from anything. My hon. friend says the same thing was done in the province of Manitoba Act. He will find no such expression in that Act or no expression that could be taken to mean the same thing. He cannot find anything in that Act declaring that certain words in the British North America Act shall be taken to mean other words or something else different entirely from what they express. When we find the First Minister declaring that what he is about to do, he could only do under the authority given him by the British North America Act, and then resorting to the expedient of changing the language of that very Act which gives him the authority, his case is a very doubtful one indeed. It really amounts to this that he is interfering with the document which the other man signed. One man gives another a power of attorney. The question then comes up whether that power of attorney gives the right to do certain things, and in order to remove any doubt or difficulty the attorney says : I will take my pen and change the language of the document, and then I will

have the right to do what I propose doing. That is the position in which the right hon. gentleman has put this government.

Mr. SCOTT. That was what parliament did in 1870 in the case of Manitoba.

Mr. LANCASTER. I say it was not at all what parliament did in the case of Manitoba. My hon. friend had better read the statute.

Mr. SCOTT. I will give you the very clause if you will permit me.

Mr. LANCASTER. I have read it as often as the hon. gentleman has. I am not a candidate for a cabinet position, I am not anxious to take the job of my former leader, I am not trying to make myself a champion of what I do not believe, I am not trying to show that I am able to swallow a section which it gave the ex-Minister of the Interior a good deal of trouble to swallow, but which, when he did make up his mind to take the dose, he did swallow with more gusto and less of a wry face than my hon. friend. Here is the enactment we are asked to pass as a Dominion parliament:

Where the expression 'by-law' is employed in subsection 3 of the said section 93, it shall be held to mean the law as set out in said chapters 29 and 30——

Chapters 29 and 30 are ordinances of the Northwest Territories, which did not come into existence until years after the British North America Act was passed. And it will hardly be contended that that Act could have meant to apply to things that did not exist until years after it itself had come into existence.

——and where the expression 'at the union' is employed in said subsection 3——

That is, subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act.

——it shall be held to mean the date at which this Act comes into force.

In other words, the date of the passage of this British North America Act by the imperial parliament shall, by the great power which this Dominion of Canada possesses under so-called Reform rule, and by a declaration such as it never undertook to make before, be carried forward until next July.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) allow me a word?

Mr. LANCASTER. I would like to deal with this subject in consecutive fashion. I do not wish to be discourteous to the Solicitor General (Mr. Lemieux), and I am sure that he knows that I would not show him any discourtesy. If he will allow me to finish the point that I am now dealing with, I shall be glad to have him put to me any question he wishes. I want to keep myself right with the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). He has interjected the statement that I will find the same section in regard to the Manitoba school laws.

Mr. SCOTT. No.

Mr. LANCASTER. Well, words to the same effect.

Mr. SCOTT. No.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then what could the hon. gentleman have meant by his interruption? What does he want to take back now? He said I would find the same in respect to Manitoba——

Mr. SCOTT. No.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then he had no right to interrupt me and cause me to waste five or ten minutes of the time of the House in proving to him that he was mistaken. He had better have another conference with the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) to find out where they stand on this question.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) allow me to explain?

Mr. LANCASTER. I think it is not fair for a gentleman addressing you, Mr. Speaker, to be interrupted even by an hon. member from the Northwest Territories, as I have been interrupted. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) had better have the local responsibility in this matter—for he is not yet elected for the provincial legislature—before he undertakes to have an opinion about it. Even a gentleman with cabinet aspirations ought not to stand up in this House, after the exhibition the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) made of himself, and undertake to tell an hon. member reading plain English that there was the same provision in the law relating to Manitoba schools, and, when it was proved up to the hilt that he was mistaken, explain that that is not what he meant. It is wasting the time of the House as the Postmaster General wasted it—not quite so completely, perhaps, but very near even that limit. I have been wondering, Mr. Speaker—and I am sorry that your mouth is closed and that you cannot give me the information—having seen what I have since eight o'clock, I have been wondering whether there is another cabinet crisis, and whether that is the reason why the cabinet is wasting the time of the House. The Postmaster General took up nearly two hours, and proved only one thing, and that is that a man could talk that long and say nothing. And now an aspirant to the cabinet takes up more time in the fashion I have shown. Now, the Solicitor General wished to ask me a question.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Listening to the hon. gentleman's very able argument, I understood him to say that we could not alter the terms of the British North America Act, nor give any meaning to the clauses of the Act under such a statute as that now before us.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is not quite what I said.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Last year the Privy Council gave judgment in the representation cases, with which my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) is familiar. Section 5 of the British North America Act says :

> Canada shall be divided into four provinces, named Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

As my hon. friend knows, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick took exception to the representation of these provinces as had been fixed by parliament and contended, with some appearance of reason, that the aggregate population of Canada as mentioned in section 51 was the population of the four original provinces. But the Privy Council decided that the word 'Canada' mentioned in section 5 was a variable term, which, at the beginning of our history, meant four provinces, but later meant five, six and seven provinces, thus explaining that the British North America Act was quite an elastic instrument, which should be interpreted according to the sound principles of the law.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Solicitor General (Mr. Lemieux) does not seem to realize that there is a difference between the British North America Act being construed by the courts and this parliament undertaking to throttle the construction by an Act of its own. With all his legal knowledge, he cannot understand the common sense difference between a judge construing the language of this Act of the British parliament and this parliament undertaking to throttle the court and prevent any interpretation except that which the Prime Minister sees fit to give. I do not wonder that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) wanted common sense in this matter. I do not wonder that the Postmaster General has assumed so much with regard to the law. I do not wonder that the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), having in view the advice that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) would give on this question, desired to look at it in a common sense way. I am glad that I am a man of common sense, and not down in the cellar of the law, where I cannot see the daylight. I am willing to leave the matter to the common sense of the common people of this country. The ordinary man whom you meet on the streets, or on the farm, and who needs no lawyer to tell him what the constitution of Canada is, but knows it as well as we do ; he will say : Do not talk to me only of law or of what the judges have said ; the constitution of Canada was made in Britain, and the courts have decided that it means something. If the Prime Minister of this country thinks it should be decided to mean something else, why not let them decide it and not throttle the courts by an Act that he has no power to pass—for he is not the imperial parliament.

Now, a great deal was said by the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) with regard to the petitions sent him through the action of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). The Postmaster General insinuated that the hon. member for East Grey was getting up petitions on the one side for the other of this question. He undertook to say the petitions had been sent in here from Orange lodges. Now, let me be understood. I am not an Orangeman. I am not a Roman Catholic. But I am a Canadian, British born ; and I believe that the Orangemen and the Roman Catholics, taken one with another, are equally good citizens and equally loyal to the country. The petition the hon. member for Grey is sneered at for bringing into this House is a petition that every Roman Catholic could sign, and the signing of which he could justify to his priest. That petition is as follows :

> We, the undersigned electors of the electoral division of do pray that in granting provincial autonomy to the Northwest Territories the Dominion parliament will not by any enactment or otherwise withhold from the newly created provinces full and unrestricted freedom of action in all matters affecting the establishment, maintenance and administration of schools.

This is spoken of as a partisan petition. Yet it is a petition that every citizen could properly sign. It says in effect : Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; render to Alberta the things that are Alberta's, and don't take away from the little fellow what belongs to him at the dictation of Quebec, which has no right to butt in at all. There is nothing here either in favour of or against the principle of separate schools ; it is simply an humble request, put in perfectly constitutional form. It is such a petition as we were asked to vote for four years ago by the Prime Minister, at the instigation originally of the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan). It was moved that this parliament should exercise its right of petition, should go to the foot of the throne and ask that the Coronation Declaration made by the King should be amended so that it would not be offensive to His Majesty's Roman Catholic liege subjects in the country and throughout the empire.

These people, I care not whether they be Orange lodges or Roman Catholics, have the same right to petition, and their petition is equally sensible, equally just, equally correct, equally constitutional, and that is the petition that my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is sneered at for bringing in here. I presented a lot of them myself, they were sent to me and I presented them ; and if they petitioned this parliament against provincial autonomy to the Northwest Territories, I would present the petition, though

I would vote against the prayer of the petition, because I would think it was not right, and the people could turn me out when I sought re-election at their hands. That is the petition that so much has been said about, and I thought it wise to put that petition upon record. That is the petition that is called by the Postmaster General, one side of the question; a petition that asks separate schools to be established is called the other side of the question. Could anything be more unfair ? There are no petitions coming from Orange lodges asking us to throttle the little province and prevent it from establishing separate schools. I call the attention of the statesmanlike Postmaster General—I will assume that he is a statesman, although he is self-appointed, self-adjusted and self-labelled as a statesman.

An hon. MEMBER. Union labelled.

Mr. LANCASTER. Well, perhaps not union labelled, and not so labelled by the people of Canada. The hon. gentleman who is so statesmanlike, the hon. gentleman who is at present running the Post Office Department of this country, undertakes to call that petition which I have read, one side of the separate school question; and a petition which asks this House to throttle a province is the other side of the separate school question. What would a gentleman from Quebec who advocates separate schools in the Northwest Territories, say if we attempted in this House, ten years or five years from now, supposing the country got incensed at Quebec butting in on these matters concerning the Northwest, supposing the country got aggravated, annoyed and disgusted, and say we will insist for a certain term in doing what the Finance Minister says is so deplorable, we will put some people in power who will settle this school question for ever in Quebec, just as these gentlemen want this government to settle the school question in the Northwest Territories, and we will abolish separate schools in the province of Quebec and Ontario. Now what would they say to that ? In principle what is the difference ? What is the difference between taking away a man's right and preventing him from exercising the right ? In common sense, what is the difference between the two propositions ? Am I doing a greater wrong if I go into a man's barnyard and steal his horse than if I said to him, although you have got a horse I will not allow you to use it, I will control it so that you shall never have the use of it ? To be practical, what is the difference ? He cannot use that which is his own in either case. He cannot deal with that which is his own, and which he has a right to deal with. There may be a difference in the way it may strike one man or another in the application, but on the moral principle—and we heard something even from the Postmaster General about morals to-night—on the moral principle what is the difference between your saying to the province of Quebec; although you have yourselves established a right to your schools in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario; you shall not have them any longer, because we think it was a mistake when you established them—what would be the difference between saying that and saying to the Northwest provinces, you shall not exercise your right to declare whether you want separate schools or not, we will tie you up so that you shall never make a declaration either way ? There is no difference in principle, no man can pretend there is.

Now I want to put on record the statements of some of the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. In 1891 Sir Louis Davies spoke on this question of education in the Northwest Territories. That gentleman is now a judge of the Supreme Court. He was one of the gentlemen who came into power on the cry that we should not coerce Manitoba. This is what Sir Louis Davies said in 1891 :

> My opinion is now, and has been for years, that when that time comes (the time to erect the Territories into provinces) you cannot withhold from the provinces so erected the right to determine for themselves the question of education in one way or the other. I would be the last to favour this parliament imposing upon the people there any system of education, either free or separate. I only claim that when a Bill is introduced to erect those Territories into provinces that Bill should contain a provision enabling the people of the different provinces so created to decide what system of education they will have.

The Hon. David Mills, in the same year, spoke, not about separate schools in Quebec or Ontario, not about the British North America Act, but in regard to the Northwest Territories, the very part of this Dominion which this parliament is now dealing with. The Hon. David Mills was recognized as an authority on constitutional law by the Reformers of this country, and I think by a good many Conservatives. In fact, he was held up by hon. gentlemen opposite as the great constitutional model of this Dominion, and this is what he says :

> When the people of the Territories, or any portion of the Territories, are sufficiently numerous to constitute a province—when, in fact, they attain their majority in regard to local matters and when they propose to set up for themselves—this parliament has no right to exercise control over them. It can give good advice, but it has no right to give commands.
>
> When the Territories have a sufficient population to entitle them to become a province, they must decide for themselves whether they will have separate schools or not.
>
> I have my view as to what will be the best decision for them to arrive at, but I must not impose on them my view as to how they should be governed after they have attained their majority.

Now then the 'Globe' newspaper came out very lately. I know people lately have said, the 'Globe' is going wrong. I do not know, everybody seems to be going wrong who does not agree to throttle the new provinces. Everybody except hon. gentlemen opposite is agreed that this House should leave questions of sectionalism alone and attend to the business of the House. The 'Globe' newspaper has been talking about this question, and the 'Globe' of March 11 said this :

> The only settlement of the disturbing Northwest school question that will be just or safe or permanent is that settlement most strictly in accord with the spirit and letter of the constitution.

The hon. Postmaster General wanted the spirit of the constitution and not the letter. The 'Globe' wants both, and I think I have shown that the hon. Postmaster General's opinion of that kind of spirit is not a very good one. I do not pretend to be a judge of any kind of spirit than that, but I think that I am as good a judge of that kind of spirit as the hon. Postmaster General is and he has said that he wants nothing but the spirit and not the letter. The 'Globe' says :

> The only settlement of the disturbing Northwest school question that will be just or safe or permanent is that settlement most strictly in accord with the spirit and letter of the constitution. Anything that swerves from that straight course, squinting in the direction of any faction or creed or race, is charged with dynamite—

These are the people that are raising the religious question in this House—the 'Globe' newspaper. I do not know whether the hon. Minister of Customs makes the 'Globe' pay duty on this dynamite or on these dynamite articles or whether hon. gentlemen opposite are now using the dynamite as well as the pistol and medicine that my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) spoke about this afternoon.

> ——and sooner or later may work havoc in the provinces, if not in the Dominion. The personal opinions of individuals or the preferences of classes or communities are not sufficiently certain and substantial to form a sure foundation for the institutions of the country. In the present instance, political safety, social progress and national peace can be found nowhere but in standing by the constitution.

Now, it goes on to discuss the question at some length and I will not trouble the House with it, but it reaches this conclusion :

> Provincial autonomy under the constitution carries with it for the new provinces, unless expressly prohibited by the constitution, autonomy in education.

It was necessary for the 'Globe' newspaper to tell the premier of this country that autonomy meant autonomy, that it did not mean something else. It was necessary for the 'Globe' to try and pull a line on the Prime Minister as the organ of the party in the city of Toronto. I presume that the 'Globe' would say that it was the chief organ of the party in the whole Dominion. I cannot pronounce upon that point, but certainly it is one of the principal organs in the Dominion, and before this Bill could be read a second time, in the hope that some other policy would be adopted, the 'Globe' gave the advice that provincial autonomy under the constitution means autonomy in education. Is it any wonder that my hon. friend who leads the opposition here is obliged to put on record an amendment to this Bill to say so ? The 'Globe' said that it was necessary to tell the Prime Minister that autonomy meant autonomy in education as well as in anything else, and for fear that some people would think that the government could say that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition did not agree with the 'Globe' I would point out that, as it happened on these two occasions these two gentlemen—I think the gentleman who wrote this article was an honest man, and I know there is no more honourable man in the Dominion of Canada than my hon. friend the leader of the opposition—came forward and took the same view as the whole Dominion of Canada will if it gets a chance. If the government went to the country upon this question to-day, the government know very well that the whole Dominion, whether Grits or Tories heretofore, would unite by their votes in saying that the 'Globe' was right on this occasion. Then, the 'Globe' proceeds :

> To this doctrine we can ask all classes and creeds to subscribe.

The 'Globe' thinks, as I do, that all classes and creeds ought to subscribe to the constitution or else get off the earth as far as Canada is concerned. If they stay in Canada and get the benefit of our constitution which we all say affords the greatest freedom that exists anywhere they should subscribe to and support that constitution.

> To this doctrine we can ask all classes and creeds to subscribe. In so far as they appreciate and approve the principles of responsible self government, all citizens should here be in agreement. The question of the value of separate schools is not primarily involved.

And it is not.

> It is not the primary question. It may be forced to the front by the Orangemen of Ontario and the Ultramontanes of Quebec, but, in so far as the problem is one for the Dominion parliament to solve, the question of separate schools is not the real issue. To make it the real issue is to misplace the emphasis and to engender strife.

Who misplaced the emphasis and who engendered strife ? The right hon. leader of the government, when he brought in this Bill. The 'Globe' is not a perjured wit-

ness ; it is not even a retiring member of the government. It did not go out for principle, because it never was in.

The issue before parliament is this: In giving provincial status to the Northwest Territory is parliament under obligation to make the maintenance of separate schools a permanent responsibility of the new provinces? In dealing with this vexed question parliament should go not one hair's breadth beyond its indisputable constitutional obligation. Leave everything provincial to the provinces. Any other course will lead to inextricable confusion, and put a new root of bitterness into the fertile soil of our national life.

Who has put the root of bitterness into the fertile soil of our national life ?—The right hon. Prime Minister who cannot pass his Autonomy Bill without dragging that question into parliament that the 'Globe' tells him should be left to the provinces. The 'Globe' has evidently been found fault with by somebody, some man on the street that we have heard about, has been to see the 'Globe,' but the 'Globe' thinks it has done right to have its own opinion. The 'Globe' on March 11 said what I have just read, but I have also here the 'Globe' of March 21, just ten days later. Somebody has been after the 'Globe' in the meantime with this result that the 'Globe' says that what we said before we believe and we are still more of that opinion than we were at the time you found fault with us. That is our argument, and the more hon. gentlemen opposite argue, the more we are satisfied they are all wrong. The more they are finding fault with the 'Globe' the more the 'Globe' feels convinced that it is right and it repeats what it said before only that it says it in stronger terms : This is what the 'Globe' says on March 21 :

1. The 'Globe' stands for the provincial rights of Saskatchewan and Alberta. Those rights are created and secured by and under the British North America Act. The 'terms and conditions' of their provincial autonomy must be 'subject to the provisions of this Act.' They can have no rights as provinces that are not expressed or implied in the British North America Act, 1867 to 1886. They can be deprived of no rights to which they are entitled under that constitution.

2. The 'Globe' holds, as has been argued in these columns again and again, that the new provinces now to be created do not come under the separate school obligation of section 93, clause 1, of the British North America Act, and, therefore, they are free under the constitution exclusively to make laws in relation to education, to continue their present system, to modify it or to substitute another for it, as their legislatures shall decide. Our reasons for holding to this view were stated yesterday, and in several earlier articles, and at the very opening of the discussion.

3. The 'Globe' is persuaded, by its first-hand knowledge of western conditions and by the assurances of representative western men, that had the education question been left without direction or trammel to the legislatures, the present system would have been enacted, and all the privileges possible under any obligatory federal clause would have been secured to the Catholic minorities without dispute or acrimonious debate.

4. The 'Globe' holds that the educational clauses in the first draft of the Autonomy Bills are ultra vires of the federal parliament, especially the third clause which is held to contravene the Dominion Lands Act and to interfere with the provincial control of the details of school administration.

5. The 'Globe,' as a logical consequence of the foregoing, holds to be ultra vires of parliament and an infringement, in theory if not in practice, of the rights of the provinces under the constitution, any legislation based on the assumption that in the meaning of the British North America Act there is no difference between the creation of a province out of territory for thirty-five years a part of Canada and under federal supervision, and the union to the Canadian confederation of an independent, self-governing, autonymous province or colony such as British Columbia was prior to 1871 or as Newfoundland is to-day. A territory is not a province, and the constitutional obligations of a province cannot rest upon a territory until it becomes a province.

That is the 'Globe's' statement and that is my idea of what is right. I do not say it is right because the 'Globe' says so, but I do say that when the 'Globe,' which is not going out of its way to injure the government says so, it means a great majority of the people of this country, Liberals as well as Conservatives, the independent thinking people on both sides of politics, are of the opinion that the government is doing wrong. But, says the government, we are in for five years anyway and what matters it ? Well, I say to them that the five years will go by. They may hold themselves in power for five years, but when the election comes the people of Canada will do as the people of Lincoln county did four years after the pledge of the Prime Minister was broken and on which pledge they returned a supporter of his to this House. The chief whip of the Reform party held the constituency of Lincoln by a majority of nearly 500, but the government broke its pledges as to provincial rights, as on every other question, and the people of the county of Lincoln punished the government because of its broken pledges, and a man of no greater ability than your humble servant was elected and the chief whip of the Reform party was left at home. As the people of Lincoln county did in that instance, so shall the people of the Dominion do when they get the opportunity. It may be that the Prime Minister will retire from office before an appeal is again made to the electorate; it may be that the Minister of Finance or the statesmanlike Postmaster General will make himself or get some one to make him Prime Minister, but whoever be the Liberal Prime Minister who appeals to the people of Can-

ada he will find that the people of this Dominion will not stand for interference with the autonomy of the provinces, will not stand for broken pledges, will not stand for the shackling of these great provinces of the Northwest with onerous restrictions as to education and the administration of their public lands. Why have we no Minister of the Interior to-day? Why is the government afraid to appoint a Minister of the Interior and send him for election to the people of the west? I have not the assurance which some gentlemen on the other side have to say that they speak for the people of the Northwest Territories when they have no mandate to speak on this question; I do not pretend to speak for the people of the Northwest Territories except to say that they want to be left alone to attend to their own business, but I do believe that the people of the Northwest Territories will treat this government as it deserves to be treated for interfering with their provincial rights. The government does not dare to appoint a Minister of the Interior because they know that the people of the Northwest would reject him by an overwhelming vote. The Prime Minister is not here to-night, but in times past he has learned something from this side of the House, and I invite the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Finance who are now present to tell the Prime Minister that it is his duty to appoint a Minister of the Interior and to test the feelings of the people of the west on this question. That is the constitutional way to proceed, but these gentlemen do not want things done constitutionally. They had not much respect for the constitution when, the Minister of Finance being absent in England, they introduced without his knowledge this Bill which deals with great financial issues seriously affecting the Dominion. They had not much respect for the constitution when in the absence of their Minister of the Interior, who is specially charged with matters pertaining to the west, they drafted and proposed in parliament this measure which vitally concerns the people whose interest he was specially charged to guard. Let them appoint their Minister of the Interior and they can soon find out whether we are right or they are right. Sir, as a man trying to do the honourable thing and representing an honourable constituency, I have no course left to me but to vote for the amendment of the leader of the opposition. In doing so, I believe I am voicing the opinions of the Reformers as well as the Conservatives, of the respectable Roman Catholics as well as the respectable Protestants of my county. If I do that I am doing my whole duty, and, Sir, if the members of this cabinet would study more what the people want and not what may suit the political exigencies of the moment they would be representing the people of Canada better than they are to-day.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 30, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

VACANCY IN THE CABINET.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether he has any information for the House in reference to the filling of the vacant portfolio of the Minister of the Interior ? It is a question of a great deal of moment, and we have not yet had a really thorough answer from the Prime Minister.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I have no information to give to my hon. friend to-day.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I suppose I will be equally successful when I make a plea for that return with reference to the transport of hay to the lower provinces, which was ordered by the House on January 25. A second order in reference to the matter was passed a fortnight later, and the return to that has been brought down, but it is absolutely useless without the other.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall inquire about that.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 69) to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta, and the amendment of Mr. R. L. Borden thereto.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. Johns and Iberville). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara reminded us, last evening, several times in the course of his speech that he comes from that part of Canada surnamed the Garden of Ontario. It was necessary that he should do so, as his violent delivery and forcible language might have led us to believe that he was not a resident of that rich and beautiful country surrounding St. Catharines, but rather that his mind had been impressed by the sight of Niagara's surging waters and his ears filled with the

uproar of the great falls. That kind of music apparently suits his taste much better than the sweet pastoral melodies.

The hon. member having taunted the hon. Postmaster General for his violent reply to the hon. member froom North Toronto (Mr. Foster), unfortunately proceeded to follow in his steps, and even went much farther. During the whole evening he assailed in an unwarrantable manner the Postmaster General, the Minister of Finance, and the Minister of Justice, and even the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). Are we not justified in giving him one bit of advice : Doctor, cure thy own ills ?

This question, Mr. Speaker, is one of justice. Justice is not the outcome of human passion, but rather of reason. Of old, it was represented under the form of a woman whose eyes were bandaged, which meant that she should not be influenced by the clamour from the street. And when I heard hon. members on the other side of the House claim that the majority wanted so and so, and the minority so and so ; that petitions in support of their views were more numerous than those in the opposite sense ; when I heard them state in this parliament, the highest court in the country, that it was not a question of deciding who was right and who was wrong, but a question of deciding who had the majority, I said to myself : Have they forgotten that this is the twentieth century; that the old principle 'Force above right,' no longer rules in this country, especially since the establishment of the Constitution of 1867.

The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) ventured to make some charges against the province of Quebec ; he accused her of not showing in practice that toleration of which she boasts so highly, and he claimed that the Protestant population was not free as regards education. And on what grounds has he brought forth such a charge ? On the fact that in our schools the Catholic religion is taught, while the Protestant religion is taught in the school of the minority. Does the hon. member know who is responsible for that system ? It has not been forced upon the minority ; the minority wanted it. The Protestant minority in the province of Quebec wanted that system to be established, they cannot complain therefore that the majority are not always tolerant, as claimed by the hon. member for Toronto North.

On the other hand, the hon leader of the opposition showed sympathy for the province of Quebec ; unfortunately that sympathy was not at all of the practical order. The hon. gentleman did not state that he was not in favour of separate schools. But he has these two objections to make ; First, the constitution will not allow us to alter the terms of the British North America Act ; secondly, under the federal constitution the Catholic minority has no rights in the new provinces. Such is the stand taken by the hon. leader of the opposition.

The hon. gentleman's contention seems to me indefensible. That is true specially as regards his first proposition, viz., that parliament has no right to step in and alter the terms of the British North America Act. Indeed, the hon. gentleman who sits at his left (Mr. Foster) was unwilling to urge that point.

With a view to find out what rights we enjoy, is it not necessary that we should consult history ? 'History,' says Laurent, 'shows us the meaning and the scope of statutory enactments.' The problem which we have to solve has already been solved, and solved by Sir John Macdonald himself in 1870. But, even before his time, the problem had been solved by the great neighbouring republic and that as early as 1820. Of course, in order to draw correct inferences from the history of the United States, we should take into account the similarity of circumstances, as also the difference between the constitutions of both countries. The United States, in the same way as Canada, have territories, and these territories will have, some day or other, to be admitted into the union. But the difference between our constitution and that of our neighbours on that point is quite marked. Not only has the federal constitution been worked out by the people of the United States, but the constitution of each separate state is also the creation of the peoples of these various states. Here, on the contrary, not only is the federal constitution a gift of the imperial parliament, but even the constitutions of the provinces of Quebec and Ontario have been granted by that same authority. In the same way, the constitution of these new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan will have been granted to them by us. Now, Mr. Speaker, although, under these circumstances, the position of the various states is much stronger than that of the federal power ; although the people of each state have the right to adopt their own constitution, however, in 1820, when the state of Missouri asked for admission into the union, with a constitution providing that slavery might be maintained for ever within its territory, Congress refused to admit that state into its union unless a contrary provision was inserted. The advocates of Missouri objected : You are interfering with the principle in state sovereignty ; you are interfering with the principle in virtue of which the people of each state are entitled to frame their own constitution. The wise men of the Republic answered : Above the principle of state sovereignty there stands the still more sacred principle of individual freedom.

Let me, Mr. Speaker, quote on this point an extract from Storey's book on the American Constitution, volume II, page 220 :

§ (1321). At the time when the preliminary measures were taken for the admission of the

State of Missouri into the union, an attempt was made to include a restriction, prohibiting the introduction of slavery into that State, as a condition of the admission. On that occasion the question was largely discussed, whether Congress possessed a constitutional authority to impose such a restriction, upon the ground that the prescribing of such condition is inconsistent with the sovereignty of the State to be admitted, and its equality with the other States. The final result of the vote which authorized the erection of that State, seems to establish the rightful authority of Congress to impose such a restriction, although it was not them applied. In the act passed for this purpose, there is an express clause, that in all the territory ceded by France to the United States under the name of Louisiana, which lies north of 36° 30' N. latitude, not included within the limits of the State of Missouri, slavery and involuntary servitude, otherwise than in the punishment of crimes, whereof the parties shall have been duly convicted, shall be, and is hereby for ever prohibited. An objection of a similar character was taken to the compact between Virginia and Kentucky, upon the ground that it was a restriction upon State sovereignty. But the Supreme Court had no hesitation in overruling it, considering it as opposed by the theory of all free governments, and especially of those which constitute the American Republic.

The decision rendered in the case of Missouri has been at all times considered as the policy of the United States. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, under the constitution of the United States, all that Congress has a right to do is to admit a state into the union. Such is not the case as regards our constitution. The British North America Act provides that we may frame the constitution of the provinces.

When the province of Manitoba was admitted into the Dominion, the public men of the time realized at once that the British North America Act, though carefully drafted was not perfect. In fact it will suffice to read clause 146 to be satisfied as to its shortcomings. It reads as follows :

ADMISSION OF OTHER COLONIES.

It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, on addresses from the Houses of the parliament of Canada, and from the Houses of the respective legislatures of the colonies or provinces of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, to admit those colonies or provinces, or any of them, into the union, and on the address from the Houses of the parliament of Canada to admit Rupert's Land and the Northwestern Territory, or either of them, into the union, on such terms and conditions in each case as are in the address expressed, and as the Queen thinks fit to approve, subject to the provisions of this Act.

That article states that, in order to admit new colonies and provinces into the Dominion, a joint address from such provinces and the Dominion parliament will be necessary. Why ? Because, at the time of the admission of such province, there is an agreement entered into by both parties, however, when it comes to admit the Northwest Territories into the Dominion, His Majesty declares that an address on behalf of the parliament of Canada will suffice. In that case, therefore, no agreement has been entered into between the parties, for the making of an agreement implies two parties. Why have we this omission in the latter case? For this reason that when these territories were admitted into the Dominion, they were not organized, they were without a constitution, while British Columbia and Prince Edward Island had each a constitution and a regularly organized government. These provinces were fully organized when they entered confederation ; but such was not the case with the Territories. It was therefore necessary that the Dominion parliament should acquire the right to lay down the terms on which these territories might be admitted into the Dominion. It was realized that section 146 was not up to the requirements. In the year 1870, Sir John Macdonald, perceiving this inadequacy, recommended that the home government should help out the Dominion parliament by granting it greater powers than had been vested in it by the constitution of 1867. The words 'terms and conditions' might well apply to an agreement, but not to the drafting of a constitution suitable to unorganized Territories. Section 146 which met the case as regards provinces having a distinct individuality, was no longer sufficient when Territories such as those in the Northwest were to be taken in. Such is Sir John Macdonald's contention, set forth in his memorandum dated December, 1870. I quote :

The address which was passed by the Parliament of Canada, contained no provisions with respect to the future government of the country, the only terms and conditions contained in it being those agreed upon between the Hudson Bay Company and Canada as the conditions of their surrender of their charter to Her Majesty. Even if the terms of the address had included a new condition for the Northwest, it must, under the above cited section, have been subject to the provisions of the Imperial Act of Union.

This is what he says : Section 146 does not invest the Dominion parliament with the right to frame a constitution for the new Territories. Hence the necessity of applying to parliament to obtain such right. He goes on to say :

The general purview of the 'The British North America Act, 1867,' seems to be confined to the three provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, originally forming the Dominion.

Now, Sir John Macdonald makes the following request :

Under these circumstances, as the question as to the constitutionality of the Act of the Canadian parliament has been raised, and as the doubt may cause grave disquiet in the territories which have been or may hereafter be added to the Dominion; and in order also to prevent the necessity of repeated applications to the Imperial Parliament for legislation respecting the Dominion, the undersigned has the honour to recommend that the Earl of

Kimberley be moved to submit to the Imperial Parliament, at its next session a measure:

1. Confirming the Act of the Canadian Parliament, 33 Vic., cap. 3, above referred to, as if it had been an imperial statute, and legalizing whatever may have been done under it, according to its true interests.

2. Empowering the Dominion Parliament from time to time to establish other provinces, in the Northwestern Territory, with such local government, legislature and constitution as it may think proper, provided that no such local government or legislature shall have greater power than those conferred on the local government and legislatures by 'The British North America Act, 1867,' and also empowering it to grant such provinces representation in the parliament of the Dominion: the Acts so constituting such provinces to have the same effect as if passed by the imperial parliament at the time of the union.

It is subsequent to this that the Imperial Act of 1871 was passed. Sir John Macdonald had not only applied for authority to lay down the terms and conditions on whirh the Territories might be admitted, but also for authority to frame their constitution; and that constitution was to be such as the Dominion parliament would deem proper to grant them, provided it did not give them greater powers than the other provinces enjoyed. Under these circumstances, the imperial parliament enacted for us section 2 of the Act of 1871:

> The parliament of Canada may from time to time establish new provinces in any of the territories then forming part of the Dominion of Canada, but not comprised in any province of that Dominion; and may, at the time of said establishment, enact provisions for the constitution and administration of any such province and for the passing of laws concerning the peace, order and good government of such province and for its representation in said parliament.

Well, that clause providing for the creation of new provinces, enacted at the request of Sir John Macdonald, in the words just quoted, and contained in the very Act which confirms that of 1870 to restrict the powers of Manitoba, that provision, as all will see, is very broad in its wording. The imperial parliament was aware of what had occurred in the case of Manitoba. It was stated at the same time in section 5 of the same Act, that the Manitoba Act 'would be and was considered as having been in force'; that it was not void, as had been contended; and with a knowledge of these facts, parliament, in the broadest terms, authorizes parliament to establish new provinces. If the Dominion parliament desired that we should not have the right to restrict the powers of the new provinces, that was evidently the time to say so.

The hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara spoke last evening of mandator and mandatory. I am glad he has suggested such an example. Let us suppose that in the ordinary course of things a proxy informed his principal that he has possibly exceeded his powers and requests him to endorse his action. Suppose also that by the same deed the mandator authorizes his proxy to make similar agreements; would there be any court of justice to decide that the proxy had exceeded his powers in acting as formerly?

But some object—and I regret that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), a distinguished lawyer, professor of constitutional law, who made an eminently patriotic speech the other evening, has thought fit to uphold the first contention of the hon. leader of the opposition. He claimed that parliament had not the power to restrict provincial rights. He said: When I consider the wording of the Act of 1871, I am forced to the conclusion that, in accordance with the construction generally put on it, this clause would give parliament unrestricted powers; however, on closer consideration, I come to a different conclusion. He takes up, to begin with, the words: 'To constitute and establish.' These are not the words used in the Act; in the French as well as in the English copy the word 'constitution' is used. According to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, constitute' would mean to fix the boundaries of the provinces and to decide on the date of their admission into the Dominion, and also to manage their affairs up to the date of the coming in force of the constitution.

Mr. Speaker, such a construction is in contradiction with the meaning given to the word 'constitution' in chapter 5 of the British North America Act. It is seen there that provincial constitution applies to the executive and the legislative power. Should there be any doubt on this point, we might consider the other terms used in section 2 of the Act of 1871, which enables us not only to enact provisions for the constitution and government of the provinces, but also 'for the passing of laws concerning peace, order and good government'; which evidently apply to the legislative power. If we were merely to admit these new provinces into confederation under the provisions contained in the British North America Act for Ontario and Quebec, they would be without a constitution, since they have not any as was the case with the province which came into confederation in 1867. New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, British Columbia and Prince Edward Island had their constitution just the same as Ontario and Quebec. But in this case it is necessary to decide on the terms of the constitution of these new provinces, since they are without a constitution at the time we are granting them provincial autonomy.

Other objections are made: If you are entitled, they say, to interfere with some of their rights, why not with all? Has not the Dominion parliament enacted laws concerning property in connection with railways, although that is a matter which comes within the purview of the provinces. Why should we have all these Dominion laws

relative to property ? Because they were needed in order to ensure the successful working of the laws enacted by the Dominion parliament. I might quote other examples. Courts have decided in many instances that we could legislate incidentally on the matters enumerated in section 92 although these matters are left exclusively to the provinces.

There is another argument, and I am glad that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has brought it up. He claims that there should have been no inequality between the various provinces. But do we not find in the constitution provisions made for the protection of minorities ? Does not section 80 enact that twelve counties in the province of Quebec are in a way set apart for the English-speaking minority, and that the limits of these counties shall not be changed without the consent of the majority of the representatives of these counties? That is a restriction on behalf of the English-speaking and Protestant minority of the province of Quebec, a restriction which is not found in the case of any other province.

In the provinces other than Quebec, the use of the French language is not official, nevertheless we find here a provision stating that in the province of Quebec, the English language shall be on the same footing as the French.

The imperial parliament having made all these various restrictions, without thinking that they were interfering with provincial rights, are we not thereby justified in following the same rule as regards the protection to the minority in the new provinces.

But that has not been sufficient to allay the fears of some of our hon. friends on the other side, and the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) sent in haste a telegram to a high legal authority in Toronto ; he asked the opinion of a leading lawyer, Mr. Christopher Robinson, as to the meaning of section 93 of our constitution. Mr. Robinson made his opinion known, and if the member for East Grey had been a lawyer, and not a doctor, he would have soon realized that Mr. Robinson was making fun of him when he answered that the power of parliament was not beyond question. Now, is there anything on earth that is beyond question, or which a lawyer may question ? Have not books been written denying the existence of God ; have not even some philosophers turned out volumes expressing doubt as to their very existence ?

Mr. Speaker, the power of parliament having thus been vindicated, the stand taken by the hon. leader of the opposition appears in a new light. While he states that section 93 has no application, his colleague from the province of Quebec asserts that it has. Under these circumstances, the country faces a conflict of opinions, a difficulty which should be solved by parliament in order to avoid all trouble. So that, if the hon. leader of the opposition is not in a position to satisfy the House that his first proposition is well founded, we have to come to the conclusion that he is not desirous of seeing the question settled.

So much has been said about this section 93 that I need not quote it, every one of us knows it by heart. However, I shall venture to say one word as to its construction. There are two ways of interpreting a statute : liberally, and literally. If I give it its liberal interpretation there can be no doubt that the first clause of section 93 applies under the circumstances. Mr. Robinson, in giving the aforementioned opinion claimed that no part of section 93 applied. If that section has no application, then it will be contended that section 92 settles the point. Notwithstanding my deep respect for Mr. Robinson, I have no hesitation in saying that his view of the case is evidently wrong. The Privy Council have decided so in the case of Brophy versus the Attorney General of Manitoba. The Manitoba Act contains a clause corresponding to clause 2 of the Bill now before us, in regard to which the Privy Council made the following comment, page 212 L. R., 1895 :

> The second section of the Manitoba Act enacts that after the prescribed day of the British North America Act shall, 'except those parts thereof which are in terms made or by reasonable intendment may be held to be specially applicable to or only to affect one or more but not the whole of the provinces now composing the Dominion, and except so far as the same may be varied by this Act, be applicable to the province of Manitoba in the same way and to the like extent as they apply to the several provinces of Canada, and as if the province of Manitoba had been one of the provinces originally united by the said Act.' It cannot be questioned therefore that section 93 of the British North America Act (some such parts of it as are specially applicable to some only of the provinces of which the Dominion was in 1870 composed) is made applicable to the province of Manitoba, except in so far as it is varied by the Manitoba Act.

So that should section 16 of the Bill disappear, section 93 of the British North America Act would still be applicable, in virtue of section 2 of the Bill, to which no exception is taken. What the learned lawyer, Mr. Robinson, must have meant was that subsection 1 and 3 of section 93 were not applicable.

We should put a liberal construction on that statute. Maxwell, in his work 'on statutes,' lays down the following rule :

> Except in some few cases where a statute has fallen under the principle of excessively strict construction, the language of a statute is generally extended to new things which were not known and could not have been contemplated by the legislature when it was passed. This occurs when the Act deals with a genus, and the thing which afterwards comes into existence is a species of it. Thus, the provisions of Magna Charta which exempts lords from the liability of having their carts taken for carriage was held to extend to

degrees of nobility not known when it was made, as dukes, marquises and viscounts.

If we apply that rule of interpretation, taking into account the fact that no provision has been made specially for the Territories, then we reach the conclusion that the word 'province' is applicable also to the Territories which we acquired in 1870. Now, that power granted by section 93 is not unlimited; it is restricted by subsection 1 and 3. Such is the meaning of that section when liberally interpreted; and even if we should interpret it literally, it is still open to the same construction. Words should here engross our attention. Warfare is being carried on about the words 'province,' 'legislature,' and 'date of union.'

It is contended that the word province does not include territory. The definition of that word is not given in the English statutes, but it is given in ours. The Canadian legislature has stated what is the meaning of the word 'province.' We read in our statute-book what should be understood by the word 'province.' Subsection 13 of section 7 of our interpretation Act says:

> The expression 'province' includes the Northwest Territories and the district of Keewatin.

It is thus seen that the word 'territory' is synonomous to 'province;' even the word 'district' is covered by its meaning, as in the case of Keewatin, for instance. Hon. gentlemen on the other side contend that the schools of the Northwest cannot be considered as actual statutory enactment, that they are mere ordinances voted by a mere council. Let us see what is the meaning of the word 'legislature' according to the Interpretation Act.

I shall read subsection 14 of that same section 7:

> The expression 'Legislature,' 'Legislative Council' or 'Legislative Assembly,' includes the Lieutenant Governor in Council and also the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories, and the Lieutenant Governor in Council of the district of Keewatin.

Therefore, Sir, 'province,' 'territory,' legislature' and 'assembly' have the same meaning for us inhabitants of Canada. In fact, the definition which I have just given is in accord with the principles laid down by the Interpretation Act of 1889 in England, as regards the word legislature. It is as follows: Any authority other than the imperial government empowered to pass laws within the British possessions. So that, according to the imperial interpretation Act itself, the Northwest Territories were governed by a legislature and the laws passed by that body are the laws of a legislature. Let us now pass on to the word 'union.' That word may mean Canada or the Confederation. It is the latter meaning which should be given to the word.

I read the following in the American and English Encyclopædia of Language:

> 'The teritories are as much a part of the United States as are the states. The ultimate purpose is that they shall, as soon as practicable be organized into states, which shall take equal place or part in the union.'

As to the term 'date of union', its meaning for the four provinces is the first of July, 1867. For the others, it means the date of their admission into the Dominion.

Section 109 shows this. Although that section mentions the three provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, the Privy Council has decided that it applies to all the provinces. It will not be contended by any one after this that the words 'at the date of union' mean in this case the first of July, 1867.

Mr. Speaker, in voting for the Bill which is now submitted by the government, we are not, as I am aware, granting very much to the minority in the provinces of the Northwest. We are only confirming the present state of things. That state of things may not be very satisfactory; but legislators are often obliged to take circumstances into account. To those who may taunt him for not granting any more, the Prime Minister may say, like Solon: I have not given them the best laws, but I have given them the best laws they were capable of standing. Mr. Speaker, since the outset of this debate, we have had surprise after surprise. Hon. gentlemen on the other side are not generally very well disposed towards the provinces, while the Liberal party has always upheld their authority and sought to vindicate their rights. The other day, the hon. member for South York, (Mr. Maclean) assailed the right hon. Prime Minister, called him a tyrant and what not. It is not many years since I entered this House, but I have in the meantime became acquainted with the true inwardness of the feeling of hon. members on the other side as regards provincial rights. In 1902, in the course of a debate, the hon. member for South York spoke as follows:

> I say that the interpretation of the law that has been given by the English Privy Council in regard to the distribution of rights as between the provinces, and the federal power, has been against the interest of the country as a whole. That I regret, I agree with the honourable member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) that some day we will have the whole jurisdiction in this parliament and in some way we will work it out, and in some way we will increase the federal power and wipe out gradually the provincial power. I take issue directly with the honourable gentlemen who oppose that view, I say that provincial government and the enlargement of provincial rights has not been in the interest of this country, and I say that Sir John A. Macdonald was right, and was a most far-seeing statesman if he believed in a legislative union and desired it carried out in this country.

Such are the feelings expressed by the hon.

member on behalf of provincial autonomy ; such are his tender mercies towards the provinces.

There is also the question of vested rights. In 1875, parliament passed a law granting a temporary constitution to the Northwest Territories, and by that constitution parliament declared that certain rights granted to the minority would be for ever assured to them. The rights of the Catholic minority were recognized by representatives of a different religious belief, and it was Mr. Blake himself who brought up the question. That same policy was confirmed, in 1880, by the Conservative government of the time. It was enacted once more that the Catholic population would have their separate schools, and parliament is to-day bound in honour to continue that system. The government itself through its officers has declared that the Dominion of Canada had guaranteed that right to the minority. I find the proof of this in a pamphlet published by the Department of Agriculture for the information of those who wish to settle in the west. The following is an extract :

THE GREAT CANADIAN WEST.

Information for those who wish to immigrate, published by the Department of Agriculture, Ottawa, 1881.

The settler, before leaving, does not only take into account the material advantages offered by the country wherein he wishes to make are the political and religious institutions of his home. He is also desirous of knowing what the community in whose midst he is to live.

It is in order to satisfy that legitimate curiosity that we propose giving, from that standpoint definite information as regards the position in Manitoba. The institutions which exist in that province will be more or less models to be copied by the other provinces of the great Canadian West when they come to be organized.

EDUCATION.

The school system is copied on that of the province of Quebec, that is to say that Catholics have full control and management of their schools, while Protestants have the same rights, the same privileges.

Such were the assurances given to immigrants in 1881. Not only did the government of Canada assure them of the existence of a good law ; but it pledged itself to maintain these same rights on behalf of the minority when these future provinces would be constitued.

Mr. Speaker, in the course of this debate, we have often heard about provincial rights; but we have heard very little about other rights of much more value, I mean individual rights. Among those privileges which, in England, Simon de Montfort and the other Norman barons forced King John to grant them in that Magna Charta so dear to the English heart, was not personal liberty the most precious of all ? And why was that personal liberty so dear to the English people ? It was because they, even at that time understood the true principles which have since prevailed in the government of progressive nations. However, we still find to-day people who are prone to return to the old notions which were current in the days of tyranny. 'I have here a letter published in one of the city newspapers against separate schools, under the signature of a man of some education. In support of his view, he quotes Aristotle, in the following words : 'The state, as regards its citizens, plays the part of an educator. It strives to regulate their actions. The most despicable of states is that which lets each one live according to his fancy.. .. Education should be public and common'. Such, Mr. Speaker, was the tyrannical system of the Ancients. The Spartans, in the interest of the commonwealth, deprived the head of a family of his children when they were seven years old ; a kind of broth was to be the only nourishment of all ; strict regulations were enacted on all subjects. The individual was nothing ; the commonwealth was all. As a result, Sparata ruled over Greece, but left a hateful name in history.

However, there appeared a man in the world's history who changed all these conditions. He abolished slavery ; he declared that personal liberty was a boon of greater value than political rights. Of what use is it to me to have a vote in parliament, if I am not the master in my own house, the master on my own property, if I have not control over my children ? The father of a family is intent in transmitting to his child not only his name and his property, but also, and particularly, his traditions, those beliefs which were imparted to him on his mother's knee. That is the most sacred inheritance. Personal liberty has precedence over provincial rights.

How could a nation be happy if that liberty is not safeguarded ? That principle had been well grasped by the fathers of confederation. Anxious as they were to guarantee the rights of the individual, they chose that system of federal union.

What the fathers of confederation desired, Mr. Speaker, was it not to preserve for each one of us, his tongue, his faith, in a word his individuality ? These great men believed that if Providence had allowed the representatives of the two greatest nationalities in Europe to be partners in the ownership of these lands, it was not for us to pretend to be wiser. They believed that happiness reigns in a country when the individual rights of each citizen are safeguarded. They believed that the Roman wisdom of the Englishman, combined with the Athenian genius of the Frenchman would ensure to this country not only peace and wealth, but also lasting glory when the hour would come for us to take a seat at the banquet of sovereign nations.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with pleasure to the argument of my hon. friend (Mr.

L. P. Demers) who has just taken his seat; and although I would be very happy to address the House in the beautiful language in which he has done, I crave the indulgence of my colleagues if I speak the language of the majority. In listening to my hon. friend I have been astonished to observe the conclusions at which he has arrived. My hon. friend has discussed only one phase of the measure now before the House, which indicates, I suppose, the great interest that is taken in the clause respecting the schools, while as a matter of fact there are other things to be considered. My hon. friend commenced his remarks by casting reflections upon those who preceded him. He endeavoured to make political party capital of the question which is now being debated in parliament. It is true, it is a political question; but we were told, at the commencement of the discussion of this measure, that we had to stand upon very high ground, because it was a very important and very dangerous question to discuss. My hon. friend, in the beginning of his remarks referred to the educational system in the republic to the south of us; he then spoke about the Educational Act of Manitoba; he went on to say that this was a question of justice; and, after speaking on the interpretation of our constitution, he concluded by saying that he would not be able, by the vote which he intends to give, to render to those who are interested in this measure, all that he would like to give them, but that he would do the best he could. My hon. friend, in speaking about the constitution, reminded me of an old saying of an American politician, that patriotism is the refuge of scoundrels. Here I am afraid we have been playing a great deal with the British North America Act. Although my right hon. friend the leader of the government stood upon the rock of the constitution when he spoke on the 21st of February, and although my hon. friend the leader of the opposition also stands on the rock of the constitution, to my mind that rock is not very solid; and since 1896, the less we speak about the British North America Act the better. To show how little we can depend upon the rules which were laid down at the time the British North America Act was passed, my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers) said a few moments ago that you would find in that Act that in the province of Quebec there must for ever be twelve counties represented by Protestants.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. I beg pardon. I did not say that. I said that so long as the majority of those twelve counties did not want to change the boundaries of those counties the majority of the province could not change them.

Mr. BERGERON. That is better. I thought my hon. friend said the opposite, and I was going to say that this would not amount to a great deal, as the population is changing; and although a provision was not made for the province of Ontario, the French Canadians are conquering some counties in that province without having recourse to the British North America Act.

Now, Sir, there are other questions involved in the Bill before the House. Many speeches have been made and many things have been written since it was introduced into this House, and I would have been very glad to have heard my hon. friend speak on some of these matters. There are the creation of the two provinces, the delimitation of the provinces, the question of the lands, and the school question. It is most extraordinary that since this Bill was brought before parliament we have heard very little of the other matters; we have heard more of the school question than of anything else. Well, Sir, I intend to say just a word or two on the other points.

With regard to the delimitation of the provinces, I would prefer to leave that to the members who are most interested. I admit at once that I do not know enough of the geography of those two provinces to say whether the delimitation made by the right hon. leader of the government is a good one or not. I may say, however, that I was satisfied to have the territory made into two provinces instead of one, although personally I would have been gratified to see the province of Manitoba enlarged.

With regard to the lands, if we were following the constitution to the letter, according to clause 109 of the British North America Act, we would have to give to the provinces the control of their public lands; but since we do not intend to follow the British North America Act all through, I am prepared to let it go by so far as the lands are concerned, and to say that I approve of the position taken by the government. At first I was not in favour of that. My view is confirmed, not so much by the British North America Act as by the fact that we have paid a very large sum of money for those lands, and that we are spending a great deal of money every year to bring in immigrants to settle upon them, and neglecting the vacant lands in the older provinces—I refer especially to the province of Quebec. But having thought the matter over, and, I may say without any false-modesty, influenced by some of the speeches made in this House, I concluded that it would be in the best interest of Canada for this parliament to hold its hands upon those lands in the Northwest Territories. We expect to have in that country a very large population; we are inviting people from all parts of the world to come there, and we do not choose carefully enough the immigration that is going on in. But we seem to be in a hurry to have those immense tracts of land opened up to cultivation. We do not know what spirit will in a

few years hence animate those new populations which are coming into the Northwest of Canada although we expect, by wise laws, to make them satisfied to live under the flag under which we are so happy to live. Yet, I repeat, in my view it was an act of wisdom on the part of the government and in the best interests of Canada to retain the public lands under the control of this parliament.

With regard to the financial aspect of this measure, I remember hearing my right hon. friend say that it was natural that we should be as generous as possible to those new provinces. I share his view. We are generous. My impression is that the people of the Northwest Territories will be, from a monetary point of view, in a better position, when enjoying their provincial autonomy, than they were ever in before. If the House will bear with me a moment, I would like to put into 'Hansard' a statement of the different amounts which will be paid by the Dominion out of the Dominion exchequer for the administration of these provinces for some years to come. We are to pay each province as follows :—

For the support of the government and legislature.. .. ..$	50,000
On an estimated population of 250,000 at 80 cents per head..	200,000
Interest at the rate of 5 per cent on the sum of $8,107,500, as a set-off against the debt of the other provinces which we assumed when they entered confederation, or..	405,375
We are also to pay them by way of compensation for the public lands per year..	375,000
We also give them annually for five years to provide for the construction of necessary public buildings..	93,750
That makes a total of.. .. ..$	1,124,125

This is to become in time, when the population shall have reached 800,000 souls, $2,207,875 for each province or $4,415,750 for the two.

I now come to the question which is creating—and I think very unnecessary—so much turmoil in the Dominion. I refer to the question of the schools. It is not my intention to dwell at any great length on the provisions of the British North America Act, as it seems to me everything that possibly could be said in that connection, on both sides of the argument, has been said by those who preceded me. My hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers), who has just discussed this question with much ability, laid great stress upon the word 'province' and the word 'territory' and even the word 'district,' in considering whether clause 93 was applicable or not to the new provinces about to be created. On this same question, a very able argument was made by my right hon. friend, and also strong arguments were made by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition and others who followed, notably the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). But there is one principle which it seems to me has been lost sight of, and yet which I think should govern us in discussing this measure, and that is that constitutions are made for men and not men for constitutions. And standing here as a representative of the people, I ask myself should I confine my endeavours to discover a literal interpretation of that clause 93 of the British North America Act, or should I rather not look higher and think of the future, not only of the Northwest Territories, but of the whole Dominion? Should I not rather regard our constitution as having been framed for the purpose of working out the destinies of this country in the most satisfactory manner possible and of being interpreted in that spirit rather than of being interpreted in that narrow spirit which would set the letter of the law above its intention and make the future harmony and greatness of this country subordinate to the mere wording of a certain clause. My right hon. friend, when he brought down the measure, made a speech which was an admirable one from my point of view. He said we are bringing those two provinces into the Dominion by the means furnished us by the British North America Act in its clause 146. He also spoke about clause 93, but in the Bill itself he furnished the best argument which I think could be brought, following the ideas which I intend to follow during my remarks. In this connection I want to ask my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers), who has just told us that the First Minister could not do everything he wanted to do, but did as much as he could, why he did not impress upon my right hon. friend the desirability of keeping the Bill intact as it was introduced. I am now speaking about clause 16. We have heard a great deal about that clause. It was that clause which brought about the resignation of my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton), and we have heard a great many speeches about the position taken with regard to the same clause by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and some other ministers whose names were not mentioned. I do not propose to discuss why the right hon. gentleman the First Minister did not wait for the arrival of the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) or the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) before bringing in his Bill. That is none of my business. I take it for granted that when the government came down on the 21st February and put before the House of Commons a project of law, that measure was the result of the deliberations of the Dominion cabinet. And I repeat that I listened with pleasure to the speech of my right hon. friend when he in-

troduced that Bill. I go further. Being convinced that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) had had a great deal to do with the framing of this clause 16, and recognizing in the manner in which that clause was drafted the high qualifications which we all know that hon. gentleman to possess, I thought that I recognized in it a kind of vindication of the position taken by the Liberal party in 1896 upon a similar question. To my mind it was the only thing the right hon. gentleman could do, and I shall say why. In the discussion which is taking place, I was not here one evening when my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) took some part in it and made some remarks, which of course do not give any idea of what he will say when he speaks at length on the measure. But some hon. members have said that clause 93 of the British North America Act settles the case. I think that is pretty well the opinion expressed by my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers). The moment a territory becomes a province, they argue, it comes in with whatever system of education it enjoys at the time of the union. Others take the opposite view and say that clause 93 does not go so far. And I imagine that it was in order to dispel any doubt on that point, that the Minister of Justice drafted this clause 16 as it appears in the original Bill.

There is undoubtedly a law concerning education in the Northwest Territories to-day. They certainly have not got an educational system by tolerance. They have it by right. There is to-day in the Northwest Territories a law governing education which was enacted and granted them by the parliament of Canada in 1875. Clause 11 of that Act of 1875, and 14 of Revised Statutes of 1886, reads as follows :—

> The Lieutenant Governor in Council shall pass all necessary ordinances in respect to education. But it shall therein always be provided that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the Territories or of any less portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name the same is known, may establish such schools therein as they think fit, and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor and also that the minority of the ratepayers therein, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein, and in such case the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic schools shall be liable only to assessment of such rates as they impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

The other subsection does not amount to a great deal, but I will read it also :

> The power to pass ordinances, conferred upon the Lieutenant Governor by this section is hereby declared to have been vested in him from the seventh day of May, one thousand eight hundred and eighty.

There is the law. Now, I contend that this law has never been repealed. It could only be repealed by an Act of this parliament. It is the law which everybody throughout the world, going to the Northwest Territories, was supposed to know. Everybody was supposed to know that there were separate schools in the Northwest carried on upon the same lines as those in the province of Quebec or those in the province of Ontario. Now, I take section 16 of the Bill——

Mr. BRODEUR. Before my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) leaves the part of the subject he is discussing, I desire, with his permission, to ask a question. Does he contend that clause 11 gives to the minority the same rights as were given by the British North America Act to the minority in Ontario and Quebec ?

Mr. BERGERON. As a matter of law ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. I may say that it is not clause 11, but clause 14——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is clause 11 of the original Bill, but clause 14 of the consolidation.

Mr. BERGERON. I contend that, in relation to the question before the House, this was the law and is the law. And, while I am prepared to rely upon my own opinion in that matter, I would refer to the Bill brought down by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in support of my position. What is clause 16 of the Bill now before us ? It is in effect a reenactment of the section of the British North America Act. It was put in the Bill as originally presented by the Prime Minister as a matter of precaution—in case any person might otherwise carry the matter to the courts and plead that we had not made it apply to those new provinces by an Act of the parliament of Canada. Now, section 16 says :

> The provisions of section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, shall apply to the said province as if at the date upon which this Act comes into force the territory comprised therein, was already a province——

That would settle the argument of my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. L. P. Demers). And then we have added the following words, in order that there may be no question as to the use of 'province,' 'territory,' 'district' or any other word :

> ——the expression 'the union' in the said section being taken to mean the said date.

And subsection 2 is as follows :

> 2. Subject to the provisions of the said section 93, and in continuance of the principle heretofore sanctioned under the Northwest Territories Act, it is enacted that the legislature of the said province shall pass all necessary laws in respect of education, and that it shall therein always be provided (a) that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of

the said province, or of any less portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name it is known, may establish such schools therein as they think fit, and make the necessary assessments and collection of rates therefor, and (b) that the minority of the ratepayers therein, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein, and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor, and (c) that in such case the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assessment of such rates as they impose upon themselves with respect thereto.

And, in case it should be asserted, as it was in 1896 in the case of the Remedial Bill that, because no money was provided for the maintenance of the separate schools, therefore it was no good, my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) made the following provision :

3. In the appropriation of public moneys by the legislature in aid of education, and in the distribution of any moneys paid to the government of the said province arising from the school fund established by the Dominion Lands Act, there shall be no discrimination between the public schools and the separate schools, and such moneys shall be applied to the support of public and separate schools in equitable shares or proportion.

There is the law that the right hon. Prime Minister wanted for the new provinces in the Northwest Territories, and I repeat—and I am not afraid to give my opinion or to state my reasons for it—this had my entire approval. To me, it seems simply a case of rendering justice to whom justice was due. To me it seemed an act of fairness to these 125,000 people that, my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) said, went into the Northwest Territories upon the faith of that law. In effect it declared to them : You have not been deceived by the government of the Dominion of Canada.

It has been said in this House in the course of this debate—I cannot remember by whom—that it was an evidence of great generosity on the part of the people of the Northwest Territories that, in 1875 the Mackenzie government then in power in the Dominion, granted separate schools for the Northwest. Well, Sir, I do not give any member of this House new information when I say that in 1875 the majority of the inhabitants of the Northwest Territories were French Canadians and Catholics. That being the case, it was merely an act of justice to give them the schools they wanted.

Now, I shall be told that there were ordinances passed after the Act of 1875. So there were. I will take these up in their order. In 1885 there was an ordinance passed effecting the organization of the school system. When I quote that ordinance it will be seen that its effect was to establish such a system as we have in the province of Quebec. In that province we have a council of public instruction composed one-half of Protestants and one-half of Catholics, the Protestant managing the affairs of their schools and the Catholics managing the affairs of their schools. This is a system of separate schools not merely in name, but in fact.

The Lieutenant Governor in Executive Council may appoint and constitute a board of education for the Northwest Territories, composed of five members, two of whom shall be Roman Catholics, and two shall be Protestants, and the Lieutenant Governor, who shall be chairman.

Now, I refer to clause 6—the clauses before that have nothing to do with the subject I am now discussing, but relate merely to domestic affairs. Clause 6 says :

The board of education shall resolve itself into two sections, the one consisting of the Protestant, and the other of the Roman Catholic members thereof, and it shall be the duty of each section :

1. To have under its control and management the schools of its section, and to make from time to time such regulations as may be deemed fit for their general government and discipline, and the carrying out of provisions of this ordinance.

This was the ordinance of 1885. When this was passed, the law of 1875 was still the law, and this ordinance was merely providing an organization for carrying that law into effect. How long did it last ? Unfortunately, in the Northwest as in Manitoba and elsewhere the new-comers, honest men, no doubt, and sincere in their convictions, by degrees have taken away nearly everything that was granted to the minority under the Acts of 1875.

The ordinance of 1892 was promulgated on December 1, 1892. There is the first blow at what I call separate schools. The name did not disappear ; it was put in golden letters here the other day by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), but the system of separate schools commenced to be torn to pieces in 1892. What was done then ?

The Lieutenant Governor by and with the advice and consent of the legislative assembly of the Territories enacts as follows :

The first three sections deal with expressions such as 'school districts' &c. Clause 4 reads :

There may be established, subject to the provisions of this ordinance and to the regulations of the council of public instruction, the following classes of schools, namely :

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish you to follow these words with the closest attention.

(a) Public schools for pupils between five and twenty years of age, in which instruction shall be given in the elements of an English and commercial education.

(b) Separate schools for pupils between five and twenty years of age, in which instruction shall be given in the elements of an English and commercial education.

Why call it a separate school? Is this not irony? Why not have only the one school? Was it for the sake of giving some gentlemen an opportunity of saying that by voting for the amendment of my hon. friend they are keeping separate schools in the Northwest? It has only to be read to be understood. That was done on the 31st of December, 1902, and it was the law and in fact it is the law brought down to the ordinances 29, 30 and 31 of which I shall speak later on.

I have shown what is to be taught in those schools. Clause 36 reads:

After the establishment of a separate school district under the provisions of this ordinance, such public school district shall possess and exercise all rights, powers, privileges and be subject to the same liabilities and method of government as is herein provided in respect of public school districts.

The very same thing. It was called a separate school but we found it was a public school, and I am not surpraised that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and even the ultra-Protestant member for Brandon, (Mr. Sifton) have changed their minds after their little stampede. The opinions of those in this House who do not believe in separate schools, who were honest about it, I respect just as much as I want them to respect mine. I know as a matter of fact that there are men who are sincerely convinced that public schools would be better, just as I am convinced that it is imperative that separate schools be maintained if the views which I hold are to be carried out, that is to say that the children of our country are to be brought up in the way their parents desire. To those who are voting for the amendment of the Prime Minister, because it is in favour of separate schools, I would quote this section:

83. All schools shall be taught in the English language and instruction may be given in the following branches, viz.: Reading, writing, orthography, arithmetic, geography, &c.

84. Any school the officers of which shall knowingly allow such school to be taught or conducted in violation of the provisions of this ordinance or of the regulations of the council of public instruction, or of the superintendent of education, shall be liable to forfeit all rights to participate in any of the grants provided by this ordinance to aid the schools of the Territories, and, upon satisfactory evidence of such violation, such grants may be withheld.

85. No religious instruction, such as Bible reading or reciting, or reading or reciting prayers (except as hereinafter provided), or asking questions or giving answers from any catechism, shall be permitted in any school in the Territories, from the opening of such school at nine o'clock in the forenoon, until one-half hour previous to the closing of such school in the afternoon, after which time any such instruction, permitted or desired by the trustees may be given.

86. Any child attending any school shall have the privilege of leaving the school room at the time at which religious instruction is commenced as provided for in the preceding section or of remaining without taking part in any religious instruction that may be given, if the parents or guardians so desire.

And these are called separate schools. This is the ordinance of 1892. I may be asked: Why was not that vetoed? I need not tell hon. gentlemen that there was a great deal of agitation at that time in the Territories. I need not say that Monseigneur Taché, whose words were read the other day by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), and others, who took a great deal of interest in the educational affairs of that country, did everything they could to repeal that ordinance.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Has that clause been repeated in the ordinance, chapter 29?

Mr. BERGERON. I am coming to that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Can you not reach that now?

Mr. BERGERON. I am getting to it by degrees.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. You might forget it.

Mr. BERGERON. It might please my hon. friend if I did forget it. It may be said: Why was there not an appeal or, why were not those amendments vetoed by the government at Ottawa, and the name of Sir John Thompson has been brought into the discussion. Sir John Thompson's opinions were well known on such subjects. I would not like to trouble the House with a great deal of reading, but I wish to point out first of all that when the effect of the ordinance of 1892 was felt it was found that it was an enactment of something which had been decided in 1891, and that the time within which it could have been disallowed was past.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What, what, what, what? I am sure my hon. friend is mistaken.

Mr. BERGERON. I will give very good testimony in support of what I am saying.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is not the reason given by Sir John Thompson.

Mr. BERGERON. This comes from the Privy Council and it is correct. There were many reasons given. My hon. friend does not want me to read the whole thing. I am bringing something before the House that, I think, will impress itself upon the minds of the hon. gentlemen who are listening to me. I have here a memorandum of Monseigneur Taché. He adds his demand to the prayer of those who came down here to obtain re-

dress in respect to these ordinances of 1892, the intention of which was, as a matter of fact, to abolish separate schools in the Northwest Territories. If it were not so, it was because, as has been said by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) they were not the law. The law was still in force. The Act of 1875 was not repealed, but for all practical purposes separate schools no longer existed in the Northwest Territories. These petitions. which, I suppose, are still in the office of the Privy Council or in the Department of Justice, enumerated the complaints of those who were suffering in the Northwest, and Monseigneur Taché adds his voice to the prayers of the petitioners. He says :

I add my humble prayer and I ask that the grievance which is complained of be remedied immediately. The intention to deprive Catholics of their rights in the matter of education and to abolish the use of the French language, especially in the schools, is so manifest that unless remedial measures are taken immediately an injustice will be consummated. The Governor General in Council cannot allow such a violation as this of the law under the authority of which the government of the Northwest Territories is carried on.

He must there refer to the law of 1875:

I have every confidence that the ordinances and the regulations of which we complain will be disallowed, and your petitioners will ever pray.

This is signed Alexandre, Archbishop of St. Boniface.

Mr. BRODEUR. What is the date ?

Mr. BERGERON. The date of the pamphlet is 1894 and the letter is dated the 4th of January, 1894. Then, the Archbishop goes on in his memoir to say:

I was somewhat convinced that the honourable the Privy Council could not help seeing the dangers of those ordinances, but I thought there was no use going any farther in attempting to assist council by pointing out the dangers which were threatening. The honourable the committee is right in saying that appeals to the Governor in Council under the British North America Act in the matter of education from the provinces of Canada have not been established for the Territories. Such an appeal does not exist for the Territories.

Then he repeats the answer which was given to him by the then Minister of Justice, or at least by the Privy Council, and he says:

Of course, if it is the committee's desire to grant an alternative answer to the prayer of the petitioners, there is only one remedy which remains. The veto is the only remedy which can be applied in response to the prayer of the petitioners who have submitted their case to the goodwill of the government. The honourable the committee says that it has not the right to do justice to the demand. In the face of that refusal, in one case because there is no power and the other because there is no willingness to apply that remedy, the committee does not find itself in a favourable position.

Then the Archbishop cites the statute of the Northwest Territories of which the petitioners availed themselves as a proof that the Roman Catholics in the Northwest Territories have a right to their separate schools, and he says that it is to be regretted that such a right should have been abolished by the ordinances of 1892. I will now read for the benefit of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice an extract from the report of the hon. the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General on February 5, 1894. I shall only read that part of it which has to do with what I have already read. This is in answer to those who say to us: Why did your friends not disallow those ordinances? Why did your friends not render justice? Your premier was a Roman Catholic; why did he not act? This is the answer:

While an appeal in the sense of the provisions of the British North America Act, referring to appeals to the Governor in Council, on matters affecting education in the province of Canada, is not established as regards the Territories, the committee of the Privy Council feel confident that any suggestion having your Excellency's authority would be given all proper consideration by the assembly and by the council, and the committee consider themselves justified in entertaining this confidence, more especially as in the same enactment as that under which the Northwest Assembly is organized and exercised its functions (the Northwest Territories Act, section 14) the following provision is made.

Then it recites the clause which I have read a few moments ago. There is no question that the Privy Council made a remonstrance against those ordinances to the council of the Northwest Territories. There is no question that a demand was made not to put in force those ordinances of 1892, the effect of which, as a matter of fact, was to abolish separate schools in the Northwest Territories. What was the answer ? Nothing was done.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Trust the west.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) is right. It is a matter for reflection. Those gentlemen who were at the head of affairs in the Territories listened to all these prayers, they knew that these petitioners were right; still they did nothing. Why? Because the majority, I imagine, were opposed to a change. We might as well accept the truth of the doctrine that under a constitutional government it is the majority that rules. That is why, I think, it is very dangerous to put on the statutes of Canada laws which purely and simply will be footballs later on for the fanatics in politics or anywhere else.

Mr. BRODEUR. Before my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) leaves that subject, I understood him to say a few moments ago that

the ordinances of 1892 could not be disallowed because it was too late when the petition was presented to the Dominion.

Mr. BERGERON. That was the first reason given, and the second reason that was given in this memorandum of the Privy Council was that they could not do it.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think that in that respect my hon. friend is entirely mistaken. The government simply refused to disallow the ordinances. They never pretended that they had no right to disallow the ordinances, but they simply said in the report that my hon. friend has just read that they did not consider it advisable to disallow the ordinances. They never pretended for a moment that they had not the right to disallow them.

Mr. BERGERON. Evidently the Minister of Inland Revenue does not understand what I have read. I read from the complaint of the minority the first time its representatives appeared before the Canadian Privy Council to complain of the injustice done them. The ordinance of 1892 that they complained of was a re-enactment of a previous ordinance passed in 1891 and they were told that it was too late to disallow the ordinance of 1891.

Mr. BRODEUR. It was not too late to disallow the ordinance of 1892.

Mr. BERGERON. No, but they were told that even if the ordinance of 1892 were disallowed, yet, as the ordinance of 1891 was still in force and it was too late to disallow it, no good would result from the disallowance of the ordinance of 1892.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Why was it not disallowed in 1891 ?

Mr. BERGERON. Because an appeal in the sense of the provisions of the British North America Act on matters affecting education, was not established as regards the Territories.

Mr. BRODEUR. It was not a question of appeal ; it was a question of disallowance.

Mr. BERGERON. The appeal and the disallowance go together and you cannot dissociate them. At all events the result was that the ordinance of 1892 remained in force. But why are my hon. friends opposite plying me with all these questions and all these objections. What is their object in that ? I am afraid that it is politics which prompts these interrogations, and I hope that politics will be excluded from this discussion, I trust to be able to treat of this matter aside altogether from petty politics. It is too serious a question with me to allow political considerations to enter into it and I am afraid that these gentlemen opposite have the idea that later on they will be able to say : the Conservatives were in power and they did not do justice to the minority. Well, Sir, if the Conservatives did wrong they have had their day of reckoning, and if the Conservatives did wrong that is no reason why a Liberal government in power should perpetuate injustice. I have read the reasons which were given for not disallowing the ordinance of 1892, and I would hesitate long before I would come to the belief that Sir John Thompson would sacrifice the Catholic minority of the Northwest Territories. I believe he would have come to their relief unless good and strong reasons prevented him. Sir John Thompson was Minister of Justice at the time, and I take it for granted that he studied the case carefully, and I believe if he had been able to disallow the Act of 1892, or if its disallowance would have been of any avail to the minority, Sir John Thompson would have disallowed it. But the ordinance of 1891 remaining in force, and it being too late to disallow it, no good would be accomplished by disallowing the ordinance of 1892. What is the use of splitting hairs on a question of this kind ? I want to take a large view of it ; I want to see what has happened ; I want to know where we find ourselves to-day and to what cause our grievance may be attributed. There is no doubt that since 1892 there are no separate schools in the Northwest Territories. Whether that be the fault of the Liberals or the fault of the Conservatives does not amount to anything in the present discussion ; that will have to be settled before the electorate. Our duty here is to make laws and just laws. Perhaps it is, that because the Conservative government may have been guilty of neglect of duty in this particular, that when the present Bill was introduced into the House of Commons it contained the original clause 16, which was an intimation to me that at least this government was doing its duty—it did not do it long though. Let us refer for a moment to the ordinance of 1891. The rights and privileges of the minority in the Northwest Territories were not taken away abruptly ; there was a gradual encroachment until we reached chapter 29 of the ordinance of 1891, the third paragraph of which reads as follows :

> There shall be a department of the public service of the Territories called the Department of Education over which a member of the Executive Council appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council under the seal of the Territories to discharge the functions of the Minister of Education for the time being, shall preside.

This was a new feature of the school law of the Northwest Territories. It gave the Territories a Minister of Education or a Commissioner of Education as he is called. It brought education into politics ; it abandoned the first council of public instruction that was formed and which was satisfactory; it abandoned the second board of education which was also more or less satisfactory,

and it brought education down to the political arena. This ordinance further says :

> The Lieutenant Governor may appoint such officers, clerks and servants as are required for the proper conduct of the business of the department and for the purpose of this ordinance, all of whom shall hold office during pleasure.

Now, here is what this Department of Education is authorized to do :

> The commissioner, with the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall have power to make regulations for the department.
>
> (2) To authorize text and reference books for use of the pupils and teachers in all schools hereinbefore mentioned as well as such maps, charts, and other apparatus or equipment as may be required for giving proper instruction in such schools. To prepare a list of books suitable for school libraries and to make regulations for the management of such libraries.
>
> There shall be an educational council consisting of five persons, at least two of them shall be Roman Catholics, to be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, who shall receive such remuneration as the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall determine.

We see from this that the board of education consists of a member of the executive council with two Catholics and two Protestants appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, but these gentlemen have not the right to vote. I think I have given the information which my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) asked for as to chapter 29 of the ordinances, which is the law in the Territories to-day. I have read to the House clause 16 of the original Bill as submitted to parliament by the Prime Minister.

Clause 16 to my mind was what it should have been, and I would have supported it, because it was giving the minority in the Northwest justice. Of course, I am speaking for myself and expressing my own views. I am in favour of separate schools ; I believe in separate schools—not merely in the word 'separate,' but in the tuition which children get in separate schools. I want religion to be taught in the schools. I want the child to hear of God and to pray in the school—not all the time ; but I want it to be understood that the name of God shall be mentioned there. I have heard men who are very sincere say : 'You are a broad-minded man ; why not let all the children go to the same school together, with the national flag floating from the top of the building ? Of course, there would be no prayer in the school, because it would offend the Roman Catholics, the Methodists, the Presbyterians or the Baptists. There would be no religion taught. The children would simply go there and learn what is necessary to earn their living. They would play together, and would grow up to respect each other.' I do not believe in that kind of school, and I do not believe that is true. I remember that when I was attending college there were some Americans there, and it was not very long before we were separated. Our differences would come out without thinking about them, and, though we commenced by playing, we would finish up by fighting. My hon. friends opposite know the college—it is the Jesuits' College. They have now a separate college for English boys. The cause of difference between the boys was not religion only ; it may have been something else ; but, at any rate, we fought together. As men we are surrounded by friends who have been brought up in different schools, and we appreciate one another ; but that appreciation is not developed in children. A man appreciates in another man certain qualities for which he respects him, but a child cannot do that. I do not want to convert anybody to my opinions, because I know that those who have opposite opinions are as sincere and honest in holding them as I am in holding mine. But I am explaining my opinions ; and, holding them, when clause 16 of this Bill was brought down I hailed it with pleasure, and I was happy at the deliverance which my right hon. friend made on that occasion. It did not last, however. Why did it not last ? My hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers) says we are not doing what we would like to do ; we would like to do more, but we do what we can in a country like this. This is not the way our forefathers talked. This is not the way the men who built up Canada talked. When Sir John A. Macdonald, in 1863, voted for separate schools in the province of Ontario, the province of Canada at that time, he was not doing what he himself preferred, for he was in favour of public schools ; but he did so because he thought it was the best thing that could be done in the province of Canada at that time, on account of the different nationalities and creeds in Upper and Lower Canada. We have often seen occasions of the same kind. Shall I speak of something nearer to us ? In 1896 we had before parliament a question very much like the present one, except that we were dealing with a state of things which was existing at that time, whilst at present we are creating a state of things. In 1896 the Manitoba school question was before parliament. It had been before the country since 1890. I heard the other day the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) boast of having had a great deal to do with the Manitoba school business. I was sorry to hear him talk like that, although he gave some reasons, in a very clever way, which hid, if I may use the word, the odious part of the business. He declared that the separate schools were not efficient, that they were not what they should have been, and that money was squandered on them. I need not tell the House that those statements have been refuted time and time again. There may have been some abuses, as there are in most things, but on the whole the

separate schools in Manitoba were good schools and the teachers were good teachers. In most cases, the people not having the means to pay teachers, the parish priests were the teachers, and we know that they are men of education. My hon. friend from Brandon knows that politics had a great deal more to do with the abolition of those schools than the question of their efficiency. There was some railway business which put the government into a very bad position, and something was needed to divert public opinion from the deeds of the ministers. Our friend Mr. Dalton McCarthy had gone on a tour through the province of Manitoba. He was dissatisfied because Sir John Thompson had been chosen as Minister of Justice. He had hopes of being offered that position, although he might have refused it, and he went to Manitoba and inflamed the passions of the people. He told them that something should be done to deliver them from the influence of the hierarchy. It was there that he commenced his fight against the hierarchy, and questions of that sort will always greatly inflame public opinion. In a short time the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway), who was at the head of the Manitoba government, and the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) deprived the minority of that province of what they were entitled to. We have been told that the question in Manitoba was not the same question that we are discussing to-day—that in Manitoba, the provincial government had given separate schools and that the provincial government withdrew separate schools and the official use of the French language; and that was provincial rights. The minority complained. I need not give the whole history of the case. The question came before parliament; and I may say in passing that the Northwest ordinance was passed while we were in the midst of that turmoil. The question was before the Privy Council and before the courts. We were taunted on the stump everywhere because the Conservative government had not disallowed the Act of the legislature of Manitoba. My right hon. friend the leader of the government was sitting on this side of the House at that time, when the Hon. Edward Blake moved a resolution declaring that it would be wise for the Dominion government not to use the right of veto in cases involving religion or nationality, and that resolution was looked upon as such a wise one that Sir John A. Macdonald, sitting where my right hon. friend does now, rose and said: 'This is a motion which should have the unanimous support of the House'; and it had. This is why that Act was not vetoed. At that time my right hon. friend and his friends in the province of Quebec said that the government did not act because it was under the heel of the Orangemen of the province of Ontario.

And it was said in Ontario that the government was under the heel of the hierarchy in the province of Quebec. This lasted from 1890 to 1896. The constitutionality of the Act of the Manitoba legislature abolishing the separate schools had gone before the Supreme Court of Canada and the Privy Council, and the Privy Council in its first judgment declared that the Act was intra vires the Manitoba legislature. Again there was an appeal to the Privy Council, and that court declared that although the Manitoba legislature had the right to pass a law taking away the schools of the minority in that province, the minority had a grievance, and it was within the rights and the powers of the Dominion government to come to its rescue and remove that grievance. Then we had the Remedial Bill submitted to the Dominion parliament, and we all know what happened. When my right hon. friend moved the six months hoist, we were at the end of the session. But when the second reading of that Bill was proposed and carried by a majority of the House, who were the members that voted for it? Who were those who voted to do justice to the minority of Manitoba and to stand upon the rock of the constitution? It was, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative party which took that stand. And I say it to the honour of the Protestants and the Orangemen of Ontario and the maritime provinces, that they voted to do justice to the Catholic minority. I remember well Mr. Fairbairn, an old representative of the province of Ontario, declaring in this House, that although he was an old Orangeman he was going to vote in favour of the Catholic minority because he had sworn to be a defender always of minorities, whether Catholic or Protestant. I am reminding the House of these facts in order that, in these days, when we read so much in the newspapers about the intolerance on this side of the House, I may give my testimony on behalf of the Conservative English Protestants of this Dominion. In my opinion, the newspapers are in many instances doing more harm than good and inflaming passions and prejudices where it should be their endeavour to allay them. I have seen caricatures published of my right hon. friend which did not at all meet my approval and I have also seen caricatures of some of my hon. friends on this side which I think were altogether out of place. I regret these methods. I regret this holding up of our public men to undeserved ridicule and obloquy, because it cannot fail to have a mischievous effect on the people. I can sympathize with my right hon. friend in his present position. I can appreciate the difficulty in which he found himself, when the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) came back and took him by the throat and possibly threatened to inflame public opinion, I can well understand that my right hon. friend then found himself between two fires. On the one side was the persistent Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), who stuck, and rightly stuck, to his clause. On the other was the Minister of the Interior (Mr.

Sifton), who in all probability was going around to members of parliament—good men, honest men, against whom I have not a word to say, for I have nothing to say against men who may have different opinions from mine—going around to members not only from the Northwest but others, and saying to them: You cannot accept this; this will give clerical schools; this is putting for ever the majority of the Northwest Territories under the shackles of the hierarchy of Rome. Then, my right hon. friend no doubt felt convinced that in order to have peace he must accept the amendment now proposed. I remember hearing him very often say in this House that he never said anything until he had pondered it well, but that when he did, he stuck to what he said. He has not done so in this instance, and I am sorry for it. What is the proposal before us now? Those who want public schools are all right, public schools by this proposal will be established in the Territories for ever. But in what position will be those who are in favour of separate schools, who want to go home and say: I have supported separate schools; I voted against the amendment of the leader of the opposition because he said let us leave those new provinces to construe the British North America Act as they desire and establish what system of schools they choose. Some of my hon. friends will say: We could not accept that amendment of the leader of the opposition and therefore we voted for the amendment of the right hon. gentleman. But what is the amendment of the right hon. gentleman, and what is it going to give the minority of the Northwest Territories? Here is the amendment:

Section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, shall apply to the said province, with the substitution for subsection one of said section 93, of the following subsection:

1. Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to separate schools which any class of persons have at the date of the passing of this Act under the terms of chapters 29 and 30 of the ordinances of the Northwest Territories, passed in the year 1901.

Where the expression 'by law' is employed in subsection 3 of the said section 93, it shall be held to mean the law as set out in said chapters 29 and 30, and where the expression 'at the union' is employed in subsection 3, it shall be held to mean the date at which this Act comes into force.

That means that there shall be given to the minority in the Northwest Territories all the separate schools they want, so long as are instituted in those provinces the Protestant or public schools granted under the school ordinance, chapter 29 of 1901.

What are these schools? There are the public schools established by law by the Act of 1875 passed by a Liberal government, then re-enacted in 1885, obliterated in 1892 and smashed to pieces in 1901. These are the schools which the minority will have in the Territories the moment this Bill passes. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is something higher than office. In 1896 the Conservative party went down to its defeat because it stood by a principle. It has been badly rewarded.

Mr. FOSTER. Heaven remains.

Mr. BERGERON. But in this instance my right hon. friend has yielded to what he thought was a threatening majority. Well, what kind of schools is he going to give the minority in the Northwest Territories? Let me show by some hon. gentleman opposite what they are. What did the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) say? It was a sight for the gods to see how zealous were some of these gentlemen after they came back to the fold. The Minister of Finance does not think that the constitution compels us to give a system of schools to the Northwest Territories.

For the purpose of record, just let me read the section in the Act of 1875—section 11, chapter 49, Act 1875:

I have already read this, but I will quote it again so that it will appear in 'Hansard' with the rest:

When and so soon as any system of taxation shall be adopted in any district or portion of the Northwest Territories, the Lieutenant Governor, by and with the consent of the council or assembly as the case may be, shall pass all necessary ordinances in respect to education; but it shall therein be always provided, that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the Northwest Territories, or any lesser portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name the same may be known may establish such schools therein as they may think fit, and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor; and further, that the minority of the ratepayers therein, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein, and that, in such latter case, the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assessments of such rates as they may impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

Now the Minister of Finance says he wants to explain that. He goes on:

That is the clause in the Act of 1875, and with the change of a few words, which in no way disturbs its substance, that is the clause we find to-day in the Northwest Territories Act.

The hon. gentleman makes a mistake there. Further on he says:

Again I say I do not for a moment contend, and I do not understand that my right hon. friend contended, that, as a matter of constitutional right fixed by the words of the statute, we are obliged to re-enact that clause. I go further. I do not hesitate to say that in my view, at any time since 1875, it was within the power—I do not say the moral right—but un-

doubtedly within the power of this parliament to repeal the Act of 1875.

What does that mean ? It indicates that this has never been repealed. If so, what can that mean but that it is the law of the Northwest Territories ?

Therefore, I am not claiming that there is any binding legal obligation, but I do say that we are obliged to look carefully into the circumstances under which that Act was passed ; and if we find that at the time it was regarded by its friends and supporters, and parliament generally, as an Act which was passed, not only for the present but the future, that creates a moral obligation which this House may well take into consideration.

Now, if I remember the words of the right hon. Prime Minister with regard to section 16, his statement was that we were obliged by the constitution to grant what is granted under this section. But the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) says something else. He goes on and wants to show that these schools are Protestant schools. And he insists upon it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Where does the Minister of Finance say that these are Protestant schools ? Can the hon. gentleman point that out ?

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, if my hon. friend will wait. I have a good deal of it to read yet. One of the things mentioned in the regulations quoted by the Minister of Finance is :

To authorize text and reference books for the use of the pupils and teachers in all schools hereinbefore mentioned, as well as such maps, globes, charts and other apparatus or equipment as may be required for giving proper instruction in such schools.

That is, the curriculum of both public and separate schools. Then he goes on :

What is there, Sir, in all this to which anybody can take exception ? These details constitute the essential elements of a national school system. That system prevails to-day in the Northwest Territories, and that system we propose to continue by the legislation which we have presented in this House. Well, there is still a shadow of difference. The difference between a minority school and a majority school in the Northwest Territories is so exceedingly small that he who would attempt to make a definition of it would find himself in difficulty.

What is a public school in the Northwest Territories? Is it a Protestant school or a national school ? If it is a national or Protestant, where is the difference ? What does my hon. friend call a sectarian or Protestant school if not one where from the time the child goes in at nine o'clock in the morning until he goes out again at half-past three in the afternoon, he hears not one word of religion ?

Mr. BERGERON.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. What does my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) say? Does he designate that as a Protestant school ?

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend (Mr. A. Johnston) ought to put that question to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), for it is his speech that I am reading.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I ask the question in all seriousness. I am as much interested in this matter as is the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). He has made the statement that the Minister of Finance said in the course of his observations that these were Protestant schools. As I understood the hon. minister, he made no such statement. I would like to know if the hon. gentleman can refer me to any such statement on the part of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. BERGERON. We do not need to discuss matters of that sort in connection with the points I am making. So far as I am concerned, schools in which there is not a word of religion are non-sectarian, or what I have been accustomed to hear called Protestant schools.

Mr. FIELDING. I understand the hon. gentleman said that I had called them Protestant schools.

Mr. BERGERON. I may have expressed myself that way, but what I meant was that I had inferred from what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) said that he spoke of these as Protestant schools.

Mr. FIELDING. I have not had the advantage of hearing this whole discussion, but I may say that I have never used such a statement.

Mr. BERGERON. That may be. But I have not finished what I was saying. It may be that the minister (Mr. Fielding) did not use the word 'Protestant.' But I infer from the way he treated the matter that he referred to what I have been accustomed to hear called Protestant schools. Because to me schools where you do not speak of God are Protestant schools.

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot admit that a school in which you do not speak of God is a Protestant school. I have always believed that there was a God in the Protestant religion as well as in the Roman Catholic.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, but if you do not recognize Him, what is the use ?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) forgets that under the school law of the Northwest Territories there is provision for recognizing the existence of God, because where the trustees so desire the school can be opened with the use of the Lord's Prayer.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, if they wish it. But it is left to the discretion——

Mr. FIELDING. Yes—no coercion.

Mr. BERGERON. But if my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) and I were boys together in such a school, the mere fact of the Lord's Prayer being used would not make it seem to me anything but a non-sectarian school. And the use of the Lord's Prayer is only permissive.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) will allow me, I can tell him that in the province of Ontario there are many public schools that are attended entirely by Catholic children.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not doubt it; nor do I doubt that it is a good thing. Let me explain, so that my hon. friends and I may understand one another. Amongst our people in the province of Ontario—I have heard it often in electioneering—when they speak of the public schools they call them 'les ecoles Protestantes.' So, as I have been accustomed to think of it, the word 'Protestant' in that connection does not mean the same as it means, perhaps, to the Minister of Finance or my hon. friend from Cape Breton. I am sure they will make allowance for my mode of expression. The hon. gentleman (Mr. A. Johnston) does not wish me to speak in French, I suppose?

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. No.

Mr. BERGERON. I have been quoting the speech of the Minister of Finance. I followed him with great care as he spoke. And I think I am right in saying that he sought to explain what had brought him back to the fold; and the reason was that these schools were, as a matter of fact, public schools.

> Then there is a further provision that all schools may be opened with the reciting of the Lord's Prayer.
>
> It is permissible.
>
> Does anybody object to that? I hope not. . . . . I want the House to consider seriously, I submit the proposition again, that if it be true, as I say, and I believe I am correct beyond the power of contradiction, that from the moment that the school opens in the morning up to half-past three in the afternoon there is no difference between a separate school and a free national school——

Mr. LEMIEUX. What do they do after half-past three?

Mr. BERGERON. They go out and play. My hon. friend knows very well that if he went to one of these schools, after half-past three, he would go out and play, he would not attend religious instruction.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think perhaps my hon. friend could not recite the Lord's Prayer at the opening of the school.

Mr. BERGERON. I have said it here in the chair very often before my hon. friend became a member of this House.

> ——and if the only point of difference between them is that half hour of religious instruction, is there enough in it to quarrel about?

The hon. the Minister of Finance is making apologies because, forsooth, he says:

> ——and if the only point of difference between them is that half hour of religious instruction, is there enough in it to quarrel about, and to have public meetings and agitation throughout the length and breadth of this land?

No, not for hon. gentlemen who are in favour of separate schools, but there is enough in it for those who want to keep schools from the minority in these provinces. Referring to those who are agitating against separate schools and who are not in favour of doing anything at all, so far as schools are concerned, in granting autonomy to the provinces, the Finance Minister says:

> When they discover, as they will, in the light of the debate which will take place in this House now and in the next few days, when the people of Canada shall learn that we have in the far west to-day a system which is practically a national school system, and that the only point of difference between us is with respect to that small matter of a half hour of religious instruction, I think the great mass of the Protestant people of Canada will say that they regret that there has been any agitation on the subject.

Well, I am not talking for those who are in favour of public schools when I call the attention of the House to these views. I want this speech to be translated and to go through the province of Quebec because my hon. friends who are from that province will go back to the people and say: We voted against the amendment of the hon. leader of the opposition, we were opposed to the amendment the object of which was to keep the minority out of their schools; we voted for the party that has at its head the men who want to render justice to the minority; we voted for the motion of the right hon. leader of the government. That is why the hon. Minister of Finance has said that these schools to all intents and purposes are national, non-sectarian schools. The Minister of Finance has said something in another place to which I wish to call the attention of the House. I cannot find it in 'Hansard' but it is reported to me by another hon. member:

> I believe that the people of the Dominion to-day are not going to have their minds engaged with an elaborate analysis of constitutional questions, which nine out of ten of them will never read, and which the whole ten will fail to understand.

Not very complimentary to the whole crowd.

I believe that the poeple of Canada, since this unpleasant question is brought before us, will expect us to meet it plainly and openly, and discuss it with the hope of finding a happy solution.

I believe there is a great deal in that. My hon. friend was not in at the commencement of my remarks but I said myself that I did not care so much what the constitution did as to provide such a solution of this matter as would contribute to the peace of the provinces which it is now proposed to admit to the confederation. I might also read what my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) has said. His remarks were about on the same line as those of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. He also tried to impress the House with the idea that we have virtually national schools in the Northwest Territories and that we have no more separate schools in the proper sense of the word. I need not read what he said because what he said has been repeated in some other places and it is already in 'Hansard.' My hon. friend the Minister of Finance said one thing which I commend to the attention of the House and of the country. He spoke about good faith. He said that in keeping that national school system we have to allow a half hour for religious instruction because we have moral obligations towards the minority. That is right. I believe that to be the case but in such a matter as that I would go a great deal farther than the law. In a country like this we cannot have too much tolerance wherever it is honourable and feasible. My hon. friend the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) has said many things which I would like to touch upon but I do not wish to detain the House beyond six o'clock.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. BERGERON. What does my hon. friend say? I commend this to the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice. The hon. member for Brandon quoted Mr. Forget, the Lieutenant Governor of the Northwest Territories, as follows:

Until the date of the ordinance of 1892 we had never been denied the right to administer our schools, to regulate the programme of studies, to choose the text books, to control the religious instruction and to authorize the use of the French language whenever thought convenient. These rights were exercised by the Catholic section of the board of education, and strictly speaking they were sufficient to preserve to our schools their distinctive character of Catholic schools.

I think hon. gentlemen understand that. That is what we understand by separate schools. It is not in the word; it is in the spirit if it. Later on the Lieutenant Governor states:

All the schools, public and separate, Catholic and Protestant, are placed by the ordinance of 1892 under the direct control of a Protestant superintendent of education and of a council of public instruction.

Further:

And a council of public instruction, composed of the members of the executive committee, in which the Catholics have not one single representative.

Then Monseigneur Taché says:

The petitioners had this and other dangers in view when they said:

The effect of the ordinance is to deprive the Catholic separate schools of that character which differentiates them from public or Protestant schools——

There it is again. He is not afraid to mention the word,

——and to leave them Catholic separate schools in name only, and such it is submitted is its obviously necessary effect.

This is not said in an ungenerous spirit. Amongst our people an English school is a Protestant school. They understand it in that way; not in the improper sense of the word at all. We do not use the word 'Protestant' in a bad sense because there are many good Protestants as there are good Catholics. The Archbishop uses that word only in that sense. Again, the Archbishop says:

In spite of all these protestations this ordinance in the dispositions which concerned us had and could have but one object, that is, the abolition of all distinct character of our schools. Thanks to that ordinance and to the regulations of the council of public instruction which followed, this end has been to-day practically attained. Nothing essential now distinguishes the Catholic schools from the Protestant schools but the designation, now ironical, of separate schools.

Now this is Archbishop Taché who says that and it has not been denied. On the contrary it is brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) to show why he supported the amendment of the Prime Minister after resigning on account of the Bill as it was first brought down. He wants to show why he came back and says that he is supporting to-day by the amendment of the Primae Minister a system of schools which is in fact a system of national schools and to prove it he places on 'Hansard' the words of a man whose utterances should have a great deal of weight with those who are in favour of separate schools. Archbishop Taché said:

Nothing essential now distinguishes the Catholic schools from Protestant schools but the designation, now ironical, of separate schools.

Then Judge Rouleau speaks in the same line. Then what does the hon. member for Brandon say:

I have read these extracts for the purpose of showing that when the ordinance of 1892 was passed the distinctive character of these schools as separate schools, as denominational schools, as schools controlled by a sectarian body for sectarian purposes, absolutely disappeared.

That is in 1892.

We have it that the clerical control of these schools was absolutely abolished.

That is what the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) says. This is the point which he has in view, that the clerical control of these schools had been abolished by the ordinance of 1892. He says :

It seems to me perfectly clear, that in abolishing the distinctive character of the schools, the legislature of the Northwest Territories did go beyond the powers that were bestowed upon it by this section of the Act of 1875.

In making a report on one of the ordinances passed shortly before 1892 but somewhat similar in its effect—not so sweeping in its effect—Sir John Thompson in substance reported that this ordinance, contracts or diminishes the rights of minorities to an extent not contemplated by the Act of 1875, and that the Act of 1875 must nevertheless be held to remain in force notwithstanding the passage of the ordinance.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I was reading the words of the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), his own apolgy for the extraordinary position which he assumes on the measure now before the House. He left the government because he could not agree with his colleagues on clause 16 of the Bill as originally presented, and when he spoke here he seemed to take a great deal of pride in the fact that the government had amended that clause and substituted for it the provision as to separate schools which we are now discussing. We have had it stated throughout the country, by the friends of the government in some quarters, that the government had not changed their policy on this question, and that the amended clause is in effect the same as clause 16, the difference being only in the phraseology. If we are to believe what the ex-minister (Mr. Sifton) says, and he seems to know all about it, it is quite clear that he carried his point against the government, against the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice, and the framers of clause 16, and that these gentlemen had to take back water at the command of their ex-minister. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) said, 'Hansard' page 3103 :

Let me give what I conceive to be an accurate resumé of the principles which are enforced and carried out by these ordinances. We have one normal school with uniform normal training for all teachers, and when I say all teachers, I mean teachers of all schools, separate and public ; uniform curricula and courses of study for all schools of the same grade ; uniform text books for all schools whatever ; uniform qualification of teachers for all schools whatever ; complete and absolute control of all schools as to their government and conduct, by the central school authority set up by the legislature under the ordinances ; complete secularization of all schools between nine o'clock in the morning and three-thirty in the afternoon, except that any school, if the trustees so desire, may be opened with the Lord's Prayer ; distribution of the legislative grant to all schools according to educational efficiency on principles set out in chapter 31.

Then, where there is a public school, the minority, Protestant or Roman Catholic, may organize a separate school ; but every separate school is subject absolutely to all the foregoing provisions, and is in every sense of the term a public school. If the Protestants are in the minority in a district, their school is called a separate school ;——

I call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the fact that what we in the province of Quebec would call a Protestant school, is, according to the member for Brandon, a separate school when the Protestants of the district are in the minority. The ex-minister continued :

If the Catholics are in the minority in a district, their school is called a separate school ; but both are public schools. They are absolutely similar save for one distinction : where the trustees are Protestant, there is Protestant teaching from half-past three to four, and where the trustees are Roman Catholic there is Roman Catholic teaching from half-past three to four. That is absolutely the only distinction between these schools.

Then the hon. gentleman read the amended clause as follows :

Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to separate schools which any class of persons have at the date of the passing of this Act, under the terms of chapters 29 and 30 of the ordinances of the Northwest Territories passed in the year 1901.

Commenting on this clause, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) is speaking to the element of our population who are opposed to separate schools ; he is making an apology for the amended clause, and he says :

What does that preserve ? I have read these ordinances through, and all that I can find this section to preserve—and it is an important thing—let us not exaggerate or minimize, let us know exactly what we are doing—I think that this is what we are doing and all that we are doing. This section preserves the right of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority to have their school, a separate school in name, but a public school in fact, in a separate building if they wish. That is the right it preserves. It preserves, secondly, the right of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority in such school to have religious teaching from 3.30 to 4 o'clock in the afternoon.

Further on he says :

But there cannot be under this system any control of the school by any clerical or sectarian body.

The aim of the hon. gentleman is to show that he is opposed to clerical or sectarian teaching more than anything else. Well, Sir, let me tell him that those who are in favour of separate schools in the proper sense of the word are in favour of clerical and sectarian teaching, or otherwise those schools would not deserve the name of separate schools. He says :

There cannot be any sectarian teaching between nine o'clock in the morning and half-past three in the afternoon. So that, so far as we have objections to separate schools based upon the idea of church control, clerical control, or ecclesiasticism in any form, this system of schools is certainly not open to that objection.

And yet the newspapers which are supporting the government in the province of Quebec are boasting that the Prime Minister is preserving for ever the separate school system which the people of the North-west Territories had at first—not the present system of separate schools existing there, which does not amount to anything. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) goes on to speak of Manitoba and he boasts of what he has done :

When we in the province of Manitoba undertook to remove what was a school system that I said was inefficient to the point of absurdity, we found ourselves confronted with many and serious difficulties.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I stated this afternoon what I believed to be the real cause of the changing of the school law in Manitoba, and when the member for Brandon says that the clerical school system is inefficient, I can refer him to such an excellent authority as the right hon. the Prime Minister who will tell him that he is entirely mistaken. If the hon. gentleman said that the elementary schools in our province, or in other provinces for that matter, if he said that what we call in French les petites ecoles are not perfect, there might be some ground for his statement, because it is unfortunately true that those who pay for the maintenance of these schools do not contribute sufficient to secure the services of first-class teachers. However, these elementary schools are mostly attended by very young children and up to the present time they have been found fairly sufficient for their purpose. But when the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) makes the sweeping assertion that clerical schools are inefficient he simply does not know what he is talking about. Let him look around him in this House and see the men on both sides, who are the alumni of clerical schools. Let him look at the men in this chamber who have been taught in colleges and schools conducted by priests ; let him look at the men who have received what he calls a clerical education, and perhaps he will revise his judgment. The hon. member for Brandon has not to look only on this side of the House ; let him look at the men sitting around him and beside him who have received their education in schools controlled by the clergy, and I think he will have to admit that they are men of education, men of high attainments, men of whom any country might well be proud.

More than that ; the hon. member for Brandon is unjust, because, if I am well informed—and I have taken my information from some newspapers of repute published in the province of Manitoba—the Catholic university of St. Boniface to-day is above competition. It is understood that in that university, the young men in the highest classes have nobody to compete with, from Toronto to the Pacific coast and they are obliged to compete amongst themselves. They have carried off prizes, medals and every distinction. Nobody knows this better than the hon. member for Brandon. These young men are taught by ecclesiastics ; they are the subjects of clerical schools. So I say to those who might be tempted to believe him that when the hon. gentleman talks of the inefficiency of clerical education, he is out of the way altogether.

In answer to my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), who had declared that the proceedings of the Manitoba government in abolishing separate schools in that province might have been obnoxious to somebody, the hon. member for Brandon said : 'Well, Sir, I am here to say that we cannot abolish abuses of that kind by handling people with kid gloves.' No, we all know that he did not use kid gloves. We all know that not only was the minority in Manitoba robbed of its system of schools, not only was the French language abolished, which is something appreciated by those who speak that language, but their buildings to the amount of $14,000 were stolen from them by the Manitoba government and were never given back to them. So when the hon. gentleman says that he did not use kid gloves, he is right. I would rather say he used a crowbar or a pince-monseigneur to steal the separate schools of Manitoba, or what they had and their buildings.

My hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) speaks very well—I have heard him before—but he always comes to a conclusion entirely different from his premises. Every time I have heard him on these subjects, I have always seen him starting against the government and finishing by being entirely with the government. He thought he would make a point in his speech by criticising my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. He even went so far as to say that he had lost confidence in the leader of the opposi-

tion. Well, that did not pain my hon. friend very much, because he had never supposed that the hon. member for Labelle had any confidence in him. The hon. member for Labelle, if I infer rightly from the words he uttered, is entirely opposed to the amendment. Still, I believe, though he did not say so in words, that he will vote for the amendment. So it is no use for me to discuss his speech, because, though it was witty and well delivered, its conclusion did not follow from its premises ; consequently there is no result to it.

My hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain), in the very eloquent speech he made in the House in answer to the hon. member for Labelle, spoke of the generosity of those men whom the hon. member for Labelle was ready to asperse. My hon. friend from Peel forgot one thing, however, when he spoke of the generosity of Ontario, he should more properly have spoken of the generosity of the Conservatives of Ontario. My hon. friend said that only lately there was an election in the province of Ontario, and the Prime Minister of the day had said that if he came into power he would see that every nationality and creed would be represented in his government. What did he do when called on to form an administration? He kept his word ; he acted like an honourable man and according to the traditions of the Conservative party. Mr. Speaker, who was the man who for the first time, appointed to the upper House of this parliament a French Canadian from the province of Ontario—a man coming from your own city, the Hon. Mr. Casgrain ? Sir John A. Macdonald, whom the Liberals in our province have always tried to make a scapegoat of, as a Protestant and a fanatic. Who appointed the first French Canadian senator from the province of Prince Edward Island, in the person of the Hon. Mr. Arsenault, but a Conservative administration ? And when that gentleman died, our French Canadian premier replaced him with an English-speaking Canadian. Who appointed Senator Poirier, another French Canadian, from the province of New Brunswick, but a Conservative administration, which also appointed Judge Landry ? I am saying this to show that the Conservative party has traditions of which it may well be proud, and that it stands by those traditions. There may be in our party some gentlemen who have ideas different from the others, but the party as a whole has a history of which it may well be proud. We cannot say the same of the other party. We know that if hon. gentlemen opposite have stood upon any platform in the past, it has been only to get into power. Their traditions are all new ; they have never been in use yet. In 1896, the Liberal party prevented the Conservative party from doing an act of justice in the settlement of the Manitoba school question. We may be told that the province of Quebec has sanctioned that. It is true. There are many considerations for that ; but it does not deprive the Conservative party of the honour of having done its duty. I heard my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) yesterday saying in a sarcastic way that hon. gentlemen opposite may boast that three appeals have been made to the people since that time, and that the people have sanctioned the position taken by my right hon. friend. What does that prove ? It proves only one thing—and I say it with all modesty—that they were believed more than we were believed ; but it does not prove that they were right. Sir, when I am speaking about traditions, I want to say this before I resume my seat, that upon all those dangerous questions, national or religious, the Conservative party has always been found in the path of duty, ready to do what was best in the interest of the country. They paid for it dearly sometimes ; but history is written, and when that history is read by those who will come later, the young men of the day, whether they are educated in separate schools or in public schools, it will tell them the truth. The Liberal party cannot continue to play double face with each and every one of these questions.

Something has been said, unfortunately, about the hierarchy ; and something has been written in the papers against the hierarchy. But it was defended here by gentlemen on both sides, and I was proud to hear gentlemen who do not belong to that creed speaking of the hierarchy in most eulogistic terms. Let me say that, although we have had this measure before the House for over a month, I have never received a letter or word of communication of any kind regarding it from any bishop or priest, and I know a great many. What does that prove ? It shows, not that the Catholic clergy are not interested, but that they have too much delicacy and too much sense of their own dignity to undertake, without being requested to do so, to advise a member of parliament as to what course he should follow. Our clergy have been deceived in the past, and if my remarks have been long and tedious, it is because I wish to put on record in 'Hansard' what I consider necessary to enable them to know who are those by whom they have been deceived. We have heard a great deal about petitions, and we have seen a great many petitions presented in this House, but the only petition that I have received from my constituency is one that is signed by fourteen Methodists —whom I know to be most respectable men—in the city of Valleyfield. We have been told of certain petitions which have been sent out in the province of Quebec by the Club Jacques Cartier at the instigation of some members of this House. But that statement was positively denied by my hon.

friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). My hon. friend stated positively that there was not a member in this House from the province of Quebec who had anything to do with these petitions. I am not pretending that there would be any harm in these petitions, people have the right to petition ; but I am merely pointing out that if any petitions were circulated, they were circulated by some one who took upon himself to do that work without having had any authorization from any member of parliament. I have not seen any of these petitions, but I understand that in all of them the right hon. gentleman is asked to stand fast by clause No. 16 of the Bill as introduced. The signers of these petitions were afraid that he might drop that clause ; they were afraid that he might be influenced by the other wing of the government, and abandon clause 16 for something else. Well, they were not wrong, because my right hon. friend has given up that clause and accepted an amendment which is satisfactory to the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). One need not go far to show what kind of an amendment that must be. I call the attention of those who are in favour of separate schools to Mr. Sifton's approval. If the amendment before the House is acceptable to the hon. member for Brandon, you may judge for yourselves how far it goes in favour of separate schools.

In 1896 there was a hierarchy in the province of Quebec just as there is to-day. What happened then ? After the elections were over and my right hon. friend was returned to power with a large majority from the province of Quebec, one of the boasts of the Liberal politicians and the Liberal press was that they had been able to carry the province against the hierarchy. If that were true, what did it mean ? It could only mean that the hierarchy had no influence at all. But if it had no influence, how could we be called a priest-ridden province ? It is not true, however, that the hierarchy had no influence, and I can tell my right hon. friend something which he knows quite well. The hierarchy in 1896 did not do anything. They did not do as much as I would have liked them to do in their own interests. So broad and nonpartisan were the mandements they published that they were accepted by the Liberals as being in their favour. But if the day should come when that hierarchy would feel impelled to take a hand in the contest, their influence would be soon felt. My right hon. friend remembers that when there was trouble in Manitoba, when a rebellion was threatened in that province, it was not on its troops that the government relied. No, the government of that day did not send out its troops, but telegraphed to Rome to his Lordship Bishop Taché, and asked him to return home and establish peace in the province of Manitoba. Bishop Taché did so. The government of that day must had confidence in his ability and influence. Many were the promises which were made him then, but which have never been carried out. For this I am not blaming my right hon. friend. The responsibility lies with other public men, but unfortunately the Liberal party had more to do with it than anybody else.

To come back to the position taken by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). We are now about to create two new provinces. We are in a sense enlarging Canada. We are making it stronger and more important. I would advise the House not to stand so much upon the letter of the constitution, but to do what is best calculated to make all creeds and nationalities in these new provinces live together in harmony. What we require in this country is tolerance and conciliation, and we cannot have that when we call for the sacrifice of any principle or the destruction of any right. Every nationality and creed in this Dominion should be made to feel that it has the respect and the confidence of other nationalities and creeds, if we want Canada to be united and ever to achieve anything. I sincerely hope that the question now being discussed is the last of the kind that will ever come before parliament. I sincerely hope that in the end we shall all join hand in hand. I trust that every province and every Canadian worthy of the name, and who desires the welfare of his country, will join hand in hand with his fellow-citizens to work together for what we believe the best interests of Canada, and not allow national or religious questions to interfere with that work.

In speaking of the position taken by my leader, I wish to say openly that, to my mind, he made an admirable speech upon this question, a speech to which nobody can take exception. We may not all share the conclusions to which he came, but every man on this side, and I believe on the other side as well is convinced that the leader of the opposition spoke in all sincerity, without any bias, and influenced solely by a desire for the welfare of Canada. So much is that the case, that if in that amendment of his, ten words were struck off at the end, I would be disposed to support it. And in doing so I would be standing on a good principle, namely, provincial autonomy and provincial rights ; and in my opinion clause 93 of the British North America Act would give the new provinces the school system they have to-day. But as a doubt has been expressed by the Minister of Justice, I would have clause 16. But here is where I think there is a difference between the position taken by the hon. the leader of the opposition and the right hon. the First Minister. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition leaves the door open by his amendment to the people of the new provinces to give themselves separate schools. From not one man on this side of the House have I heard a word against the system of separate

schools in itself. Those who have spoken have declared in favour of allowing the people to have whatever system of schools they please.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) allow me a question?

Mr. BERGERON. Yes.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Was the hon. gentleman in the House when the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said that the system of separate schools was a bad one?

Mr. BERGERON. I did not hear the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) say that.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman for Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne) refer to separate schools as they exist in the Northwest?

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I asked my hon. friend if he contended that the system of separate schools in that province was a bad one and he answered yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I said that that system, in my judgment, was not a good one. But I added, in connection with the schools in the Northwest, that our fight was not against the people giving separate schools if they desired to do so, but against interference with their rights to have any system they chose.

Mr. BERGERON. I accept the word of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and I would remind my hon. friend from Montmagny that it could not be otherwise, as the separate schools in the Northwest are, for all practical purposes, the very same as the public schools. Now, the amended Bill of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), in my opinion, will prevent altogether the establishment in the Northwest of separate schools such as I would like to see. He perpetuates the provision of the ordinance now existing. And the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) has declared that the schools under these ordinances are entirely public schools. Put this upon the statute-book and you prevent for ever the establishment of separate schools in the Northwest provinces. On the other hand, the position taken by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) leaves it open to the provinces to establish any system of schools they desire.

Now, I fear I have kept the House too long. I had intended to speak much more briefly. But hon. gentlemen will pardon me because this is a very important question, and I hope that it will be long before we shall be called upon to speak on any such subject so delicate and so dangerous. When I am called upon to address the House again, I hope it will be on some question upon which members of the same party can agree. Still, though this is an unfortunate question, a dangerous question, I wish to pay this compliment to my colleagues in this House, on both sides of the House—that the newspapers of the country might well take a leaf out of 'Hansard' for they will find there that every man who has spoken has been able to express his opinion frankly yet in such a way as not to hurt the feelings of any of his fellow-members. Hoping, as I have said, that we shall not have again such questions to deal with, but that we may all unite for the best interests of Canada, I am reminded of the words of Tennyson, with which I close:

> Let Whig and Tory stir their blood,—
> There must be stormy weather;
> But for true results of good
> All parties work together.

Hon. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa). Mr. Speaker, will my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) permit me to extend to him my congratulations, and to assure him of the pleasure which I share with other gentlemen upon this side of the House, because of the fact that he will give his vote on the measure before you in support of the government of to-day. Whatever may be thought of the reasons which the hon. gentleman gave as justifying that conclusion, it is a gratification to know that, on this occasion, he will vote with us. He said that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) had devoted most of his speech to remarks antagonistic to the course of the government, and still concluded by declaring that he would vote with the government. I am afraid that the hon. member for Labelle has found a very ready imitator in that respect, in the person of the hon. member for Beauharnois—in fact the hon. member (Mr. Bergeron) has gone the hon. member for Labelle one better; the whole speech to which we have just listened, has been—I say it without offence—a tirade against the government of the day. He did not say at the end how he would vote, but I presume he will vote against the amendment.

Mr. BERGERON. I may have forgotten to say that. I will not vote for the amendment.

Mr. BELCOURT. Then, what has been said has been well said. The Canadian national family will extend to the two new provinces in the west their hearty congratulations when, on the first of July next, they take their place in the family circle and around the family table. I hope that by that time the note of discord which has been heard in one part of this country will have ceased to sound—I believe in fact that that will be the case, and that even if it still sounds, it will not mar the chorus of pride and satisfaction with which all Canada will extend a welcome to the two new sisters in the west, with hearty good wishes for their progress, prosperity and happiness. In discussing this Bill I do not

intend to take up the time of the House in referring to those features which are not the subject of contention. As to irrigation, as to financial arrangements, as to the division of the territory into one or more provinces—as to these, there seems to be but little dispute. With your permission, I will devote the time during which you may indulge me, to treating with the main question in dispute, the question of education, and incidentally, the control of the public lands. As to the question of education, section 16 preserves, in my opinion, what we Roman Catholics hold as part of our religious faith—religious instruction in the schools. I need not say that I am a believer in that doctrine, that I am in that respect, altogether at one with the church to which I belong. And it is a gratification to me to know, and I feel fortified to know, that there are many great men, not only in this country, but in the mother country and elsewhere, not professing the religion to which I am attached, who also believe in the necessity of religious instruction in the schools. I say that section 16 is altogether justified under the letter and spirit of our constitution. I say also, and I shall endeavour to demonstrate it, that, on grounds of highest public policy, the enactment of section 16 is altogether expedient and is rendered absolutely necessary. We know the rights which are preserved by section 16. If separate schools are allowed, I care not whether they are called denominational schools or whatever name may be given to them. To my mind there is nothing in the name, or very little—it is altogether in the principle, a principle which is sanctioned, admitted, and perpetuated by section 16, insisting on the right or privilege of the minority to give religious instruction in the schools of the Northwest Territories.

This privilege is recognized and in existence to-day by virtue of the statute of 1875 and by virtue of the ordinances of 1901 which have been passed pursuant to that statute. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition devoted a large portion of his speech to demonstrate as a legal proposition that the statute of 1875 could at any time have been repealed and that it could be repealed to-day. He cited the authority of Sir John Thompson and others in support of that contention. I do not think that any lawyer will dispute that. It is quite clear and must be clear to any lawyer that the Act of 1875 could have been repealed and that it could be repealed now at this very moment. But, Sir, it has not been repealed. It is in existence to-day. The ordinances which have been made in pursuance of that statute are in existence and they will be in existence on the 1st of July when these two provinces join the confederation. The effect of section 16 is to preserve and perpetuate that right upon the admission of the two new provinces. I say, that, under the letter of sections 93 and 146 of the British North America Act, that clause is not only justified, but it is necessary. The real question with me is to determine what is the right of the province at the moment it enters the union in the words of section 93. The whole question with me is determined by the fact that the right or privilege mentioned in the section exists concurrently with the creation or birth of the province as a province. The word 'province' in section 93 means the province, not before, but the province at the moment that it enters confederation and for ever thereafter. But before it does enter as a province it is not a province of the union and consequently if it has been admitted as a territory the provisions of section 93 have no application. The provisions contained in the British North America Act, 1867, are provisions which apply to and which regulate the relations of the provinces of the union which determine the rights, privileges and obligations of the provinces as provinces. In section 1 to section 146 of the British North America Act are contained the provisions, stipulations and agreements made between the original partners to the confederation, which are applicable to the provinces of the union and to the provinces of the union only. Surely it cannot be contended that the original British North America Act, 1867, section 1 to section 146, was intended to regulate and determine the relations of any part of British North America other than the provinces which agreed at that time to form part of the confederation or which later on were to be added thereto. I repeat, Sir, that the right to be preserved is the right concurrent with and co-existent with the creation of the province or existing at the time of its entering into the union. Take section 93 and what is its plain ordinary meaning? I say, referring to the words of the section, that the word province in the section—

—Any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the union.

——means nothing else than a province coming into the confederation as a province and not as a territory. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition, in order to make good his point, says that because the Territories had been admitted into the confederation in 1870 section 93 has no longer its application; in other words, that the provisions of section 93 must be applied as to the Territories in 1870, because, according to him, that is the date at which they came into the union. Well, I say that in order to come to that conclusion my learned and hon. friend has had to do what he charged the government with doing in this case, he has had to interpolate into section 93 a word which is not to be found in section 93. He has had to interpolate the word 'territory' into the section which is not to be found in the section. He has had, in fact, to substitute for the

word 'province,' which is in section 93, the word 'territory,' which is not in section 93. I think I am not doing my hon. friend an injustice in stating that as his argument.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not disposed to admit that my hon. friend (Mr. Belcourt) is exactly stating my argument. However, my argument is before the House and when we come to discuss this question afterwards in committee we will have an opportunity of interchanging opinions. But, I would like to ask my hon. friend one question, if he will permit me, and it is this: I would infer from what he has just said that he considers section 2 of the Bill now under discussion as being sufficient to bring into operation in the new provinces the provisions of section 93, and that these provisions would perpetuate in the new provinces the provisions of section 14 of the Act of 1875. That is the logical deduction from what my hon. and learned friend has just said. Am I correct in so understanding him?

Mr. BELCOURT. If my hon. friend will permit me as my argument develops I will give him an answer to his question, although I am not quite sure that I thoroughly understand his question. It may be that it was doubtful, if, under the original provision of the British North America Act, 1867, we could admit the Territories otherwise than as provinces. I am willing to go that far on the lines of my hon. friend's argument. It is doubtful with me, if the Act of 1871 had not been passed, whether we could have admitted the Territories except as full-fledged provinces to the union. I have not the slightest doubt that the principal reason which prompted the Act of 1871 was the very doubt to which I have referred. But the passing of the Act of 1871 has, to my mind, removed any doubt which could have existed to that effect. What is the general scheme of the Confederation Act? The general scheme of the Confederation Act, as has been pointed out by others, was to establish a national partnership between then fully independent and autonomous provinces or colonies subject only to one jurisdiction, and that was the imperial jurisdiction, whatever it may have been and which I have no doubt varied from one case to the other. But the idea of the fathers of confederation was to make an agreement—a partnership agreement I will call it—for the purpose of determining the conditions, the powers and the relations of these autonomous provinces, as between themselves and for the sake of creating a central power and enlarging the importance of their positions in British North America. They came together for the purpose of determining the conditions of that partnership. The Act of Confederation determined what the relations of these autonomous provinces as between themselves and the central power and what their powers, rights and obligations would be. It also provided, by section 146, that later on these portions of British North America which at that time did not come into the confederation might do so, and I say that it was the intention then, under the letter of the constitution, and that it was then provided and stipulated that if other provinces should later on enter the confederation they should come in under the same terms and conditions, and that the conditions which were made applicable to the original provinces were uniform conditions applicable not only to the original provinces but to those which might be added to the partnership later on.

It was not contemplated by the provisions of the British North America Act, sections 1 to 146, that there might be admitted at that time as full-fledged provinces any portion of British North America then in process of formation. It was not thought that those portions of territory in the west, which at that time had very little population except the coureurs de bois and a few stray settlers here and there, should be admitted as provinces; it was not contemplated at that time, for instance, that there was any possibility of admitting them except as temporary portions of the confederation. I say that the provisions contained in the British North America Act, 1867, so far as they concerned the original portions of the confederation, or such provinces which might be admitted later on, are absolutely immutable; they are unchangeable, at all events, so far as this parliament is concerned, although they might, it is true, be subject to amendment by the imperial parliament. But the Canadian parliament cannot materially alter the specific provisions of the British North America Act.

Mr. SPROULE. You are proposing to do it by this Bill.

Mr. BELCOURT. Not at all. It has been argued, and it has been stated repeatedly, that the Northwest Territories, when they came into confederation in 1870, came in subject to all the provisions of the Act of 1867. Such argument would have some foundation, as I have said, if the Act of 1871 had not been passed, but the Act of 1871, in my opinion, was passed principally in order to get over that very difficulty. It was thought at that time, after Manitoba and the Territories had been taken in, in 1870, that the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, were insufficient to cover the case of the Territories. There arose a doubt at that time whether all the provisions of the Act of 1867 were applicable to the Territories upon their admission. There also arose another doubt as to whether the powers of this parliament in admitting territories as such under the provisions of section 146 had not been exhausted. It was thought by some that we had exercised the power given to us by section

146 in admitting these Territories as territories, and that being so, it was doubted if it was any longer open to us, if we still had the power to admit them later on as provinces. That, I think, was the principal reason of the amendment of 1871. That was the principal object of that legislation, and I think it was also the principal effect of it.

Mr. LENNOX. If that contention is correct, what would be the effect now ? Would that statute that was passed then be sufficient to cover the case with which we are now dealing ?

Mr. BELCOURT. I cannot understand the hon. gentleman's question at all.

Mr. LENNOX. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that it was thought that the power of section 146 of the British North America Act was exhausted.

Mr. BELCOURT. I said a doubt arose.

Mr. LENNOX. That was supposed to be the reason for getting another Act from the imperial parliament. If that Act was necessary at that time, would that Act be sufficient for the present case, or would it be exhausted by the exercise of it at that time?

Mr. BELCOURT. I said that the Act of 1871 was passed for the purpose of allowing us to admit these provinces, on the supposition that the power conferred by section 146 had been exhausted.

Mr. LENNOX. I have not recently been looking at the section with this particular point in view, but my recollection is that the statute only provides for the case of Manitoba, and would not be sufficient to cover the new province now about to be admitted.

Mr. BELCOURT. It covered the case of Manitoba in so many words, but by necessary inference it covered the case of the Territories as well. The hon. gentleman must remember that when this Act was passed the Territories had been admitted into conederation as territories ; Manitoba had been admitted as a province, and the Act of 1871 was passed, as I have said, for the purpose of allowing us a power which it was thought we had already exercised under 146 by admitting them as territories, a power to admit them later on as provinces. I say that by inference the Act of 1871 enables us to do that to-day.

There was another reason to which the hon. gentleman also referred, that is, the provision for the control of lands under the Manitoba Act. It was thought at the time that that was possibly ultra vires, and that was another reason why the Act of 1871 was passed ; but one has only to look at the preamble of the Act of 1871 to see clearly and plainly that these were the reasons that prompted that Act. The preamble reads :

Whereas doubts have been entertained respecting the powers of the parliament of Canada to establish provinces in territories admitted, or which may hereafter be admitted into the Dominion of Canada, and to provide for the representation of such provinces in the said parliament, and it is expedient to remove such doubts and to vest such powers in the said parliament:

The preamble of the Act is plain, and seems to leave no question that the object of the Act was to remove the doubts to which I have made reference. Under the provisions of the Act of 1871 we have had the power ever since it was passed to apply to these Territories such provisions of the British Columbia Act as we saw fit. We have had the power to apply the original provisions of the British North America Act in whole or in part, in any modified manner that we chose, and we have had the power, as was pointed out by my hon. friend, to repeal these provisions and, from time to time, to substitute for them other provisions of a similar or of a different nature. As far as the Territories are concerned, it must be remembered that they came into the confederation without any special provisions applicable to them, that it was left to this parliament to determine, from time to time, what powers we should confer upon them. That seems to me to be absolutely justified. As I have pointed out, as every one knows, the Territories were then in their early infancy. They had a very sparse population, the whole matter was tentative ; the jurisdiction which the Act conferred on them must necessarily for manifestly obvious reasons be a tentative one; and, therefore, it was provided, under section 2, that we might, from time to time, apply to them such provisions of the British North America Act as we should deem proper. I say that that discretionary power vested in this parliament with reference to the Territories was with reference to territories only, and not with reference to provinces. I say that under the Act of 1871 this parliament has not to-day the right to apply to any province coming into the union any but the original provisions, from section 1 to section 146, of the Act of 1867. I say that the Act of 1871 was made for the purpose only of the Territories, and cannot to-day have any application, and should not have any application whatever, when we are taking a province into confederation.

The Act of 1871 was passed for the purpose of completing the Act of 1867 ; not for the purpose of modifying it, not for the purpose of repealing any of its provisions, but simply in order to add to the Act of 1867 provisions which it was found had been omitted from that Act. Its scope was limited to the entry, control and government of new territories. Under the rules of construction, I submit that my argument is quite justified, because I think every lawyer in this House will agree with me that the modification of a

specific, clear, definite provision cannot be modified by another provision made in general terms to be found in the same Act or in another Act to be read together with it. All the provisions of the Act of 1871 are susceptible of application and are susceptible of interpretation apart altogether from the provisions of the Act of 1867. What better proof of that do we require than the course we have pursued for the last thirty-five years during which we have administered these Territories altogether by virtue of the provisions of the Act of 1871. Since 1870 when these Territories came under our control, we have not governed them by virtue of the Act of 1867 but by virtue of the Act of 1871. Therefore, the Act of 1871 has not in any way modified or altered the specific provisions of the Act of 1867, and so long as these Territories remain Territories, this parliament of course continues to hold absolute jurisdiction over them. The legislation in these Territories shall be just exactly what this parliament chooses to make it; from time to time this parliament may repeal provisions previously enacted or substitute for them provisions entirely different. But when the status of the Territories is changed and they are made provinces; when they are elevated to the dignity of provinces, then come in and are immediately applicable the provisions of the Act of 1867. The new provinces are entitled to all the benefits and all the provisions of the Act of 1867; they are entitled to all the provisions which were applicable to and which could be claimed by the original provinces of confederation. Therefore it is that I say, that when these Territories are being admitted as full-fledged partners in the original partnership of agreement, when they are admitted as full-fledged provinces of the union they are entitled to the full benefits of section 93 of the Act of 1867 and the rights or privileges referred to in subsection 1 of said section are preserved to the new provinces. Every one admits that we could have repealed the Act of 1875, that we could have modified it, and that we could have replaced it by another Act. If we had simply repealed the Act of 1875 the ordinances made thereunder by the Territories would have all been wiped out as a necessary consequence, but not having repealed the Act of 1875 the ordinances which have been enacted by virtue of that Act remain, and they will be in existence on the first of July when these provinces come into the union. It has been argued, and I am not prepared to dissent, that section 16 of the present Bill constitutes a modification of the Act of 1875. I shall not discuss whether it does or whether it does not, nor shall I say whether the modification if any is an important or an unimportant one. But the very moment it is admitted that this section 16 constitutes a modification of the provisions of the Act of 1875, then there immediately arises the necessity for the enactment of this very section. It has been said that this section 16 of the Bill we are discussing is the result of a compromise, and that may be or it may not be the case. I admit that it is in some sense and in some respects a modification of the law of 1875, not a modification of the principle of religious instruction in the schools, which in section 16 is again upheld, but a modification probably in the manner in which the principle is to be applied, but the leader of the opposition has told us that because it constitutes a modification of the provisions of the Act of 1875 we are, in enacting section 16, amending section 93 of the British North America Act. I do not think that is correct and I would like to ask my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) if he will contend that we could not to-day by a separate Bill enact the provisions of section 16.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You mean with regard to the Territories?

Mr. BELCOURT. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why certainly we could enact any legislation with regard to the Territories, and we could repeal it.

Mr. BELCOURT. Quite so; the jurisdiction is in this parliament and it will remain here until these new provinces come in. What is the difference then between enacting section 16 in this Bill or in a separate Bill?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would think there is a very plain difference.

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not think there is.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do.

Mr. BELCOURT. I think not. We have the jurisdiction, and having the jurisdiction what is the difference between enacting section 16 by itself or along with other provisions?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The difference is so extremely obvious that I would suppose it could hardly escape the attention of my hon. friend. In one case we are dealing with territories, which, as my hon. friend has just explained, are under the absolute legislative jurisdiction of this parliament until they are created into provinces. In the other case we are creating them into provinces subject to the provisions of the British North America Act as to the distribution of legislative power between the Dominion on the one hand and the provinces on the other. I would think that is a pretty obvious distinction, but it may not commend itself to my hon. friend.

Mr. BELCOURT. I fear the hon. gentleman has not appreciated my argument.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am afraid I have not.

Mr. BELCOURT. For reasons which I am not going to discuss, it appears that the majority of the members of this House think that the time has arrived when the provisions of the Act of 1875 shall be changed. Some of us think it might be changed in a broader sense, while others think it might be changed in a more restrictive sense. Whatever of that there has been a compromise; the majority in this House have agreed that the legislation of 1875 is not the legislation which should govern in the Territories to-day. I say then, that we have a perfect right under the constitution and under the provisions of the Act of 1871 to enact for these Territories which are still under our jurisdiction, Territories over which no other jurisdiction exists, I say we have the power to crystallize by a separate enactment or as we are now doing as part of this measure the provisions of section 16 of this Bill, and these provisions would be in existence when these two provinces come into the union on the first of July next. In other words, we have the right to determine to-day what shall be the law in reference to education in the Northwest Territories. We have now the right and power to repeal or modify the provisions of the law of 1875 as to education.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Certainly. I would like to ask my hon. friend a question just here. We have the right to determine that; therefore we can by an Act of this parliament withhold any power whatever in respect of education from these Territories while they are in a territorial condition. It would follow therefore, if my hon. friend's argument is correct, that we can do exactly the same thing when we create them into provinces and reserve to this Dominion absolute control of the educational system. Is that what my hon. friend means ?

Mr. BELCOURT. Not exactly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think it is, but it is the logical outcome of his argument.

Mr. BELCOURT. What I mean is this—my argument may not commend itself to my hon. friend, but I would like him to understand what my argument is.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like my hon. friend to make that clear.

Mr. BELCOURT. My argument is, that to-day with reference to education, and for that matter with reference to all other subjects, the Territories are under the jurisdiction of this parliament. We may repeal those rights or change them at any time we wish. I say that to-day a majority of the members of this House, representatives from all parts of the country, have agreed that the time has come when there must be some modification, important or unimportant, of the Act of 1875, and we have the right to make that legislation until our jurisdiction is exhausted, until it ceases, which will be only on the 1st of July next. Until then we have a right to make such legislation as we deem proper for the Territories in reference to education. I hope I have made myself plain.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am trying to understand my hon. friend, but will put another question and see if I can make myself plain to him. As I understand his argument, we have full legislative jurisdiction over the Territories. We have seen fit to give them only a modified power to legislate with respect to education—that is to say, we have imposed a limitation on their power. Because we have done that, he says we have an absolute right to continue that limitation when they are created into provinces. If that is good argument, is not this good argument, that because we might absolutely withhold from those Territories, under our legislative power, any jurisdiction whatever in respect of education, therefore, for exactly the same reason that my learned friend has advanced, we can withhold from them when we create them into provinces any jurisdiction whatever in regard to education ? That is my hon. friend's position.

Mr. BELCOURT. Not at all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to know what it is, then.

Mr. BELCOURT. I will give an answer which may not be convincing to my hon. friend, but may be to others. It is this. My hon. friend did not follow me closely. I said with reference to the special, clear, definite, specific provisions of the British North America Act, that it is not in our power to modify or change them in any way either with reference to the provinces which came in in 1867 or with reference to those coming later on and one of these is the provision with reference to education contained in section 93. But I say that under the Act of 1871 our power of legislation with reference to those Territories is absolutely unlimited and now at this moment fully existent and unimpaired.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When we form them into provinces ?

Mr. BELCOURT. To-day our power is unlimited.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But when we form them into provinces ?

Mr. BELCOURT. That is another subject. I am not dealing with that. I say that to-day it is within our power to enact such legislation with reference to education in the Territories as this parliament thinks fit—so long as they are Territories, of course. When they become provinces, on the 1st of July next, our powers will have ceased. Whatever we may decide now to

be the law with reference to education, in the Territories will be the law and if that law is in existence on the first of July next, when the new provinces come in, will be perpetuated by their charter by virtue of section 93. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition has told us that the provisions of the British North American Act apply automatically or mechanically—I do not remember which word he used.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not go quite that far. If my hon. friend will pardon me—I do not want to interrupt him except when he does not state any argument correctly—I said that section 2 of this Bill would bring into operation section 93 of the British North America Act, so far as it could have any application to the Territories, and therefore I did not see any necessity or justification for section 16. That a moment ago—whether or not he thinks section 2 of the proposed Bill brings into force in the new provinces the provisions of section 93, and, if it does, whether or not the provisions of section 93 have application, considering the conditions existing at the time when the Territories will become provinces.

Mr. BELCOURT. It is rather immaterial to me whether the provisions of section 93 of the British North America Act apply automatically or mechanically, or whether the enactment of a clause like clause 2 is necessary to make them applicable. It is rather unimportant to me whether that is done by virtue of the Act itself, or whether the duty is imposed upon this parliament when creating provinces to say that those provisions shall apply. But I am not prepared to say that my hon. friend is not right. It may be that the provisions of section 93 apply, as he says, automatically or mechanically; and I must say that I am inclined to believe they do. Of course, he and I disagree altogether as to the time when in this case the application is to be made. He goes back to the time of the entrance of these Territories into confederation, in 1870, and in order to do that he has to read into section 93 the word 'Territory,' which I do not find there. I say that the provisions of section 93 apply at the time of the entrance of the province as a province.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In order to understand my hon. friend's argument, might I ask him one more question? In case my hon. friend is right in the view he has just taken, what after all is the necessity of section 16? Is it not superfluous, absolutely superfluous?

Mr. BELCOURT. No. I stated that section 16 constitutes, in a measure, unimportant perhaps, but in a measure, a modification of the law of 1875, and for that reason there is a necessity for section 16 to-day. If the law of 1875 were not modified in any way, perhaps my hon. friend would be right in stating that there would be no necessity for section 16, or for section 2 for that matter; but section 16 is in some respects a modification of the law as it exists to-day, and that is why I say it is necessary for this parliament to enact it to-day, and this parliament has power to enact it. That is my argument.

Mr. SPROULE. The man in the street would have a hard time in getting that into his head.

Mr. BELCOURT. Well, I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I am hardly addressing my argument to the member for East Grey. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition also argued, and he relied upon the opinion of Mr. Christopher Robinson, that section 93 applied only to Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will not interrupt my hon. friend, but I would rather have him take my argument as I stated it.

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not think it can be seriously argued that section 93 was framed for the purposes of Ontario and Quebec only, and that its provisions are to be applied only to Quebec and Ontario. It is true that subsection 2 of section 93 covers the case of Quebec and Ontario, that it was framed for that purpose, and that it protects the rights of the minorities in Quebec and Ontario only. But then I would like to ask, if it was intended by the general provisions of section 93 to protect the rights of the minority, whether Catholic or Protestant, only in Ontario and Quebec, why enact subsection 1, which reads as follows:

> In and for each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions:
>
> 1. Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools, which any class of persons have by law in the province at the union.

Surely this was not intended for the province of Ontario and Quebec only manifestly this was intended for provinces other than Quebec and Ontario. Surely this was intended for such other provinces as came into the confederation at that time and such as woulld come in later on. I say that the opinion expressed repeatedly in this House that by section 93 it was intended to protect only Ontario and Quebec with reference to education has no foundation whatever, and the merest examination of section 93, subsection 1, will convince any one that it was intended to protect the rights of the minority in any part of the country which was then brought into confederation, or which would be brought in later on.

Otherwise subsection 1 has no meaning. No one in this House has endeavoured to give to subsection 1 any other meaning. It is not susceptible of any other interpretation or application. I say therefore, that when subsection 1 was framed, the fathers of confederation evidently intended by it that whatever other provinces might come into confederation, besides Ontario and Quebec, they should be similarly protected, so far as education is concerned, and the same provision applied to them or to any other portion of the British North America Act which might later on join the union. I have no hesitation in my mind regarding that conclusion. I have no doubt that the conclusion to which I have come, after considerable investigation and thought and research, is the right one. But it is quite evident that my opinion is not shared by every one. It is quite evident that it is not in accord with many of the legal opinions which down to the present have been expressed in this debate.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Up to a certain point it is absolutely in accord with my own.

Mr. BELCOURT. I am afraid that my hon. friend and myself differ at the crucial point. It is not surprising that this should be the case because we are dealing with a very intricate constitutional question. We are dealing with the interpretation of the spirit and letter of a constitution, made nearly 40 years ago, and now being applied to conditions and circumstances which are very complicated, and which at that time could only have been pictured in the mind's eye. It is not surprising therefore that the Confederation Act should give rise to these legal divergencies and disputes. In fact it is rather surprising that during the forty years which have elapsed since that Act was enacted, there have not arisen more difficulties and divergencies ; and it speaks highly for the wisdom and ability of those who framed that Act that greater difficulties have not arisen as to its interpretation both in the letter and the spirit. In any deliberative body, such as a legislature or parliament, it is very difficult to have constitutional questions calmly considered and threshed out as they should be and any opinion definitely agreed upon. But, however divergent may be our views upon the letter of the constitution, there ought to be no doubt as to its spirit. Any one who will read and scrutinize the various provisions of the British North America Act in the light of what happened before and led up to it cannot but conclude that it was clearly the intention of the framers of the constitution that the rights of the minority, whether Protestant or Catholic, should be protected. Whether that minority lived in the province of Quebec or the province of Ontario or was to be found in any other portion of British North America, the dominant idea was the same ; and whether a man lived on the banks of the St. Lawrence or the Saskatchewan or the Red river, he was to enjoy the same rights and privileges as regards education and the exercise of his religion. The spirit which prompted the fathers of confederation to recognize the rights and privileges of the minority in matters of conscience surely had equal force whether that minority lived in the east, west, south or north. Therefore it is manifest that the fathers of confederation intended whatever may be said as to the effectiveness of the language used, that the same principle should apply and the same rights be respected and preserved in every portion of the Dominion. And because these differences in constitutional views have arisen to such an extent that it is difficult to get half a dozen men in this House to agree what the letter of the constitution means, it has become absolutely necessary to have section 16 enacted and made part of this Act.

I referred a moment ago to what had preceded confederation. I referred to the rights of the minority with reference to the preservation and the recognition of liberty of conscience and liberty of religious belief. I say that from the very inception of British power in British North America from the very day of the conquest when the colony of Quebec capitulated to the British—from that day on, at every stage, on every occasion when the imperial parliament and the Canadian authorities were called upon to deal with the rights and religious belief of the minority, that religious belief always received the sanction and protection of imperial and Canadian authority. By articles 2 and 6 of the capitulation of Quebec, that principle was sanctioned and recognized. By articles 27, 28, 29, 32 and 38 of the capitulation of Montreal, it was also recognized. By the treaty of Paris, clause 4, by the Quebec Act, clauses 5, 7 and 8, by the constitution of 1791 section 35, by the Union Act of 1840, clauses 42 and 46,—by all these Acts and on all these occasions religious freedom and liberty of conscience were absolutely recognized and granted to every subject, and more particularly to the Catholic minority in this country. It is not surprising therefore that when the fathers of confederation in 1863 met in the city of Quebec for the purpose of framing the conditions upon which the then provinces of Canad should come together and live together as a happy family, and upon which new provinces should be admitted in the union—it is not surprising that on that occasion what had been done on all the previous occasions to which I have referred should have been repeated, and the same rights and privileges and liberty of conscience should have received the sanction of those who were framing

the British North America Act. The whole principle which is crystallized in section 16 of this measure is one which is as old as British Dominion in America and which has been recognized on every occasion, from the very day the colony of Quebec capitulated down to the present. Why then in 1905 should the rights of the Catholic minority, which has grown from 60,000 to two million and over, not receive the respect and sanction of the parliament of Canada ? If it was just and proper, as the right hon. the leader of the House pointed out the other day, in 1867, that the rights of the minority in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario should be preserved, is it not equally just and proper that in 1905 the Catholic or Protestant minority in these new provinces should also have its rights recognized and perpetuated ? Where is the difference ? What was right and proper in 1867 is surely just and right in 1905.

Mr. Speaker, in opening my remarks, I said I would endeavour to show that according to the letter, as well as to the spirit, of the constitution, section 16 was absolutely necessary. I also said that, for what I believed to be reasons of high public policy, it was expedient and necessary that we should enact section 16. In the divergence of opinion expressed by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), by my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), by Mr. Christopher Robinson, K.C., and to-day by my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. L. P. Demers), for all of whose opinions I entertain the greatest respect, I find the strongest possible reason for saying that considerations of high public policy make it expedient and necessary to enact section 16, as we are now doing. Who in this House or in this country is yearning for a renewal of the agitation we had some years ago over the Manitoba Schools Act ? Who is willing to have the passions and the prejudices of the people aroused in the manner in which they were aroused at that time, bringing this country almost to the verge of civil war ? Who is willing to have the energies and activities of the nation paralyzed in the way they were paralyzed at that time ? I would ask the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) if he would be willing to-day to suggest that the Act of 1875, and the ordinances enacted thereunder by the legislature of the Northwest Territories, should be repealed ? Would my hon. friend rise in his place in this House and suggest that we should repeal the provisions of the Act of 1875 ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I never suggested that.

Mr. BELCOURT. I believe not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What I have said is that that is not a matter for me, but a matter for the people of the Northwest Territories. And I have said further that I do not believe that we shall advance the position by passing a law which we have no power to pass. That is all.

Mr. BELCOURT. I quite believe, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) would not to-day suggest that the Act of 1875, and the ordinances enacted thereunder, should be repealed ; for I know he would not be willing to take the risk which that would involve. My hon. friend must realize that that is the position in which the government was placed ; and if my hon. friend the leader of the opposition were on the treasury benches, that is the problem that would face him.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not so understand it.

Mr. BELCOURT. I do, if the hon. gentleman does not. The government had to do one of three things—to continue the legislation of 1875 as it was, to repeal that legislation altogether, or to modify it. The government did not choose to repeal this legislation any more than the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) would have dared to advise the repeal of it had he been in power.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. Belcourt) that section 15 of the Bill expressly continues the laws in force in the Northwest Territories ? The hon. gentleman apparently has not read the Bill.

Mr. BELCOURT. Yes, I have read it, I still hold the opinion that section 16 constitutes a modification of the law of 1875. As I have said, I do not intend to discuss the extent of that modification ; but, as was demonstrated by the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), it does constitute a modification. I have no doubt on the subject, and I do not think there can be any doubt. Obliged to do one of the three things to which I have referred, the government did not dare, any more than the leader of the opposition would have dared, to repeal the Act of 1875. It chose to continue that Act in a modified form, thus doing one of the three things I have mentioned. But, in speaking as he has spoken in this House, the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) has virtually taken the position that the law of 1875 should be repealed. He has told us that this matter should be left entirely to the new provinces and that we should not interfere, and that there is absolutely no danger to the rights of the minority being in any way taken away or impaired, but that we must trust to the spirit of justice and fair-play of those who live in these new provinces. For myself, I have confidence in the spirit of justice and fair-play among the inhabitants of the Northwest Territories. But how long would that feeling exist and the spirit of justice remain if the agitation that hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends and their press have caried on in this province

were carried on in the Northwest ? How long would the rights of the Catholics to religious instruction in the schools of the Northwest remain, if the views of the hon. member from East Grey (Mr. Sproule)—which views, I have no doubt, he entertains sincerely, were carried out ? How long would the Catholic minority in the Northwest have the privilege of having religious instruction in their schools ?

Mr. SPROULE. I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt) that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has never spoken or written one word that would be fairly susceptible to that interpretation.

Mr. BELCOURT. Perhaps it is time to learn now where the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) stands.

Mr. SPROULE. I stand exactly where I have always stood. I objected to the interference with the rights of the provinces to deal with the subject.

Mr. BELCOURT. We are not dealing with the question of provincial rights now, but with the question of religious instruction in the schools.

Mr. SPROULE. But we are dealing with a subject laid down in the British North America Act, a subject with which it is the birthright of every province to deal—the subject of education.

Mr. BELCOURT. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule), no doubt, thinks he has triumphantly aswered my question. I submit that he has done nothing of the kind. What I ask is whether he is in favour of religious instruction in the schools or not ? Will he answer ?

Mr. SPROULE. That is my own business. I wish to say that I was led to refer to the question in the remarks I made upon the subject, by what the Prime Minister said in introducing the Bill. In reply to that, I referred to some matters which otherwise I should not have introduced into my speech at all.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to be permitted to put a question to my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule). Will he deny that he wrote letters to residents of the Northwest Territories, even before these Bills were introduced, pointing out to these gentlemen to whom he wrote that this was the time for them to get rid of separate schools for all time ?

Mr. SPROULE. I deny it. There is not a word of truth in it.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to say that I cheerfully accept my hon. friend's words and to add further that I have been misinformed by a gentleman who lives in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. BELCOURT. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is a great adept at beating about the bush and turning sharp corners. My hon. friend is not candid—I will not use another expression which I might—when he refuses to state whether or not he is in favour of religious instruction in the schools. But we know what his views are.

Mr. SPROULE. Better than he does himself.

Mr. BELCOURT. He is entitled to his views. He has consistently advocated certain views in this House and elsewhere, and they are not favourable to religious instruction in the schools. He has told us that in the House. He has told us that he is not in favour of separate schools. What does he mean by it ? I do not know, but I would assume that he was not in favour of religious instruction in the schools. If the hon. gentleman wants to be candid he will tell us that he is not only not in favour, but he is unalterably opposed to religious instruction in the schools.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman wants to cross question let him try his hand on the hon. the ex-Minister of the Interior and the hon. Minister of Finance.

Mr. FOSTER. They will be more sympathetic.

Mr. BELCOURT. The hon. member for East Grey is the witness now before the court, but it is very difficult to get him to give an answer. I am sure I am not going to tackle anybody else until I have got something from him. I take it according to the French maxim, qui ne dit mot consent, that the hon. gentleman is unalterably opposed to religious instruction. And he is not alone. I can count them by the dozens on the other side of the House who are opposed to religious instruction in the schools. We have heard them say so one after the other—yes, by the dozens on that side of the House who are opposed to religious instruction in the schools. Well, Sir, I want to know—

Mr. SPROULE. How many on that side?

Mr. BENNETT. Give them a run of the commandments over there.

Mr. BELCOURT. I want to know, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentlemen who sit on that side of the House have their way whether you will have very much religious instruction in the schools of the Northwest or if you will have that spirit of fairplay and justice upon which we are told we must absolutely rely ? Why, Sir remember Manitoba. We had confidence in the spirit of justice and fair play of the people who inhabited Manitoba, but how long did it take to shatter our hopes and

our confidences in the spirit of fair play and justice?

Mr. INGRAM. Who did it?

Mr. BELCOURT. Well, the people of Manitoba did it and the people of the North-west Territories to-morrow will do it if the hon. gentleman can have his way.

Mr. INGRAM. I stood up in 1896 for the rights of the minority in Manitoba when the hon. gentleman's deskmate refused to do it.

Mr. BELCOURT. Well, Sir, we have been told by other hon. gentlemen of what they did in 1896 and we were told yesterday by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) that what he did in 1896 he does not propose to do again. He gave us the reason why he did not propose to do it again. He told us that it does not pay politically.? That is the reason. I believe the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) will probably think also that it does not pay and he does not propose to do it again.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. BELCOURT. Well, well.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has given an alleged reason as to why I said I would not probably do it again. His reason is—

Mr. BELCOURT. No, the hon. gentleman gave it himself.

Mr. FOSTER. His reason was that I would not do it again because it does not pay. My reason was not that.

Mr. BELCOURT. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; it is exactly the reason he gave. He told us that in 1896 that the people did not appreciate his self-sacrifice. That in 1900 they did not appreciate his self-sacrifice; that in 1904 they did not appreciate his self-sacrifice and he said that politically it did not pay and for that reason he was not going to do it again.

Mr. FOSTER. It is now put so baldly that I must deny it absolutely and ask the hon. member either to give his authority from the 'Hansard' or to immediately withdraw it—one or the other, and I appeal to Mr. Speaker to see that that is carried out.

Mr. BELCOURT. If the hon. gentleman gets very threatening perhaps he will not have it carried out. If he will appeal to my instincts and desire me—

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. BELCOURT. I have the floor.

Mr. FOSTER. And if you wish to persist in saying what you have you may keep it. If you do not wish to be honest and fair and do what an honest and fair man would do you may keep it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. BELCOURT. Well, if the hon. gentleman has ended this show of inflamed temper perhaps he will allow me to proceed. I understood the hon. gentleman to tell the House that in 1869 he had, much against his own inclination, much against his own desires, supported the Remedial Bill. He did it, he told us, when he had no desire to do it. He did it because he wanted to protect the rights of the minority. I understood him to say that his course was not appreciated by the people of this country, that in the election which immediately followed this great act of disinterestedness on his part was not appreciated by the people and that on the contrary they supported the opposite side. I understood him to say that the same thing happened in 1900 and again in 1904, that it did not pay politically, and that as far as he was concerned that was the end of his sacrificing himself. If I am wrong in my understanding of what the hon. gentleman said I am wrong honestly. That is the impression which I gathered from his speech, but if the hon. gentleman tells me that it is not the language which he used I am prepared to accept his statement. Perhaps he will permit me to read what he did say on that point.

Mr. FOSTER. Read; that will be better.

Mr. BELCOURT. (reading):

> Now, Sir, I never was a separate school adherent, I never believed in separate schools as against national schools. In 1896 I stated my belief, as I state it now; I knew it was not politically to my advantage, I knew it was not politically to the advantage of the Liberal Conservative party; but, Sir, without thinking of ulterior things, I said to myself——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BELCOURT. Perhaps my hon. friend will allow me to read:

> —there is the constitution, there is the pronouncement of the highest judicial tribunal in this empire, there is the minority coming with a grievance and having the right to appeal to the Dominion government and the Dominion parliament, the only power that has jurisdiction to right their wrongs I said to myself: I believe it is right, I believe in the policy of attempting to carry out the constitution. Let me ask this question: If my right hon. friend, in 1896, had thrown his forces with the forces that made for remedial legislation, who can doubt that we would have carried it in this country? No one can doubt it.

At page 3384 of 'Hansard' the hon. gentleman went on:

> And I make bold to say that as long as grass grows and water runs, I do not feel disposed to go against that will three times expressed of the people of this country.

I have nothing to withdraw, I refuse to accept the statement which the hon. gen-

tleman just now made because it was not a candid and honest statement.

Mr. FOSTER. Then if my hon. friend will allow me——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. BELCOURT. The hon. gentleman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. A point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is rising to a point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. My point of order is simply this, that I have been misrepresented, whether knowingly or not.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. I am quite competent to state my point of order and any one who takes exception to it may do so afterwards. But let me state my point first. I rise to this point that whether knowingly or unknowingly the member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) has misrepresented my position and he has——

Mr. BELCOURT. I read 'Hansard.'

Mr. FOSTER——and he has misrepresented it on a very vital point.

Mr. BELCOURT. I read 'Hansard.'

Mr. FOSTER. He has declared that my position was this, that I did support remedial legislation in 1896 but that I would not support it again, and have so declared in the House, because it did not pay politically.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Now I think that is as clear a statement as I can make as to what the hon. gentleman has just said. I stated that that was not a proper representation of my position, that I have stated in the House that I was not an adherent of separate schools, but that I believed the constitution of this country gave to a minority one method of access for redress and that after the decision of the courts and the decision of the Privy Council had been given, that road was open and I said I believed that although it was not politically to my advantage, and it was not as I believed politically to the advantage of the party to which I belonged——

Mr. BELCOURT. Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BELCOURT. Surely that is not a point of order; I would like to know what the point of order is.

Mr. FOSTER. I am stating my position—

Mr. BELCOURT. I would like the hon. gentleman——

Mr. BELCOURT.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BELCOURT. I want the hon. gentleman to state what the point of order is?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

An hon. MEMBER. Wait until the Speaker calls him to order.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) cannot state my point of order. It must be my right to state my point and as he has interrupted me I shall have to commence a little further back than where I left off. I stated that, although I did not believe at the time it was my advantage politically, and I did not believe it was to the advantage of the party to which I belonged politically, I believed it was constitutionally right and that I did it because I believed it was constitutional and that it was my duty to do it. Then I said after that had taken place there was a power higher than the constitution and that power was the sovereign will of the people; that after the position was laid before the people in 1896 in 1900 and in 1904 the people by their votes had endorsed the party that opposed remedial legislation and consequently, as long as water ran and grass grew, I did not think I would be found in that same programme. Now my position is as I have stated. The statement made by my hon. friend is exactly to the reverse. Mine gives as a reason a regard for the principle of the constitution and a regard for the will of the people. The hon. gentleman stated that my reason was that I would not do it again because it did not pay.

Mr. BELCOURT. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to continue this acrimonious discussion. I made a statement, I gave the proof and I leave it to the House to judge.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BELCOURT. I have nothing to withdraw, absolutely nothing to withdraw.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the hon. gentleman one question? Does he yet persist in saying that I declared yesterday in the House that I would not again vote for remedial legislation because it did not pay?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BELCOURT. I did not make that statement at all; that was not the statement I made.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) will admit that it is customary to accept a statement made by a member if he has been wrongly reported, misconstrued, or wrongly understood. The moment a member gives a personal explanation it is customary to accept the explanation.

Mr. BELCOURT. I accept the personal explanation given by the hon. gentleman

and if it is as unsatisfactory to the other members on this side of the House as it is to me I am willing to let it go for what it is worth.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think that is quite right; I do not think it is quite right for my hon. friend to take that position. There is a distinct rule laid down in books on parliamentary procedure that if an hon. gentleman in this House says that his remarks were not intended to bear a certain meaning that must be accepted unreservedly.

Mr. BELCOURT. I have accepted the statement the hon. gentleman has made.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Belcourt) has not accepted it in my opinion.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Leave it to the 'Hansard.'

Mr. TAYLOR. The 'Hansard' does not prove it.

Mr. BELCOURT. I think I may go on.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) states that he understood the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Foster) to state a certain thing. The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Foster) gives an explanation and the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) is willing to accept the new statement. I think the point of order is all settled.

Mr. BELCOURT. I said I accepted the statement of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Foster).

Mr. INGRAM. Then we understand that the member for Ottawa——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down; order, order.

Mr. INGRAM. I will ask Mr. Speaker——

An hon. MEMBER. There is no point of order.

Mr. INGRAM. I am in order; I want to know first whether or not——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. INGRAM——the member for Ottawa——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. BELCOURT. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. INGRAM. Mr. Speaker I ask your ruling.

Mr. BELCOURT. Order.

Mr. INGRAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. INGRAM. I can stay here all night if my hon. friends——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand you rise to a point of order.

Mr. INGRAM. I do.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Please state it.

Mr. INGRAM. I want to know through you whether the member for Ottawa used the words 'to pay' and whether that is in order?

Mr. BRODEUR. That is decided.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have given my ruling. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) may have summarized unjustly the member for Toronto, but the member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) has declared that he accepted the statement of the member for Toronto (Mr. Foster). I have given my ruling.

Mr. BELCOURT. We are told that in this matter we should rely upon the spirit of fair-play and justice of the people in the new territories. I was proceeding to tell the House that we must in this matter remember Manitoba, when I was interrupted by the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). I wish to say that in my own judgment in matters of this kind we ought to do what good business people do in every day dealings and transactions. Whilst people believe and take it for granted that other people are honest and intend to be honest until the contrary is proven, yet they make an agreement, when they decide upon something, they reduce it to writing. Until the day of universal fair-play and justice, until the day of universal honesty, which I think most will admit is not going to be in the very near future, I think people will continue to have more confidence in and to place more reliance upon the written agreements of other people than they will upon their spirit of fair-play and justice. That rule applies to nations as well as to individuals.

We have made an agreement, we have decided what is to be done with reference to those new provinces and it is far better for the peace of this country, far better for every consideration, that that agreement should be committed to writing as it is by enacting section 16. When we look at what section 16 merely perpetuates it is astounding to hear the objections that are made to it. Section 16 simply consecrates the principle of religious instruction in the school, and I should like to ask: What principle is violated; what wrong, legal, moral, natural, or constitutional is done? Does the exercise of the privilege claimed by the minority cause injury to anybody; does it entail upon any one in this wide Dominion the deprivation of any right or any privilege; does it take anything away from anybody; does it hurt, hamper or injure any one in the slightest degree; does it do

violence to the conscience of any one that there should be religious instruction in the schools. Whose conscience is violated by the privilege that is given to the minority to have one of their own religion come to the school room at stated hours to give the children religious instruction ? Mr. Speaker, to put the question is to answer it. The principle recognized by section 16 hurts nobody, and yet for weeks and for months past the Conservative press, the public halls and some of the pulpits in this great province have been filled with angry and unjust declamations, with impassioned and violent denunciations, with appeals to the passions and prejudices of the majority against the minority. This House has been flooded with petitions protesting against the so-called tyranny involved in this legislation, and we have heard a great deal about the shackles and the fetters which we are about imposing upon the poor helpless provinces of the Northwest. The editor of one of the most prominent newspapers in this province had the temerity to say on the public hustings in the city of Toronto, that in this country you must have absolute unity of race and creed. Mr. Speaker what does that mean? It means that the Catholics of this country are to be absorbed or annihilated ; it means that the Catholics in general and the French Canadians in particular are to be wiped out. Why, Sir, we are told that the province of Quebec must be wiped out of confederation, all because forsooth the Catholic minority in the new provinces want to have religious instruction in their schools. Our Catholic clergy have been daily assailed and insulted; our priests have been held up to the electorate of the country as retrograde, grasping and tyrannical. Under the pretense of protecting provincial rights in the new provinces ; the rights, the religious convictions, the prejudices if you will, of two-thirds of the Canadian people have been made the subject of harsh, unjust, unworthy and unfair criticism and attack. The hierarchy of the Catholic Church has been once again made the butt of prejudice and unfounded assertion. Sir, in the face of the storm which has raged in Ontario over this question it is only fair that I should contrast the calm, the moderation, the spirit of tolerance displayed by that very hierarchy which has been so ruthlessly assailed. Has any one heard the Catholic clergy or the minority in the west or elsewhere say a word in this crisis ? Has any one seen them stoop to pick up the gauntlet thus thrown down ; has any one heard them answer the insults levelled against them. No, Mr. Speaker, they have pursued a dignified course, conscious that the spirit of fair-play to be found in the Canadian Parliament will uphold their just rights. I should think that the contrast would be sufficient to bring the blush of shame to the cheek of those who profess to practise the true Christian spirit, but who seem to have forgotten it for the moment.

And Mr. Speaker, who are those Catholic clergy and who are the hierarchy who have been thus maligned ? They need no defence from me ; the history of British North America is their best vindication. Let me remind its detractors that the Catholic clergy has done as much as any other body for civilization and christianity on this continent—there has been in Canada no truer, no surer, no more constant upholder of British institutions and British power than this very clergy—if this country has been preserved to the British Crown, it is due in a measure to the loyalty and bravery of the French Canadians and in a greater measure still to the Catholic clergy. Let me place on record some of the utterances of Canadian Catholic bishops in defence of British connection. In the year 1775, the year of the American invasion, Monsigneur Briand, the bishop of Quebec, wrote on the 22nd of May to his flock :—

> A body of revolted subjects against their legitimate sovereign, who is also our own, has just invaded this province, less with the hope of being able to maintain themselves within its limits than with the object of drawing you into their rebellion, or at least of inducing you not to oppose them in their pernicious undertaking. The particular kindness and gentleness with which we have been governed on behalf of His Most Gracious Majesty King George III., since the time when the fate of arms put us under his dominion ; the recent favours with which we have just been loaded by him, in being given back the use of our laws, the free exercise of our religion, in being made to participate in all the privileges and advantages of British subjects, would no doubt be enough to impel our gratitude and to rouse our zeal in upholding the interests of the Crown of Great Britain. But motives still more eloquent must speak to your hearts at the present moment. Your oaths, your religion, impose upon you an indispensable obligation of defending with all your might your country and your king. Close then your ears, dear Canadians, and heed not the promoters of sedition who aim at your unhappiness and seek to stifle in your hearts the sentiments of submission to your legitimate superiors, which education and religion have embedded in them. Be cheerful, ready for anything that you will be directed to on behalf of a kind governor, who has no other aims but your welfare and your happiness. It is not a question of carrying war into remote provinces ; you are only asked for a helping hand to drive back the enemy and check the invasion that threatens this province. The voice of religion and that of your own interest are here united, and assure us of your zealousness to defend our frontiers and our possessions.

In 1812, similar language was used by Monseigneur Plessis, then bishop of Quebec. In 1813, similar language was used by Monseigneur Plessis in addressing his people. In 1837, at a time when the French Canadians were, not unjustly, complaining that they were not being treated as British subjects ought to be treated, the hierarchy of Quebec

told the people what their duties were under the circumstances and counselled them not to join in rebellion. On the 11th of December, 1837, Monseigneur Signay, the bishop of Quebec, wrote to the people of his diocese :

That, by legal and constitutional means, one should endeavour to remedy grievances of which one may think oneself entitled to complain, is a right which we do not pretend to deny any one, but that, in order to attain this object, one should resort to insurrection, is using means not only ineffectual, imprudent, baleful for the very ones who appeal to them, do we say, but moreover criminal in the sight of God and of our holy religion ; under the delusion of escaping an evil, it means throwing oneself into an abyss of irretrievable wrongs—and the experience of all the centuries shows that these our words are in accordance with the most absolute truth.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, and cite several other extracts of that kind which I have here, but I do not propose to delay the House by doing so. I am much mistaken, Mr. Speaker, if six months hence people in this province who have indulged in these appeals to passion and prejudice, will not ask themselves, after all, what all this great to-do was about ; and I am much mistaken if some of them at least will not, in their own estimation, cut a very sorry figure when they look upon the part they played in this agitation.

But, Mr. Speaker, we were asked the other day, who is responsible for this agitation ? The hon. member for East Grey answered the question. Some other gentlemen on the other side of the House also answered it. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the member for East Grey is a very profound thinker or a great orator ; I do not think he himself would lay claim to be either ; but there is one thing for which I am willing to give him the palm, that is, that he is a consummate actor. For the hon. gentleman, without a wrinkle on his face, without a smile, in tones of apparent earnestness and conviction, told us that the man responsible for all these appeals to passion and prejudice, the man responsible for this storm, is—who ? The right hon. gentleman who leads this House.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, and I repeat it again.

Mr. BELCOURT. Why, Mr. Speaker, there is a pretty general opinion in this House that the petitions with which it has been flooded during the last few weeks have all originated with the hon. gentleman himself—that he is the father, the instigator, the propagator of these petitions —that he is the one who has gone into the by-ways and the back townships to get them signed and sent here.

Mr. SPROULE. That is entirely incorrect, allow me to say. I think I am within the mark when I say that half the petitions which have come here never originated through me or by any suggestion of mine.

Mr. BELCOURT. The hon. gentleman has told us on several occasions that petitions which were being presented by other members had come to him, and that he had sent them to those members to be presented. Why, he was the manipulator, the whole thing, in connection with those petitions. They were his special business, and he gave it all the attention and the zeal he could. We know that the hon. gentleman has, through the press, in this House, at meetings of the great Conservative organization of which he is the sovereign grand master, and which he so consistently, so constantly and so profitably steers for the benefit of himself and the Conservative party, appealed to the brethren to keep up the agitation against this measure. It is a well known fact, Sir, that this campaign did not originate in the west, with the people most concerned, but in the province of Ontario. I believe that before the Bill was introduced into the House, there was absolutely no feeling in the Northwest against the perpetuation of the privileges granted to the minority. I have it from hon. gentlemen from the west who sit opposite that they had to come to Ottawa to learn that there was such a thing as a school question, for they had never heard of it up there. But, forsooth, the hon. gentleman for East Grey and his friends had to start an agitation in the province of Ontario among people who were more interested in the matter than the people directly concerned. It is true, Mr. Haultain told us some time ago that so far as he was concerned, he had no objection to separate schools—that if he were a dictator there, he would not think of abolishing them. I am told that the draft clause in the Bill which he submitted two years ago is very much on the lines of section 16 of this Bill. It is true, he has changed his mind about that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Which draft clause was that ?

Mr. BELCOURT. In his Bill of 1902.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have examined that Bill, and do not recall any such clause. Which draft clause does the hon. gentleman refer to ?

Mr. BELCOURT. The draft clause with reference to educational matters. I have not got it before me. It is true, Mr. Haultain has changed his mind, as is evidenced by the letter which he has addressed to the Prime Minister. Is it not true, Mr. Speaker, that this agitation has been confined almost exclusively to the Conservative press and to gentlemen who belong to the Conservative party ? With the exception of a few misguided or misinformed or

renegade Liberals, the agitation has been carried on——

Mr. LENNOX. What about the 'Globe'?

Mr. BELCOURT. I said renegade Liberals. The agitation has been carried on almost exclusively by the Conservatives of this province. And is it not extraordinary, Mr. Speaker, how much religion people who, up to a certain moment, are known to have no religion at all, can develop on occasion? It is perfectly extraordinary how much religion has been developed in this province within the last few weeks. It is extraordinary how much religion has been professed by people who have constituted themselves the doughty champions of a faith which nobody attacks, and which certainly is in no danger.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I hope the hon. gentleman will direct my attention to that clause. He has charged Mr. Haultain, who is not here, with having changed his mind, and I would like to see the clause he refers to. There was a clause like section 2 and one like section 15, but I do not recollect any like section 16. I am positive as to that. I think it would be only fair for the hon. gentleman to indicate to us what he means.

Mr. BELCOURT. If my hon. friend will permit me, I have the clause before me, and I will read it. I may be wrong as to the effect of it, as I was speaking from memory:

> On, from and after the said first day of January, 1903, the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, except those parts thereof which are in terms made or by reasonable intendment may be held to be specially applicable to or to affect only one or more but not the whole of the provinces under that Act composing the Dominion, and except so far as the same may be varied by this Act, shall be applicable to the province of ———— in the same way and to the same extent as they apply to the several provinces of Canada and as if the province of ———— had been one of the provinces originally united by the said Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is practically clause 2 of this Bill.

Mr. BELCOURT. That may be.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Where is the clause equivalent to clause 16 of this Bill as to which my hon. friend said Mr. Haultain had changed his mind? In justice to Mr. Haultain, who is not here, my hon. friend should read the clause to the House or withdraw that statement.

Mr. BELCOURT. That is the clause I read.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is not clause 16.

Mr. BELCOURT. The clause I read is the one Mr. Haultain proposed in his draft Bill two years ago.

Mr. BELCOURT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is clause 2 of this Bill. My hon. friend as I understand, said that Mr. Haultain had placed in his draft Bill a clause the same as clause 16.

Mr. BELCOURT. I said in effect, and I have read it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then my hon. friend says that clause 2 is the same as clause 16.

Mr. BELCOURT. No. What I meant, and what I think I said, was that in 1902, Mr. Haultain, in submitting to the government a draft of the Bill providing for autonomy, submitted a clause which virtually had the same effect as section 16.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. I have in my possession that draft and would be glad to show the hon. gentleman section 13.

Mr. BELCOURT. I doubt very much if the passions and prejudices of so many people would have been aroused to the extent they have been by hon. gentlemen opposite if they had not expected to derive some party advantage from it; and when the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) resigned his portfolio, they concluded that their day had come and that if they could only keep up the agitation and make the storm still greater, some very great material, political benefit would be the result. They succeeded in getting their leader who, we believe, up to that point was very undecided as to the position he should take, to adopt their views and take the course he did.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman is stating that of which he has no knowledge and for which there is not the slightest foundation in fact. The statement is made recklessly, and should not be made by an hon. gentleman of his standing in the House, without better foundation than he can possibly have for it. It is absolutely untrue.

Mr. BELCOURT. I am sorry to have aroused the ire of my hon. friend in this way. If my hon. friend says that he had made up his mind as to the course he was going to take on the very day this Bill was presented, of course I accept his statement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend knows that that is not the portion of his remarks to which I was referring. He said that I was induced by pressure to take a course which I at first hesitated about. Naturally I looked into the constitutional question and made up my mind about that at the earliest possible moment, because it was upon that question alone that the right hon. gentleman relied in introducing the Bill. But when he suggests that pressure was put upon me by any hon. gentleman on this side to take one course or the other, or by any one outside the House,—with the

exception of letters, sometimes anonymous sometimes otherwise, which came to me from both sides and to which I paid no more attention than such communications deserve—apart from these no pressure was put upon me. It has been often stated in the press which supports the hon. gentleman, and with which he is connected, that pressure had been put upon me by my constituents in Carleton. That statement is absolutely false. Not one of my constituents, I am glad to say, ever communicated with me, verbally or otherwise, with regard to this matter up to the time I spoke in this House.

Mr. BELCOURT. I accept unreservedly the statement of my hon. friend, but I had thought—and I think every member in this House will agree with me that it was a very legitimate thought—that the leader of one of the great parties in this House, in a matter of this kind, would naturally consult with his supporters and followers and be, to a very large extent, guided by their opinions. If he has not consulted the wishes of the people with whom he is associated on that subject, if he has not consulted the wishes of the county of Carleton which he represents, he is entitled to make the statement he has. But I thought it was only natural that he would consult his followers and the constituency he represents.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend persists in his personal allusions. I say again that I did not think it was a question upon which I should consult my constituents or upon which I was bound to consult them. At all events that is a matter for me to judge and not the hon. gentleman. It is really a matter with which he has no call to interfere. I do not know that I ever constituted him the censor of my mode of dealing with my constituents nor have I heard that they have ever given him any mandate to represent them. So far as my own friends are concerned, none of them knew what course I was going to take on this Bill, as far as I am aware. I announced it in caucus the day before I spoke in this House, and I did not announce it as a matter on which they should dictate to me but as a matter on which I had made up my mind, and I spoke in the House in accordance with the position I then took.

Mr. BELCOURT. I suppose the hon. gentleman thinks that, in a matter of this kind, it is not proper for him to consult his constituents or his followers in this House.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Neither did the First Minister.

Mr. BELCOURT. I am sorry to have brought these hon. gentlemen to their feet so often. I had no wish to say anything offensive, and I submit that the remarks I made were quite within parliamentary rules. I am surprised to find that they should have caused so much trouble and anxiety to hon. gentlemen opposite. I accept the statement of the leader of the opposition that he did not consult anybody, either his followers in the House or his constituents. But there is a very shrewd suspicion on this side that in taking the course he did, he took the lines indicated by the hon. gentlemen who follow him, whether he consulted them or not. There is a very shrewd suspicion that the game he is playing to-day is that which the gentlemen who sit behind him have set for him, that he is following the pace they set for him, and that, not with a great deal of relish, it is evident, but still bravely enough, he is trying to keep ahead of the procession which these gentlemen have organized. He realized at the outset that in doing so he was going to alienate a great many of his friends in the province of Quebec. He realized that the course he was inspired to take was going to alienate his friends in the province, and he tried to make up for it by paying them compliments. They asked him for bread and he gave them a stone. They asked him for bread, and he gave them petrified bouquets. I wonder if the hon. gentleman deceived himself to the extent of believing that any one in the province of Quebec is to be hoodwinked by these empty and sonorous compliments. If he did, he had a very prompt, rude and sad awakening. Within a few hours from the time he delivered his speech, the most accredited and influential of his lieutenants was on his feet, and in a remarkable speech destroyed to atoms the speech which his leader had so laboriously prepared and so laboriously delivered. The example set by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk)—and I hope my hon. friend will permit me to pay him the compliment of saying that he rose to a very high ideal and made a most remarkable speech—was followed to-day by my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), who told us that he also, like his colleague from Jacques Cartier, was going to vote against the amendment of his leader. He must realize to-day that the course he has taken with or without consultation with his followers has broken the ranks of his own party. He must realize to-day that, whether he intended it or not, his action on this question is a boomerang, and that while the ranks of the opposition to-day are divided, the ranks of the Liberal party present an unbroken front. When the vote is taken on this question there will be given for the Bill the largest majority that was ever given in this parliament on a great question.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken much longer than I intended to. But I think that if the interruptions with which I have been favoured were taken out of my speech——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There would not be much left.

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not think that remark is quite candid. If there was so little in my speech, I wonder why hon. gentlemen opposite so often interrupted me and asked questions. The hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden), only a few moments ago, got up with his face white with rage. And yet he says there was nothing in my remarks. His earnest and very frequent interruption was one of the greatest compliments he could pay me.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I apologize.

Mr. BELCOURT. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the lesson that stands out most clearly in this controversy? Is it not the lesson that in this country appeals to race and religious prejudice, to passion, to intolerance, though they may yield some temporary advantage, yet, in the long run, are bound to re-act against those who resort to them? Is it not the lesson that in this country government is possible only by tolerance, by conciliation, by fair and honourable compromise? To this policy the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who leads this House, early in his public career, devoted himself; to this policy he has steadfastly adhered; and of this policy he is the most distinguished and successful exponent in this country. His faithful devotion to this ideal, and his masterly application of the principle have made him the beloved and idolized leader of his party and have won for him the respect and admiration of all Canadians, including, I believe, his opponents, and have won for him no less the respect and admiration of the whole British empire. Before I close, I would like to quote to the House a passage taken from one of Burke's immortal speeches, covering, to my mind, a most significant and pregnant statement of the present situation in Canada:

> All government, indeed every human benefit, every virtue and every prudent act is founded on compromise and barter. We balance inconveniencies, we give and take; we remit some rights, that we may enjoy others; and, we choose rather to be happy citizens, than subtle disputants. As we must give away some natural liberty to enjoy civil advantages, so we must sacrifice some civil liberties and advantages to be derived from the communion and fellowship of a great empire. But in all dealings the thing bought must bear some proportion to the purchase paid. None will barter away the immediate jewel of his soul. None of us who would risk his life rather than fall under a government purely arbitrary. But, although there are some amongst us who think our constitution wants improvements to make it a complete system of liberty, perhaps none who are of that opinion would think it right to aim at such improvement by disturbing his country and risking everything that is dear to him.

Mr. Speaker, on these lines, and on these lines only, with these ideals and principles, and with these alone, can His Majesty's government in Canada be carried on. On these lines only can the people of different races and different creeds who inhabit British North America continue to live at peace, in harmony and good-will. On these lines only, and with such conduct only, can we develop ourselves into the nation we ought to be in the time to come. On these lines only, Mr. Speaker, can we accomplish the high destiny to which Providence has called us.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). Mr. Speaker, it has been said on several occasions lately that this House is now dealing with the most important question that has ever come before it. May I go a little further and say that this is a great occasion in the history of the British colonial empire? Britain's greatest colony is proposing to give a constitution to one of her own colonies. And, while I do not presume that there is any analogy between the powers which the mother country exercises in relation to her Crown colonies and the powers exercised by the Dominion in relation to the Northwest, still there is sufficient resemblance between the two to make it a matter of interest to observe the spirit in which Canada deals with her colony as compared with the spirit which has been shown by the mother country in dealing with her colonies, and with Canada herself especially. I ask that the same spirit which has been shown by the mother country in dealing with Canada shall be shown by Canada in dealing with her own colonies. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, the exhibition which we have seen to-night takes away a good deal of the hope which I might have cherished. I hope we may calm down a little as this discussion proceeds. What we are doing is being watched outside of Canada, and will have an influence far beyond our boundaries. I desire to acknowledge in a few words the welcome which the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) extended to the new provinces on joining the Canadian family circle. But I would remind him that the Territories are full-grown, and as such they feel themselves entitled to the full rights of manhood. If they are denied these rights, the relations within the family circle will be exceedingly unsatisfactory.

I am afraid I must spend some little time in going back into the history of this question. The matter which we have now before us was first brought prominently to the front on May 2nd, 1900. The first step in the movement was taken in the legislative assembly of the Northwest Territories on that day, when a memorial was addressed to the Governor General in Council asking that this matter be dealt with. In November of that same year a Dominion general election was held. In December, 1901, at the invitation of the Dominion government, a conference took place between a sub-committee of the Privy Council and the repre-

sentatives of the Northwest Territories. After the conference a draft Bill, setting forth in detail the terms and conditions on which the Territory would be willing to become one of the provinces of the Dominion, was submitted to the Prime Minister. In the following spring at the next session of the legislative assembly that Bill was laid before the assembly and unanimously endorsed by them. The only dissenting voice was in reference to the question whether there should be one or two provinces. In regard to every other detail the Bill was endorsed with unanimity. On the 21st of May, 1902, a general election was held throughout the Territories and the question of autonomy was the main issue in that election. The Bill was distributed throughout the whole country and an appeal was made to the people by the premier and by other gentlemen who were supporting him in that election in these words : 'These are the matters upon which your judgment is invited. The issue is plain ; it is for the people of the Territories to decide.'

The people of the Territories did decide by returning Mr. Haultain to power by an overwhelming majority. In spite of this fact a great many excuses were made by the Dominion government for delay in dealing with the question. Two more sessions of the legislative assembly were held and in each one of these sessions a resolution demanding that this question be taken up was passed unanimously, being voted for by both Liberals and Conservatives. There was no dissentient voice on either occasion, but still the matter was not taken up by the Dominion government. During the session of 1904, when it was again probable that the demand would be repeated, we suddenly received the well known letter from the Prime Minister in which he made his promise that if he was returned to power he would deal with the matter at the present session of parliament.

I have indulged in this history in order to show that the government of the Territories had a definite and full mandate from the people of that country as to the terms which they should ask to be granted to the Territories when they became full-fledged provinces. The government of the Territories were invited, as you know, Sir, to a series of conferences by the right hon. the Prime Minister during the first few weeks of the present year. The premier of the Territories and a member of his executive council attended the meeting. I wish to say here that as far as my information goes, there was no change in the conditions which Mr. Haultain demanded from the Prime Minister from those which he had been authorized to demand by the people and the legislative assembly of the Northwest Territories. I believe that he departed from them in no single particular, and I think the protest that he addressed to the right hon. Prime Minister after the introduction of the Bill is a proof of that fact. But, what did we find? We found that after this conference the Bill which was introduced differed in most essential points from the request of the Northwest Territories, that it was, in fact, in many respects absolutely contrary to the wishes of the people. In consequence of this difference a strong remonstrance was made by the premier of the Territories which was couched in dignified and determined terms. Because it was not signed by the other member of the executive council, it was stated by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that it was only Mr. Haultain's individual opinion. The hon. Minister of Finance said that if it was the case that we were doing something against the wishes of the people of the Northwest the government of the Northwest had entered no protest. I should like to ask what warrant had he for any such statement ? All we have heard is that Mr. Bulyea expressed a different opinion to that of Mr. Haultain in an interview which he was supposed to have given to the 'Globe' directly after the introduction of the Bill. I am told that Mr. Bulyea denies having given that interview. At any rate, whether it was so or not, Mr. Bulyea is remaining in the government of Mr. Haultain. It is inconceivable that if he disagrees with his colleagues on such an important matter as this, he should continue to remain a member of the government. I say, Mr. Speaker, that his actions count for far more in this particular than anything that he may have said in any supposed newspaper interview. It is juggling with words to assert that when the premier of a government protests it is only the protest of an individual. As a matter of fact, Mr. Bulyea had just the same mandate that Mr. Haultain had from the people of the Northwest Territories. That mandate was too clear for it to have been possible for him to have taken any position other than one in accordance with the views of his leader and the fact remains, that he is still a member of Mr. Haultain's government. I have also gone into this history to show that two Dominion general elections have been held since this matter was placed before the Dominion government. The government refused to act or define their policy in any particular during the whole lifetime of one parliament. More than that, when another appeal to the people became imminent they refused to define their policy before the elections. Although they had had the draft propositions before them for three years they were not prepared to declare themselves in any respect. The hon ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) went into the Northwest Territories and when he was questioned in regard to this matter he refused to commit himself except on one point which I shall mention just now, but on all the main points in connection with the draft Bill he refused to commit himself. We were

all told in the Northwest Territories—I heard it myself on many platforms—that the proper thing for us to do was to trust the Liberal party, that with their record in the past they would be sure to give us fair and liberal terms. We have been told quite recently and told triumphantly that the seven Liberal members of parliament who come from the Northwest Territories would support the Bill in its present form. If so, then I think it must be due to a sudden change of opinion on the part of at least two of those members. The two hon. members who were in the last parliament. They have put themselves definitely on record in regard to this matter. I refer to the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and to the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). The hon. member for Edmonton, on the 13th of October, 1903, said this :

I said in this House last session, and I take the liberty of repeating it, that if the House will give the Northwest Territories the terms asked for in the draft Bill contained in these papers, I will certainly support it most strongly. We will support it. These are the terms we want.

That statement was placed on record. Then the hon. member for West Assiniboia a couple of years previously had placed himself on record as asking very similar terms to those which were subsequently comprised in the draft Bill which was submitted by the Northwest Territories. Therefore, I hold, Mr. Speaker, that if these two hon. gentlemen, at any rate, from the Northwest Territories, had any mandate from their constituents in that country, that mandate would certainly be in the terms in which they had placed themselves on record in their public utterances.

I regret that after having for years advocated the granting of provincial autonomy to the Northwest Territoriees, I am unable to welcome the measure which has just been introduced. It does not contain the 'fair and just terms' for which the people of the Territories ask and it does not give 'complete and absolute autonomy' such as we were promised by the Prime Minister. It creates two new provinces of an inferior type and of a lower grade than the other provinces of the Dominion of Canada, and I contend that the people of the Territories are justified in their demand to be placed on the same level as is occupied by the other province especially as they have a population larger at the present moment than the populations of four of the seven existing provinces of the Dominion. Their disapproval of the Bill which has been introduced has been amply proved by the great number of protests which they have made and which have been placed before this House. I am sorry that there are two provinces instead of one. The assembly of the Northwest Territories was strongly in favour of having only one province for the whole of the Territories. They had voted on that question and had endorsed that position by a large majority. The whole country had given their opinion on it when they voted as they did at the general elections to which I have referred. The late Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) committed himself on only one particular point and that was with reference to the matter of one or more provinces. Although I was not present at the time I am told on credible authority that both at Regina and Indian Head he stated that he was in favour of one province. The Solicitor General (Mr. Lemieux) has given the reasons why apparently the government considered it would be undesirable to make the whole of the territories into one province. He was afraid that the progress and the prosperity of one large province would become such that the influence of that province upon the rest of Canada would be too great. I regret also to see the name of Assiniboia disappear from the map. The most thickly settled portion of the eastern province, has borne that name for a long time past.' The magnificent wheat producing fields of that district have made the name famous in the great markets of the world. Assiniboia contains the largest portion of the population of the eastern provinces, and therefore I think when a choice of names was being made Assiniboia should have been retained. No matter what the opinion may be as to whether it was a good name to choose in the first instance, it was sanctioned by usage, and should have been preserved rather than the name Saskatchewan.

However, there are other and greater questions than these involved in the Bill and I shall leave these minor points and proceed to deal with two or three of the main points at issue, as shortly as I possibly can. I shall take up for a few minutes the limitation of the powers of taxation which are being imposed on the people of the new provinces in these Bills—I refer of course to the question of the exemption of the Canadian Pacific Railway from taxation. One would imagine from what one constantly hears in this country that the Canadian Pacific Railway had been built in order to open up the Northwest and that therefore the Northwest should pay for the Canadian Pacific Railway. But was that the case ? Let us turn back for a few moments to the Quebec resolutions. Section 69 reads as follows :

The communications with the Northwestern Territory, and the improvements required for the development of the trade of the great west with the sea-board, are regarded by this conference as subjects of the highest importance to the federated provinces, and shall be prosecuted at the earliest possible period that the state of the finances will permit.

That is to say this question of building a railway into the west was looked upon as a subject of the highest importance to

the federated provinces. It was to open up channels for the trade of the east. That was the first reason for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The later and perhaps the most cogent reason was that it was absolutely imperative, if faith was to be kept with British Columbia, that a railway should be built across the continent. A contract was made by the Dominion government with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the consideration on the part of Canada included a grant of money, a grant of land and exemption from taxation. The Northwest Territories are to-day paying their share of the interest on that money grant so we will wipe that question away. However in addition to that which is imposed on them in common with the rest of Canada they are contributing a land grant not only for that portion of the line which was built in the Territories, but also for that portion which was built in British Columbia and for a part of the line which was built in Ontario and in Manitoba. Now, Sir, that is a great burden upon the country. The result of it is that millions of money which have been made in that country and which should be kept in the country to develop its resources are being sent out in payment for the lands. We have claimed compensation in the draft Bill for such lands as were alienated by the Dominion government for purely Dominion purposes. Our demand in that respect has apparently not received consideration and all I desire at this moment is simply to mention the fact and to enter my protest because it has not been considered.

To turn to the third consideration for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The exemption from taxation is a very unjust burden and it falls entirely on the shoulders of the new provinces. It is an unjust burden which was incurred for the benefit of the whole of Canada, and the Dominion should relieve us from it. The Dominion parliament made the contract and incurred the obligation. There was no provincial legislature at the time ; if there had been one in existence I do not suppose it would have been possible that such a contract would have been made. A very strong point was made in the argument which accompanied the draft Bill in this respect. It was urged in the strongest terms that this unjust burden should be removed from the shoulders of the new provinces. In the teeth of this protest we find that it is actually proposed in this Bill to rivet the burden on the new provinces as part of their constitution. I can see no possible reason for such action as that, and I enter against it my strongest protest. I hope that when this Bill comes to the committee stage the government will see fit to withdraw that particular clause. When this exemption was being discussed in parliament some two or three years ago, and when the leader of the opposition made a proposal that certain steps should be taken which would remove this burden from the Territories and place it where it properly belonged, the Prime Minister, at all events by implication, gave some sort of hope to the Territories, when he used this language :

> All this shows how absolutely essential it is that the question should be referred to the courts ; that we should have an authoritative decision as to the meaning of the law before we can take any public action in the way of giving relief to the settlers of the Northwest Territories.

The right hon. gentleman evidently admits here that the settlers of the Northwest had a case in asking for relief. I recall that statement to his mind, and trust that he will give it serious consideration. We have also a statement made by the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) on the 20th of October, 1903, when he said :

> Let me say that in face of the position of this Canadian Pacific Railway tax matter, in view of the millions of acres of land that are involved and the millions in value of railway property of the company that are involved, it appears to me that the people of the Northwest would be simply crazy at present to accept autonomy unless driven to it as a last resort.
>
> * * * *
>
> Such being the case, I certainly approve of delay until all doubt about the Canadian Pacific Railway tax exemption has been removed.

That was the opinion of the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) not so very long ago, and yet we are to-day told in triumphant tones that the seven Liberal members from the Northwest are behind the government in support of this Bill.

Let me deal for a moment with the question of the public domain. The Bill proposes that the lands, mines and minerals and timbers are to be retained by the Dominion government and not placed under the jurisdiction of the new provinces. If gentlemen on the other side of the House have their will in respect to this Bill, that is what will occur. Well, Sir, we claim that we have just as much right as any other province in the Dominion of Canada to the full possession of our lands. I was very glad to see that the Prime Minister had dropped the old stock argument that Canada had purchased the Northwest Territories, and therefore that the federal authority could deal with these Territories just as it liked. There were very cogent reasons for the right hon. gentleman dropping that argument, but I was surprised to hear the Solicitor General revive it and in doing so he must have been oblivious to some circumstances which have occurred within the last few years. In reply to the Solicitor General's statement that the acquirement of the Northwest Territories had not been profitable to the Dom-

inion, I beg to tell him that the profits from that investment have already been sufficient, and more than sufficient to pay the entire claim of the Hudson Bay Company. Probably the reason which has caused gentlemen opposite to drop the old argument as to the purchase of the Territories, is the grant within recent years of 116,550 square miles of the same territory to the province of Quebec. More than that, the Prime Minister now is proposing to make free gifts of the same territory to Quebec, Ontario, the new province of Saskatchewan, and Manitoba, although in the case of the provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan, it would not be a gift but simply a request that they should administer the territory. The old argument that this territory belongs to the whole Dominion must have been abandoned by the present government, or otherwise they would have no warrant for making these free gifts to the old provinces.

The Prime Minister has appealed to the precedent of Manitoba as a reason for withholding the public domain from the new provinces, but he deliberately disregarded that precedent in 1898 when he had a Bill passed through parliament giving to the province of Quebec a vast area, nearly one-half the size of one of the new provinces. If there is any doubt as to the statement I have made, I would like to lay before the House a few extracts from an Order in Council of the Quebec government dated the 24th of April, 1898, upon which the legislation was subsequently framed. Attached to this Order in Council is a report from Mr. E. H. Taché, assistant Commissioner of Crown Lands, who, after discussing the question as to the province of Quebec making a demand for that portion of the coast of Labador which is under the jurisdiction of Newfoundland, goes on to say :

> The claiming of that territory would result in serious diplomatic complications which the Dominion government certainly will not raise, but it seems to me that a compromise might be arrived at which will prove acceptable to all those interested. The claims under the old French regime, thus altered, would still include a vast extent of territory, which in extent and value would be a good equivalent to the territory claimed by Ontario. The claim might be framed in the following manner :

He then goes on to define in detail the boundary line as it was finally adopted in the Bill passed by this parliament, and he says :

> The definition of the limits means an increase in area of 116,550 square miles. In my opinion to go further, as far as the Hudson Strait would be too grasping.

Too grasping even for the province of Quebec in a matter of this sort ; so grasping indeed that the deal might not be put through parliament. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to protest in any way against this accession of territory to the province of Quebec. I think it was a perfectly correct policy ; I believe that the province of Quebec could administer that territory far more satisfactorily than it could possibly be administered from Ottawa. Some day there may be a great rush of people into that country for all we know, and then I am quite certain that the provincial management will be more satisfactory to these people than could possibly be the management of the more distant central government at Ottawa. But, Sir, this incident forms a precendent set by the Prime Minister himself, which surely he ought to follow in this case of the new provinces. I am afraid, however, that what is sauce for the goose in this case is not considered sauce for the gander.

Now, I would like to ask whether there is any similarity whatever between the conditions which prevailed in Manitoba in the year 1870, when Manitoba became a province of this Dominion, and the conditions of the Territories in this year 1905. If there is no similarity whatever in conditions, there can be no precedent. At that time Manitoba was under the paternal government of the Hudson Bay Company. In the debates of 1870, you will find the opinion expressed that the people of Manitoba were scarcely fit for a provincial form of government. A doubt was expressed as to the 'fitness of a people just emerging from the conditions of serfdom'—that was one of the phrases used. They were also referred to as an ignorant people. They comprised in all some twelve thousand souls, and they were at that very time in the throes of rebellion. Is there any similarity whatever in the condition of Manitoba at that time and the present condition of the Northwest Territories, who have a responsible government, a constitution, limited certainly as to its powers, but one which they have enjoyed for a great many years past ; who have carried on a liberal and progressive government, a government which is, I think, second to none in any of the other provinces of the Dominion, and also with a population, as I have just stated, larger than that of the majority of the provinces of the Dominion.

Then, if any hon. gentleman will look through the debates of the House of Commons for many years succeeding the formation of the province of Manitoba, he will find that the opinion on both sides of the House was always in favour of the principle that the public lands in the province should belong to the province. I have culled a number of opinions from the great men of that time—Mr. Mills, Sir John Macdonald, Sir Leonard Tilley, Mr. G. W. Ross, by all of whom to a greater or less extent that principle is recognized. The reason given in nearly every case for withholding the lands from the province was that it would not pay the province to hold them—that the administration of the lands would

cost more than the province would ever be able to make out of them. That is the reason which was given for a great many years. But a change came over the scene in 1885, or a little previous to that, when it was discovered that the lands had an exceptional value. The Prime Minister, in stating his main reason for withholding the public lands from the new provinces, quoted from an Order in Council of the year 1885; but he did not quote the main reasons which were given in that Order in Council by the Conservative administration of the day for withholding the public lands from the province of Manitoba. He only quoted a consideration which 'had much weight' with the sub-committee after three or four of the main reasons had been stated, that consideration being that it would be advisable in the interests of immigration that the Dominion government should continue to hold the public lands in its own hands. Now, to my mind that is a very unsound argument. The Immigration Department is for the whole of Canada—for all the provinces, and for no one more than another. It may happen, and it does happen, that the province of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories are the most attractive field for immigrants to-day; but to-morrow it may be Ontario or Quebec or British Columbia; we do not know. As a matter of fact, we find that the Immigration Department is working hard in the interest of the other provinces of the Dominion, just as hard, I imagine, as it is for the Northwest Territories. Here is an extract from the report of the Minister of the Interior with reference to the immigration into Ontario:

> In order to relieve to some extent the situation in the province of Ontario, where there has been such a great dearth of labour, the department took steps early in the year to direct its agents in the old land to divert as much as possible the farm labouring classes to that province. The result of this has been that some thousands of labourers who perhaps would have gone to western Canada were induced to remain over in Ontario, all of whom were immediately distributed by the Ontario bureau amongst farmers throughout the country. It has been found almost impracticable to divert much of the foreign population, even of the farm labouring classes, to eastern provinces, many of these people coming through to meet friends, and, moreover, nearly all of the farm labourers from the continent appear to be desirous of securing lands for themselves first.

That shows that the Immigration Department is working for the province of Ontario, and for the other provinces of Canad just as well as for the Northwest Territories; and I do not think it can be said that any very great inconvenience is caused to that department by the fact that the lands of the province of Ontario are in the hands of the government of that province. Farm labourers and small tenant farmers are certainly the very best class of immigrants, and I have no objection to their being diverted to Ontario to get their first experience of Canada. But if the lands of the Northwest Territories are to be retained in the hands of the Dominion government, simply because it wants to apply its immigration policy to the best advantage, then it should not divert from those lands any immigration which is coming out. But I am sure that is a position that would be resented by every other province of Canada. Every immigrant who comes into this country is an asset to the whole Dominion.

I consider that the difficulties which have been raised are entirely visionary. If the new provinces were possesed of their own public lands, they would be the most interested of all in encouraging immigration to come within their bounds. We should have three local governments all hard at work trying to bring in immigration, and all competing with each other for immigration. More than that, the local government, thoroughly understanding the local conditions, would be able to make matters so much more comfortable for the incoming settlers that they would produce a more contented class of settlers; and the old saying still holds good, that the contented settler is the best immigration agent, and the quotation which I have just made from the report of the Minister of the Interior goes to prove it. These people coming in are, a great many of them, coming to their friends, from whom they have heard of their great prosperity and who have encouraged them to come to the country. I contend that the moral if not the legal right of the new provinces to the ownership of their public lands has practically been conceded by the government. I do not think any doubt has been seriously raised upon this subject. This question, as well as the whole question of provincial powers, was very clearly stated by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) some four years ago. My hon. friend sent me a copy of his speech on that occasion. I concurred then with him in the position he took, and am very glad to put on record the second time some of the opinions which he expressed in that speech, and which are very similar to those I hold myself. On the 25th March, 1901, he said:

> I may say that what the people will expect and what I think they have a right to expect—and this is really the point to which I wish to call the attention of parliament—is that they will be dealt with on exactly the same basis as the originally confederated provinces dealt with themselves, and be put in exactly the same position as that occupied by the originally confederated provinces. If the proper principle is adhered to, if the principle of absolute equality is observed, if parliament places the new provinces upon an equitable basis, the local government will be given a proper grant for government, also the per capita grant, and be given anything that may be shown to be due as the debt allowance. And they will

be put in the possession of the public resources, lands, timber and minerals in the same way as the other provinces were put in possession of those resources. I believe that that portion of the confederation arrangement by which the original provinces retained control over their public resources was looked upon by the fathers of confederation as the keystone of the whole scheme.

The hon. member then went on to quote from speeches made by Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir A. T. Galt in connection with confederation, in which they explained the reasons for placing the public lands at the disposal of the different provinces. My hon. friend went on to say :

When Prince Edward Island was taken into confederation a grant was voted her for the very reason that she did not have any public land.

Further on he said :

The people of the Territories contend that the public lands of that territory are now simply held in trust by parliament until such time as provinces may be created in that area. They firmly believe that their contention is good. But even if a strict legal or moral right cannot be established by the people of the Territories to be given possession of their local resources, I appeal to this House whether it would not be unwise and impolitic to create provinces out there on any different basis from that on which other provinces stand. Entire equality is the only sure guarantee of the permanency of the confederation structure. Is it not a fair proposition that the citizens of the Northwest Territories should be looked upon in all respects as equal to the citizen of any other province of Canada. The subjects that come under the purview of the local government affect the people more closely than those dealt with by this parliament, and the best way to promote the progress of that country will be to give as much financial ability as possible to the local legislature to deal with their local affairs, so that education, public works and all local services may be dealt with efficiently and adequately. My opinion is that by no other means can parliament do as much at one stroke to promote progress and the true welfare, not of the Territories alone but of Canada as a whole, as by placing the main portion of western Canada in a strong, efficient, capable position as concerns its local government.

My hon. friend concluded as follows :

I trust that when the time comes, whether it comes next year, or the succeeding year, and I feel assured that it will come before the end of the term of this parliament, that parliament may deal with the question on broad principles and endeavour to place the citizens of the Northwest Territories in a position entirely equal, in no way inferior to the position which is occupied by the citizens of any other province of Canada.

I have not heard that my hon. friend has since receded from the views he there expressed. He did not, at any rate, in the fall of 1903, and I think we are entitled to believe that those are his opinions still ; and if he has any mandate from the Northwest Territories, it can only be to give effect to the terms of his speech which he distributed throughout that country far and wide.

Let me now make a comparison between the value of the lands when Manitoba entered confederation and their value to-day. In 1883 Sir Charles Tupper read a statement to this House, which showed that the sales of land from 1872 to 1880 had been less than two million acres, and that the average price received was 31½ cents per acre. Further on he declared that only 13 cents per acre out of this sum had been paid to date. Compare the value of the lands in these days with their value in the Territories to-day. We find that the Canadian Pacific Railway lands were selling in January at an average price of $4.10 per acre and the school lands at an average of nearly $10 per acre. We also have the statement of the First Minister that $3 an acre is a very moderate rate for land in that country. Therefore, I contend there is no comparison whatever between the conditions of Manitoba in 1870 and those of the Territories in 1901.

Coming to the question of the compensation offered to the new provinces for the loss of their public lands, I would like to ask the First Minister what is the basis of that calculation? Why have the government selected 25,000,000 acres out of the 175,000,000 which, roughly speaking, will be comprised in each of these new provinces, and why have they placed a value of only $1.50 per acre on these 25,000,000 acres ? Again why do they only pay 1 per cent interest at first on those lands, and how do they arrive at the gradual increase in the rate of interest as population increases in that country ? I can only suppose that they began to argue the question backwards. I would presume that their first thought was : How much money is the least we can give to the people of these provinces ? And having decided upon the figure, they began to hunt for some method of making it up. The whole arrangement seems to me an extraordinary one. I could not find a word to describe it until the Prime Minister supplied it the other day, when he used the word 'ramshackle.' That well characterizes the arrangements made in this Bill for compensation to the provinces for the loss of their public lands. It will be noticed that compensation is only offered for one-seventh of the whole area or one-fifth of the whole area still undisposed of according to a return brought down the other day. Who will say that 113,000,000 acres out of these 138,000,000 still undisposed of in each of these provinces are of no value whatever, that only 25,000,000 are of any value, and that the value of those shall be fixed at $1.50 per acre ? Further than that, no consideration whatever is given for the mines, minerals and timber which are being withheld from us. As to the fisheries, I do not

know whether they are to be withheld from us or not.

With regard to the value of these lands, in the latest report of the Minister of the Interior, we have the statement of the sales of land made by the railway and other companies from 1893 to 1904. The sales amounted to 10,512,349 acres, and the amount of money for which these lands were sold was $36,992,482, or about $3.50 per acre. That is to say, we find that as the actual result of the 10 or 11 years' sales of the great land companies, they obtain for a little over 10,000,000 acres a sum nearly equal to the whole compensation to be paid to the people of each of the new provinces for 138,000,000 acres. Then, again, we have the figures given by the government of school lands sales. As I have said, they average about $9.90 per acre. Also, the Prime Minister mentioned as 'a very moderate rate' $3 per acre. He was afraid that if the land were handed over to the people of the Northwest Territories they might begin to sell them at something more than this very moderate rate of $3 per acre. When he was questioned whether the lands were generally open for sale at these figures, we discovered that they were only open to a few favoured individuals and that the general public were not able to buy lands even at $3 per acre. I will go a step further and take the figures given by the Minister of the Interior a couple of years ago in discussing the Grand Trunk Pacific project. He then made the calculation that that one line of railway alone was going to open up 50,000,000 acres of land, and that the 20,000,000 or 25,000,000 acres which the government would have for sale would have an accrued value of $3 per acre within ten years after the completion of the line. Or, take the ex-Minister of the Interior's (Mr. Sifton's) statement made last Friday, when he referred to the school lands trust fund as being valued at $50,000,000. That statement he made in the course of his speech on the educational clauses of this Bill. Now, these school lands consist of two sections out of every 36 sections in the township. That is, the school lands are about one-eighteenth part of the whole territory. About 1¾ sections of each township have been set aside for the Hudson Bay Company, so that the school lands amount to one-seventeenth part of the area available. And, if the seventeenth part of the whole area is estimated by the ex-Minister of the Interior at $50,000,000, it is a simple calculation to arrive at what he estimates as the value of the whole public domain in the Northwest—all you have to do is to multiply $50,000,000 by 17. But I am not suggesting that that is a fair valuation of these lands. The ex-Minister of the Interior, I presume, thinks it must be. It is an exceedingly difficult thing to find at this time what the value of these lands will be at some date in the future. But while it is a most difficult thing to arrive at any final conclusion on this question, I submit that the calculations I have quoted go to prove conclusively that the compensation that is offered for the loss of these lands is absolutely and utterly inadequate. The Prime Minister took the Manitoba lands as a precedent, as I have before mentioned. But, in the case of Manitoba, the swamp lands were handed back to that province. The Prime Minister says there are no swamp lands in the new provinces. I would not like to make such a confident assertion as that myself. But, if there are none, I think the Northwest should have some lands given them in lieu of the swamp lands. How much better it would be to avoid all these difficulties which confront us in the calculation of their real value by handing the lands over to the new provinces just as their public lands have been placed in the possession of the other provinces of the Dominion. The people of the new provinces would then feel that, in this respect at any rate they had been fairly treated; that in this respect, they had been granted full provincial rights. Or, I will make another proposition. If this parliament considers only 25,000,000 acres of land of that country to be of any value, I would invite them to select 25,000,000 acres in each province and pay us $1.50 per acre and hand over the remainder to the provincial authorities. The people of the Northwest will make some use of the land if you will give it to them.

As a matter of fact I hold that no monetary consideration is sufficient to compensate us for the loss of our land. It is impossible to have a satisfactory administration of these lands from a centre upwards of two thousand miles distant. Nearly everything has to be referred to Ottawa. It takes nearly a week to get an answer to a letter from one of the nearest points, Regina. The people on the spot understand the conditions far better than the officials of the department down here in Ottawa. The land will be much better administered by officers responsible to the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories. The whole administration will be under the eyes of the people who are most deeply interested in the lands. It is quite a different matter when the administration is placed in the hands of one man at Ottawa. He becomes, in a sense a dictator, and he is responsible to a body of men very few of whom have any intimate knowledge of the local conditions which prevail in the Northwest Territories. The representatives of the other provinces of the Dominion control and manage their own lands. And they are the people best qualified to control and manage those lands. But I contend that they are not so well qualified to control and manage the lands of the Northwest as are the people of the Northwest themselves. I was very much amused by one feature of the speech made

the other day by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). He tried to show what a kind and statesmanlike thing it would be to relieve the people of the Northwest of the burden of managing these lands. That seemed to be the general trend of his remarks. He suggested that the members of the provincial legislatures might be pressed to use the lands improperly. If he finds that difficulty in the province of Quebec he has the remedy of inducing his province to hand over all their lands to the administration of the Dominion. But, we have never found any difficulty of that kind whatever in the Northwest Territories in the matters with which we have had to deal up to the present day, and I believe we shall find no difficulty in that connection in the future. At any rate, who is the more likely to have improper pressure put upon them to administer these lands wrongly ? Is it the members of the legislatures of the new provinces who are directly under the eye of the people most intimately concerned, or is it not likely to be the Minister of the Interior who is acting by himself down here at Ottawa ?

After all, these questions, important as they are to the people of the Northwest Territories, are overshadowed by the educational clauses in this Bill. These clauses have been introduced, I assert once again in spite of what the hon. member for Ottawa said, in such a form as to invite opposition ; and the disparaging references made constantly to the people of the Northwest by member after member on the other side of the House have not been such as to soothe the feelings of the people under these difficult circumstances. I would like to say, in reference to the statement made by the hon. member for Ottawa that he had been told that no school question existed in the Northwest Territories up to the present time, that that is practically the case. The school question has been raised in this parliament and raised on the other side of the House. But, I consider that the same hon. gentleman misrepresents the position of this party when he suggests that our attitude is to favour the repeal of the present system of education which obtains in the Northwest Territories. The position of this party is that this is a local and provincial question which should be dealt with entirely by the provinces, that this is a matter in reference to which this parliament has no right or power to place restrictions or limitations on the provinces. We contend for provincial rights in this matter. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) accuses us of misusing what he refers to as that sacred term. With one breath he denounces us for appealing for provincial rights and then with the next breath he approves of the federal authorities retaining possession of the public lands of the Northwest Territories which we

believe it will be an infringement of provincial rights for the Dominion to retain in their possession. He went on to treat the people of the Northwest Territories as if they were children and as if they had no rights. I do not propose to follow him into the religious discussion which he raised. This evening we again had a violent racial and religious appeal from the hon. member for Ottawa. As I said before I have made up my mind that I at any rate will not follow the bad example which has been set us by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. I respect the religious convictions of others and I think they should show the same respect for my religious convictions. I feel they have not done it. Nor, Sir, is it a question of the value of separate schools as an abstract proposition. We are not discussing that question at all. It is a question of equal rights to the new provinces with those which have been given to other provinces in the Dominion to deal with matters of education. It has been suggested that this question has been raised on this side of the House as a party question, that this side of the House is responsible for the agitation that is going on in the Northwest Territories at the present moment. Now, Sir, it just happened that yesterday afternoon, after the close of the sitting of this House, I received a letter from the largest town in my constituency which I propose, with your permission, to read :

Indian Head, Assa., March 22, 1905.

R. S. Lake, Esq.,
Parliament Buildings, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—At the annual meeting of Indian Head Liberal Association held here to-day, I was instructed to send you a copy of the following resolution which was duly carried, viz.:

We, the members of Indian Head Liberal Association, desire to enter a protest against the educational clauses in the Autonomy Bill, believing that such is an interference with provincial rights. The clause as amended in the compromise Bill now before parliament, does not, in our opinion, contain any modification of what we believe to be an infringement of our rights as a province, and for this reason we as emphatically protest against the Bill as remodelled.

Yours respectfully,
(Sgd.) J. M. THOMPSON,
Secretary Indian Head Liberal Association.

I would like to ask the hon. member for Ottawa, if he were present, if he considers that my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) had anything to do with that resolution. I presume that these are the gentlemen to whom he referred as renegades, or are these the gentlemen of whom the hon. Minister of Justice spoke when he said that the right hon. Prime Minister had not lost the respect of any persons for whose respect he cared ?

I differ entirely from the cheerful declarations of the hon. Minister of Finance when he stated his 'firm conviction that most

people in the country will not bother themselves very much about this constitutional question' and that there are other questions greater than the constitutional question involved in this matter. The rights and liberties of the British people have been too closely connected with the constitution to have it treated thus lightly. I also wish to offer my protest against the suggestions which have been constantly made that the people of the Northwest Territories will be less generous than the people of Nova Scotia in dealing with this question. That suggestion has been made more than once on the other side of the House. What my views are in respect to the separate school question as an abstract proposition, has in my opinion, really nothing whatever to do with this discussion. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have discussed this question on its merits as have hon. gentlemen, I must admit, on this side of the House. Although I do not intend to follow their example I intend to claim the privilege of briefly putting on record the views which I hold with regard to this question. After nearly 22 years residence in the Northwest Territories, I believe firmly that the public school system as at present administered is the one best suited to the needs of the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAKE. The fact that separate schools have been so little taken advantage of shows that except in certain centres and thickly-populated districts there is no demand for them. Taking an average settlement in that country, the separate school system is nearly impracticable and places a heavy burden on the people in the increased taxation incidental to minority schools.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAKE. In certain instances it would actually prevent the formation of schools at all. I do not wish to be understood as favouring the exclusion of religious teaching from the education of the young. No education, in my mind, can be satisfactory which does not include the ethics of religion, but I say that doctrine and dogma should be kept to the church and to the home.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAKE. And I am opposed to a purely sectarian education. That is my own personal opinion, and I believe that I am as well entitled to hold that opinion and state it in the House as any other gentleman. In the public school system of the Northwest Territories provision is made to allow of religious teaching, as has been frequently stated in this House. But the impression which has been conveyed by many of the speeches that this religious teaching is the regular rule, is an erroneous one. It is not, as a matter of fact, the general rule. In fact, I do not know personally of one particular instance in which religious teaching is given during that last half hour. But it is open, under the ordinances, to any and every denomination to teach religious doctrine in the same school during the last half hour in the afternoon if they desire to do so and can obtain the consent of the parents and the trustees. If they do not do so it is the fault of the people themselves ; it means that they do not wish it, and I take the ground that they should not be forced to have it. The separate school system in its practical working out means a hardship in the case of any Roman Catholic who prefers a public school education in the Northwest Territories, and I would say again that there are many Roman Catholics in that country who do prefer a public school education.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Is it not a fact that in the school districts where the Catholics are in the majority they have not the choice, but are obliged to go to the public schools, because they cannot form separate schools ? Under the ordinance, in every school district where the Catholics are in a majority they cannot form a separate school, but have to go to the public school ?

Mr. LAKE. That is quite true. But they would control the teachers and, of course, they could have religious instruction for the last half hour of the afternoon. That is quite the case, and the hon. gentleman has stated what is really a very good case in favour of our national school system as it exists. I do not think you need go further than Ottawa to find gentlemen of that faith who believe in the public school system of education as contrasted with the separate school system.

I would like to know what the educational clauses, as at present embodied in the Bill, really mean. In a House where there are so many lawyers we laymen might have expected to get a clear answer to this question : What do these clauses really embody; what do they really mean ? But we find that legal opinions differ in regard to this as widely as the poles, and I am inclined, after hearing a good many of the speeches pro and con, to believe that they mean just about the same thing as the original clauses.

Now, let us trace this question up ; let us consider the way in which the original clauses were arrived at, and the way in which these substituted clauses were arrived at. A sub-committee of the Privy Council was appointed to deal with this question ; it was composed of four gentlemen of the legal profession, all men of repute—the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice, the Secretary of State and the Postmaster General ; the three first of these were gentlemen who belonged to the Roman Catholic faith and were gentlemen who are avowedly in favour of separate schools. They took the unusual course of issuing a pamphlet and distributing amongst the members of this

House what purported to be a brief history, from official sources, of the legislation with respect to separate schools since 1863. At the end of that pamphlet they went beyond the bounds of history, and made a distinct appeal on the subject. They said that 'it would be a breach of faith and a violation of the British North America Act to disturb now rights and privileges granted thirty years ago'—a violation of the British North America Act; and I would like, by the way, to ask who it is that now proposes to violate the British North America Act? But the pamphlet did not rest at this. The rights and privileges granted thirty years ago were defined in another part of this pamphlet as 'the same system as prevailed in Ontario and Quebec.' After issuing this pamphlet, in which this strong appeal is made for separate schools, they proceeded to draw up a set of clauses. To provide for what? According to the Prime Minister in his speech on the introduction of the Bill, it was to enable the minority to establish their own schools and to share in the public moneys as the law is to-day. A similar statement was made a few days later by the Minister of Justice, that they drew up these clauses to give effect to the provisions of the Act of 1875 and the conditions that are now in force in the Northwest Territories. Now, we are told by the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Customs, the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) and many others that the ordinances now in force in the Northwest Territories, for all practical purposes, simply provide for a national school system, and not for a separate school system in its recognized sense—that is, in the sense in which it prevails in Ontario and Quebec.

So we have this position, that, after issuing a pamphlet in favour of separate schools, they drew up a clause which did not provide for separate schools as they understood them, but simply provided for what was in practice a national school system. These four legal gentlemen drew up this clause which the Minister of Justice said was drawn up designedly to be 'so clear and simple that any man might understand it;' those were his very words. But a revelation came a few days later. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) returns and tells us that those clear and simple words have a deeper meaning, that they actually do provide for the same system as prevails in Ontario and Quebec, and in addition give, for the support of separate schools, a share of a $50,000,000 endowment which had been specially held in trust for public schools.

And these four legal gentlemen apparently never saw what they were embodying in this clause! They believed all the time they were simply perpetuating the law as it exists at present. For the last three or four weeks there have been anxious negotiations on the other side of the House, and they have finally agreed to lay the blame on the poor draughtsman. These four gentlemen then took back the clauses they had drafted originally, and provided a substitute which in the opinion of the member for Brandon really does provide for the schools now in existence and nothing more. The Prime Minister in introducing the amended clauses explained that the objections to the original clauses were that they were 'too broad and too vague, and if adopted would create confusion instead of certainty.' Remember these were the very clauses which we were told were to be so clear and simple that any man could understand them. The Prime Minister told us that the amended clauses simply embody the law of the country which has been in force for thirteen or fourteen years; but I would remind the House that the right hon. gentleman said the same thing in reference to the original clauses. The Minister of Finance says that the present clauses continue for ever the school system which now exists, and the Minister of Customs explained how simple it all was, and he told us which of the different clauses of the territorial ordinances were affected by this Bill. If the Minister of Customs were a lawyer he would have been a little more careful, but having had experience of the difficulties of four of the leading legal gentlemen of the cabinet, some of us began to think a layman's opinion might throw some light upon the question. However that may be, the member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) showed us pretty conclusively the other day that there is more behind this matter than we have been led to believe, and that the separate school clause of 1875 is re-enacted in its entirety by the present legislation, and that for all practical purposes the substituted clauses are just the same as the original. Is it any wonder that parliament and the country are extremely suspicious as to what there is underlying all this, and that we want to know distinctly and definitely what this proposal really does mean? We find the very peculiar circumstance that the most violent advocates of separate schools as well as the most violent opponents of separate schools on the other side of the House, are, one and all of them urging us to accept these educational clauses. We are told by one set of these gentlemen that they strongly approved of these clauses because they would tend to disminish the number of separate schools and I suppose, finally do away with them altogether. By another set we are urged in impassioned language to vote for the clauses and give the Roman Catholic minority their rights; we are told that there is a religious principle at stake and that no country can be great and can endure without separate schoole. Why all this flood of eloqu-

ence if the Bill does not provide for separate schools as the people of Quebec understand them ? Why is it necessary to change the British North America Act to curtail the liberties of a free people, if we are only contending for a shadow ? It seems to me to be an extraordinarily foolish thing to invade provincial rights and to create so much ill-feeling if it is only for a shadow. Mr. Speaper, it is not yet too late for the government to retrace its steps. I trust that the Prime Minister and his government will withdraw these objectionable educational clauses and leave this matter in the hands of the people of the Northwest. I can assure the right hon. gentleman that he will make no mistake in trusting to the generosity of the people of the new provinces. The gentlemen on the Treasury benches and their supporters have been mistaken in their estimate of the character of the people of the Territories. I can tell them that the people of the Northwest are a just and broad-minded people ; I can tell them that the free air of the prairies has inspired the people with as great or a greater love for freedom than possibly exists down here. The people of the Territories will not be driven, and will not be coerced. It is foolish to try to coerce them ; trust them and they will show a gentle and a generous spirit in those matters.

It is a most extraordinary thing that the member for Brandon should have been ignorant of the proposed action of the government in regard to the educational clauses of the Bill. No man has occupied a more prominent position than he on the question of separate schools. It is incredible that he did not have this matter under his close attention and consideration or that he did not take steps to keep the Prime Minister well informed as to his views. However, he appears not only to have been kept in ignorance of the whole thing, but to have kept himself in blissful ignorance too. The reference of the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) to the bolting of the government supporters on this question and his comparison of it to the bolting of a flock of sheep reminds me of the experience of an old friend of mine who was taking his flock to a new ground where the pasturage was exceptionally good. The shepherd found he had to take his sheep through a narrow and difficult passage right in the centre of which was a large boulder. The sheep took alarm at the boulder and began to bolt in every direction. The shepherd had however a very sagacious old bell-wether in his flock and a brilliant idea struck him. He gave the bell-whether a kick behind and sent him off with the rest. When the sheep got well away he rolled the stone over so that it did not look the same as before. The plan answered to perfection, he soon got the flock together again and they safely negotiated this difficult place led by the old bell-wether. But, Mr. Speaker, it was just the same old boulder which he had simply rolled over and changed in appearance.

It was argued th other day by the member for Brandon that it would be a breach of faith with the people who come into this country expecting a separate school system if this remedial legislation were not passed in advance, so to speak ; and if a law were not put on the statute-book to retain a separate school system in this country for all time to come. The Minister of the Interior is responsible for the immigration pamphlets which are issued by his department. I have here one of those pamphlets, and I am told there are others, in which the system of education which exists in the Northwest Territories is set forth as entirely different from what he stated it to be. Further than that, I believe he has induced to come into this country a very large number of settlers from the United States, in the belief that they were coming into a country where a public school system existed. These are the words of one of these pamplets : 'The schools are non-sectarian and are national in character.' How about the rights of those people whom the Minister of the Interior has induced to come into this country upon such a definite promise as that ?

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that I have already occupied the time of the House at far too great a length. I appeal to this House to endorse the amendment which has been moved by the leader of the opposition, and to subscribe to the principle stated therein, which is the very principle upon which confederation was accomplished. That resolution sets forth that 'subject to and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1886, the legislatures of the new provinces are entitled to and should enjoy full powers of provincial self-government, including the power to exclusively make laws in relation to education.' If this principle is not embodied in the legislation now before the House, and if the rights of the new provinces are restricted and limited, then I wish to say, so far as I am concerned, and I believe so far as the Northwest is concerned, that the question is not settled finally. We shall take such further action, constitutional action, as we see fit ; and I am mistaken in the spirit of the men of the Northwest if they do not finally secure their full rights in this matter. The Prime Minister in his speech has appealed to precedent in regard to education and in regard to public lands. In each case the precedent which he has selected has been the exception to the general rule. He proposes to use these precedents to curtail the rights of the people of the new provinces. In British history, Mr. Speaker, it was not for such a purpose that precedent was ever quoted. Let me remind the right hon. gentleman of some lines of Tennyson,

which give the true meaning of precedent, and let me ask him to apply them to this great and progressive Canada, with its future to a great extent what he now chooses to make it :

A land of settled government,
A land of just and old renown,
Where freedom broadens slowly down
From precedent to precedent.

Canada cannot achieve the great destiny before her unless all her provinces are on an equality, unless all her people have equal rights and equal privileges. Do we appeal in vain to the former champions of provincial rights?

Mr. WALTER SCOTT moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 12.25 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 31, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

ABSENCE OF MINISTERS AND CABINET VACANCY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish once more to call to the attention of the House the quite unprecedented condition of affairs which exists at the present time. During many months we have not had in this House the presence of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Sutherland). That gentleman is one of my personal friends, although we are opposed in politics, and no one regrets more than I do the unfortunate circumstance that illness prevents him from taking his place among us, and any remarks which I have to make with regard to violation of constitutional usage by the government are, of course, not connected in any way with that gentleman, because I would be very glad indeed to have him restored to us, to once more have his assistance in the House and to have him back at work in his department again.

But my right hon. friend seems to take for granted that he is at liberty, so long as he may see fit, to deprive parliament and the country of the services of a Minister of Public Works possessing the authority and invested with the responsibility which that position gives to him. I have looked a little into this question, which has arisen more than once in Great Britain, and I find that the rule there acted upon is not at all in accordance with that suggested by the right hon. gentleman. To cite just one instance, in 1871, action was taken in both Houses of parliament in regard to the absence of Mr. Childers, the First Lord of the Admiralty, during the early part of the session, on account of the state of his health, and within a month after his resignation took place. It has been asserted in this House, I do not know with what truth, that the Minister of Public Works some time ago placed his resignation in the hands of the right hon. gentleman, or at all events told him that his portfolio was at his service whenever the interests of the country required it. However that may be, I wish courteously to place on record a remonstrance against the continuance of this condition of affairs. I do not think there is any warrant for it under the constitution. Indeed, I do not think there is any warrant for it under the terms of the Order in Council which was discussed somewhat last session, and under which one minister of the Crown may under certain circumstances act for another minister of the Crown.

On another occasion, which is referred to by Mr. Todd in his work on constitutional government, Lord John Russell had accepted the seals of the Colonial Office, at a time when he was absent on a diplomatic mission in Vienna. Within two weeks after he had accepted the seals of office, the matter was brought to the attention of parliament, and again on two or three occasions subsequently, and was made the occasion of a grave criticism of the administration, which only ceased when he took his place in parliament on the 28th of April. Now, so far as my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works is concerned, he has been absent from his duties in parliament and from his duties in the department for a very long time ; and if there be any foundation for the rumour that he is ready to surrender the seals of office at a moment's notice, I do not know for what reason the right hon. gentleman proposes to carry on the business of the country in the way in which it is carried on at the present time.

We have not only the case of the Minister of Public Works, but we have what seems to me a much more serious violation of constitutional usage in the conduct of the government with respect to the vacant portfolio of the Interior. I do not want to repeat to-day what has already been said in this House. I have asked the Prime Minister more than once for an explanation of his extraordinary conduct in passing over that gentleman in introducing a very important measure, a most momentous measure, into this parliament without even having submitted the terms of perhaps its most important clause to that gentleman, although his return was daily expected. My right hon. friend has treated that very

lightly. He has treated also very lightly the circumstance that he also withheld the terms of that clause from the knowledge of his Minister of Finance, who certainly of all ministers of the Crown, should have been acquainted with the provisions of the measure. I might almost venture to say that the conduct of the Prime Minister, in bringing that Bill down while withholding from parliament the knowledge that those gentlemen had not approved of it, amounted to an insult to this parliament; I think I might even go further, and say that the right hon. gentleman, in taking that course, demeaned himself; and not one word of explanation with regard to that very peculiar circumstance has fallen from the right hon. gentleman's lips from that day to this. Instead of that, we have had mere flippant replies or absolute silence when any explanation has been courteously demanded across the floor of this House. Moreover, we have had rumours, I do not know with what truth, but it is right that they should be stated and some answer made—we have had rumours from the press of the province of Quebec in close touch with this administration, and even direct statements, that the cause assigned to this parliament for the resignation of the Minister of the Interior was not the true cause. Further than that, a certain journal published in the province of Quebec with which a very devoted champion and warm and intimate personal friend of the Prime Minister is connected, has seen fit to make that statement in the form of a cartoon, which most of us have seen, but to which I will not make any further reference by way of description.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What paper?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. 'Le Nationaliste.'

Mr. LEMIEUX. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. It is not a paper friendly to the government. It is opposed to the government every Sunday.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I accept at once the superior knowledge of my hon. friend the Solicitor General. I do not profess to be an expert in regard to the opinions of that paper; but my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), who is a warm champion of the government with regard to this measure with which the resignation of the late Minister of the Interior is closely associated, has a very close connection with that paper, if I am rightly informed.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If the hon. member for Labelle were here, I am sure he would dissent from my hon. friend's statement. The hon. member for Labelle has repeatedly declared before this House and before the public that he had nothing to do with the 'Le Nationaliste.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I accept the statement of my hon. friend as I would accept the statement of the hon. member if he were here; but I have been imformed, perhaps incorrectly, that the hon. member for Labelle has been one of the regular contributors to that journal, and I myself have seen contributions in that journal which purported to be signed by that hon. gentleman. I do not think my hon. friend will deny that.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I can say to my hon. friend that when the paper was started about two years ago the hon. member for Labelle wrote two or three articles which he signed 'Henri Bourassa;' but since then he has declared over and over again that he has nothing to do with the paper.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I accept whatever my hon. friend states about it without the slightest reserve, either parliamentary or otherwise, and I will leave that for the gentlemen from the province of Quebec to settle. I do not pretend to know anything about it. There is another little interesting rumour which has come to us from time to time, and I observe that in former days my right hon. friend was very much interested in these rumours and used always to bring them to the attention of parliament in order that they might be contradicted. I have looked up his record in that regard and find that I have good precedent for what I am about to mention. There is a very strong rumour, said to have emanated from a certain member of the administration, who lately received a pretty severe little stab in this House from the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), that the ex-minister was not so absolutely ignorant of the terms of this measure, in the first instance, as had been suggested in this House. I do not know about that, but my right hon. friend can perhaps give us information and set at rest at once that disquieting rumour.

But what is the position to-day, so far as the Department of the Interior is concerned? We have a statute which says that there shall be a Department of the Interior and there shall be a Minister of the Interior. We start with that in the first instance. That statute goes on to say: 'The Minister of the Interior shall have the control and management of the affairs of the Northwest Territories.' Those are the exact words of the statute, and that statute has been in force during every one of the thirty-one days which have elapsed since the ex-Minister of the Interior has resigned. What was my right hon. friend's view with regard to this constitutional question not long ago? I have already brought it to the attention of the House, but it is not out of place that I shall repeat his own words again:

> In the practical working out of responsible government in a country of such vast extent as Canada, it is found necessary to attach a special responsibility to each minister for the public affairs of the province, or district with which he has close political connection, and

with which his colleagues may not be so well acquainted.

Well, we have a statute which says that the Minister of the Interior shall have the control and management of the affairs of the Northwest Territories, and we have the words of the Prime Minister himself who tells us that the Minister of the Interior, apart from any statute, has a special responsibility with regard to the affairs of the Northwest Territories with which he is more closely connected than his colleagues. But what are we proposing to do at present? We are proposing to take a step which the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues declare to be one of the most momentous ever taken by a parliament of Canada. Yet the right hon. gentleman has not filled the post of Minister of the Interior. That position is still vacant. We are now in the heat of debate upon the Bills he has introduced. Before long we shall be in committee on those Bills, and we shall not have the advantage of the presence and counsel of a minister specially responsible for the administration of those Territories. We do not find at present in the cabinet any minister who is able to carry on the work of that department. I have been informed by men, whom I have no reason to disbelieve, on various occasions during the last two or three weeks, that the work of that department is practically at a standstill for the lack of a responsible minister, familiar with its affairs and able to give his undivided attention to them. Why is this the case? Is there any reason for it? Let me show my hon. friend how zealous he was in respect of such matters when little difficulties, such as have recently occurred in the present administration, happened to occur some ten years ago in the Conservative administration of that day. What was the right hon. gentleman's view then:

> No administration would dare to sit and discharge the public business of the country unless the different provinces, or at all events the great provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, were properly represented in the cabinet; and when it is known that at present three of the ministers representing one province—that three of those gentlemen who represent a great portion of the population of the country—are out of the cabinet at the present time, whether officially or not, they are practically out of the cabinet. I say that we are not only in the midst of a great political crisis, but that we have reached a position unprecedented in the history of Canada, where the government would undertake to carry on the business of the country, one great province, the second in the Dominion, being altogether unrepresented in the cabinet.

But what is the right hon. gentleman proposing to do to-day? We have in the Northwest Territories to-day a population 150,000, greater than was the population of New Brunswick at the time when it served as an illustration for the comments of my right hon. friend which I have just read.

He is proposing to give to these Territories a constitution which at no time in the future will a Canadian parliament be able to change, and, forgetting the great constitutional rule which he laid down in days gone by, he is proposing to do this in the absence of any representative of those Territories in the cabinet. He is proposing that parliament should finally deal with a measure vitally affecting the Northwest Territories while these Territories are absolutely unrepresented in the cabinet. For what purpose was that statute passed creating the portfolio of Minister of the Interior? Why, if not that there shall be in the cabinet a minister representing that country who would be thoroughly competent to safeguard its interests especially in matters of such importance as the one now before us? Why, in those days my right hon. friend was so anxious in this regard, that upon the mere rumour of the resignation of ministers from Quebec, he moved the adjournment of the House and discussed the question at length. Later on, upon full explanation being given, when he had been assured that those gentlemen had not resigned and were at one with their colleagues, he was so much interested in the constiutional aspect of the case that he again moved the adjournment. But to-day when we inquire whether or not the vacant portfolio of the interior will be filled, my right hon. friend seems to emerge temporarily from a condition of forgetfulness. He is as one who would say: 'Why, bless my soul, then there is a Department of the Interior; I must look after it one of these days. There are Northwest Territories, but I had almost forgotten their existence. One of these days we will take the question up when there is nothing else to do; but in the meantime we will go on and deal with most important questions affecting these Territories without any regard whatever to the statute.' In those days he was a stickler for constitutional usage but to-day he displays a complete change of front. Let me read one more brief extract from a speech of the right hon. gentleman of those days:

> Moreover here are two seats vacant, vacant since yesterday, and although the hon. gentlemen who occupy these seats may not have tendered officially their resignations to His Excellency, it is quite evident that they are no longer in harmony with their colleagues, otherwise they would be in their places to discharge their share of the business of the country.

In view of the cynical disregard of the constitution which we see every day in this House, is not the reminiscence, brought up by the utterances I have just quoted, perfectly delicious? Here are two-thirds of the cabinet not in harmony with the other one-third, if we apply the test which the right hon. gentleman himself applied ten years ago. How many of the colleagues of my right hon. friend are present in the House to-day? There is a vacant seat next to him.

The one next to that is vacant. There is another vacant on his left and another alongside of the Minister of Inland Revenue. There is also a vacant seat immediately behind the right hon. gentleman. But still there is an unusually large number of ministers in the House to-day, and I have taken, I must admit, an unfortunate occasion to exhibit an object lesson to the country. Usually we have only about three ministers present, and we must therefore, according to the test which the right hon. gentleman applied ten years ago, conclude that the other ten are on the eve of resignation. However that may be, let me say that I do not observe in anything which has been suggested by my right hon. friend any reason why the portfolio of the Interior should not be filled.

He has said nothing on the subject. Has he no material? If he does not appoint my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) to be Chief Justice of the Northwest Territories, in view of the constitutional argument he gave us the other day, I imagine that that hon. gentleman would make a very good Minister of the Interior, and I am inclined to press his claims. He is a very good friend of mine personally, though we differ somewhat politically; and I stand here to urge the claims of my hon. friend from Edmonton to this position. He is a gentleman of ripe experience and great ability, and, as we all know a gentleman of absolute and perfect independence on all questions. But, if we cannot have my hon. friend from Edmonton, why should we not have the hon. member from West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). Is not he capable? Is there any apprehension on the part of the right hon. Prime Minister that there will be any difficulty about securing the election of either of these gentlemen? Does he propose to let this matter stand until after the close of the present session, in defiance of all the high constitutional principles which he professed ten years ago? If there is a lack of material among the members for the Northwest Territories, why not appoint some broad minded man like my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt), who spoke last night, or my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa)? Could not one of these gentlemen be induced to go up and teach these men in the Northwest Territories, whom they described as so narrow and bigoted that they could not be trusted, some of these men whom my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) described as regenade Liberals?—why not send one of these broad-minded tolerant gentlemen to these men of the Northwest Territories to teach them what true Christian charity and toleration really are. I do not think there could be any objection to that, though, of course, my hon. friend from Labelle might be himself a candidate for the Chief Justiceship in oppositon to my hon. friend from Edmonton, for he has said that he is ready to discuss the constitution with any man in this country or anywhere else.

Now, just one more observation on this subject. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was rather facetious ten years ago. He told us of those two ministers coming back and likened them to kittens coming back to their cream. Well, we have had a couple of kittens who were a little skittish on this occasion. One, it is true, did not leave the cream. It arched its back and curved its tail, but remained within a reasonable distance of the cream, and is still lapping. The other did leave the cream.

Mr. FOSTER. Shooed away.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is a disquieting rumour throughout the country, to which the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) might address himself, that, although the minister in question, like the kitten, has left the cream for the time being there is being prepared for him an exceedingly dainty dish of cream which will be served up in due season. We do not know whether that may be the case or not; but, perhaps it would be well for the right hon. gentleman, remembering the analogy which he gave to the House some time ago, to tell us whether or not there is anything in this rumour.

But, in all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, I do think it is due to the House and to the country that the Prime Minister should state what the intention of the government is in regard to the filling of the portfolio. The government, in defiance of all constitutional usages and of constitutional rules laid down by themselves on many occasions intend, apparently, to press this measure through parliament without having in the cabinet any minister who is more especially responsible for the Northwest Territories. We should be informed, in view of the delay in filling this position, what is the cause of that delay and also when the Prime Minister expects to fill this portfolio. Or, if he does not propose to fill it in the immediate future, may I not, respectfully, and with every right, ask him to announce to the House and to the country what the difficulties really are which prevent him, at the present time, from calling to his cabinet some gentleman from the Northwest Territories or elsewhere, who, in the cabinet, will particularly represent these Territories.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, I have no serious fault to find with my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) if he has chosen to have another little joke upon a subject which is evidently congenial to him. I have no fault to find if he has brought to the attention of the House the resignation of my hon. friend the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) from the portfolio of the Interior and the

reason why he has not yet been replaced. Yet, I might have hoped that my hon. friend would abstain on this occasion from referring to another gentleman, a highly respected member of this House, who, unfortunately, is not in his seat, from a cause which, we might have hoped, would appeal to the hon. gentleman's sympathy as to the sympathy of every member of this House. My hon. friend, I think, was not well actuated, nor do I think his remarks were at all called for, in directing the attention of the House to the fact that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. James Sutherland) has not been in his place in this House during the present session. The fact is correctly stated, and, perhaps, under different circumstances, no fault could be found with the observations which my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) has made. But I was under the impression that the well known cause of the absence from the House of the Minister of Public Works would warrant everybody in allowing that absence to pass without remark. The hon. gentleman (Mr. James Sutherland) has been absent from this House because of the state of his health. I am reminded that, some six or seven years ago, when another of my colleagues, the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) having suffered a severe shock in a railway accident, was absent from this parliament for a whole session, not a word was ever uttered upon the subject. Everybody understood the circumstances and hoped that the hon. gentleman would resume his duties as we hope that the hon. Minister of Public Works will, in the near future, be able to resume his place. And that is the reason why the absence of the Minister of Public Works should not be commented upon. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) has referred to a rumour that the Minister of Public Works has tendered his resignation to me. I would have preferred not to speak upon this subject. I do not know that the House expects me to speak upon it even after the reference to it made by my hon. friend. Still, I may say that the Minster of Public Works has not placed his resignation in my hands. When he told me that he was in poor health and could not attend to the business of the session, I took it upon myself to say to him, 'My friend, you had better go away and stay away until you are better; we will arrange to carry on the work of your department; and every member of the House will be glad to know that there is hope that you will soon come back again.'

Now, with regard to the resignation of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), I have only one observation to make in answer to the numerous queries my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) has put to me. So far as I know, and I have no reason to believe to the contrary, the only difference that occurred between myself and the late Minister of the Interior was that he resigned upon this educational question and for no other reason. I owe it to my hon. friend from Brandon to make this statement openly, widely, and, as I hope, for ever to set at rest any rumours to the contrary.

Now, it is true that my hon. friend has not been replaced yet. How many days have elapsed since he resigned his portfolio? Just thirty-one days. But, before I come to that, let me say that I do not think there is any anology whatever between the resignation of my hon. friend the late Minister of the Interior and what took place some ten years ago, in 1895. Then we saw a very different spectacle—members coming in and members going out, members resigning one day and taking back their resignation the following day, or the following week, members absent from parliament, not because they were called away a few days for any reason, but members not in their seats because they were neither in nor out of the government, and because they did not appear to know what position they occupied. There is nothing of the kind here, we know where we are, at all events. But when there are disagreements amongst ministers, the honourable course is for the dissenting minister to proffer his resignation, and to say to the Prime Minister: I do not agree with your policy. This is what has taken place; and therefore there is no analogy whatever between what took place in 1895 and what is taking place to-day. It is true, as I say, that the hon. member for Brandon has not been replaced in the cabinet. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition asks, for what cause? Is it any lack of material? Perhaps it may be for an opposite cause, perhaps it is too abundant material. There is such a thing as an embarras de richesse, although my hon. friend appears to be suffering from the reverse, he is suffering from penury. while we on this side are suffering from abundance and that may be just as good a reason as the reason suggested by my hon. friend.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Make two ministers then.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know but that would be a good reason, I will think of it. It might be well to have two ministers instead of one; but I am sure that if I were to ask parliament for an appropriation for another minister my hon. friend would be one of the first to object, he would not allow us to do it. However, we will have to be content with one Minister of the Interior, that is all we are called upon to appoint. I do not think my hon. friend can charge the government with negligence because it has not appointed another minister to a portfolio which has been vacant only thirty-one days. I do not think there has been any negligence whatever, on the contrary I think the government has done right

to deliberate, to consider what position they are going to take, who they are going to call upon to fill the very important place left vacant by the late minister.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The right hon. gentleman appreciates of course the fact that in this connection I called attention to the peculiar condition, namely, that we are about to pass a very important Bill with regard to those Territories.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, and this is a reason why, in my estimation, instead of pressing the matter, we should exercise a little delay. This Bill cannot be postponed if we intend to have these provinces begin operations on the 1st of July next. There are many reasons why this should be done, the people expect it, and therefore we cannot delay the prosecution of the Bill. But the hon. gentleman wants us at the same time to proceed with the Bill and to proceed with an election in the Northwest Territories, or somewhere else. I do not think, under the circumstances, we can do anything else than to proceed, as governments have always proceeded in these matters, and to take time to consider who is the best man to seek to fill this position. There are numerous precedents, of which I will refer to a few. There has been a vacancy before in the portfolio on the Interior. For instance, the Department of the Interior had been filled by a very able man, the Hon. Thomas White, from the 5th of August, 1885, to the 21st April, 1888, and then a vacancy occurred through the death of that gentleman. That vacancy remained from the 21st April to the 3rd August, 1888, not one month, not two months, not three months, but more than three months elapsed before the vacancy was filled. This occurred during a session of parliament, and I do not remember that any word of criticism was made against the government because they did not proceed immediately to fill that portfolio. But that is not all. I would call attention to another important department of the government, the Department of Railways. That department was created on the 20th of May, 1879, it was filled by Sir Charles Tupper, who occupied the position until the 23rd of May, 1884, when the position became vacant and remained vacant—how long ? To the 25th of September, 1884 ? No, but until the 25th of September, 1885, nearly a year and four months. But that is not all. The Hon. John Henry Pope occupied the portfolio from September 25, 1885, to April 1, 1889, when a vacancy again occurred by the death of Mr. Pope, and the portfolio remained vacant until the 28th of November, 1889, when it was filled by Sir John A. Macdonald. He occupied the post of Minister of Railways until the 6th of June, 1891, when the portfolio became vacant and remained so until the 11th of January, 1892, when it was filled by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart). Yet there was not, so far as I remember, much criticism on the fact of these vacancies remaining so long, one of them for a year and four months. On the present occasion, a vacancy has occurred in the portfolio of the Interior, but it will not remain vacant for one year and four months, not even for four months, not even for three months, but in due time, and before long, I shall give my hon. friend the fullest satisfaction that he desires to have on this question.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto) The right hon. gentleman has, as usual, risen to the occasion in his own way ; whether that way is satisfactory to the House and to the country is another matter. He has, as often happens recently, not treated the matter seriously. He seems to think that, as the responsible head of a government, he is not bound to give any sufficient reasons for violations of constitutional practice, violations of precedent and violations of the canons of good government. He read my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, a lecture upon propriety, which I think was altogether uncalled for. It seems to me that the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. R. L. Borden) introduced his reference to the Department of Public Works in the most kindly and most courteous way. He attempted to find no fault with the minister personally. But what did strike him, and what, I think he expressed to the House very properly and very reasonably, was the fact that one of the most important departments of the government is now, not for one month, or two months, or three months, or four months, but for many, many months more than that, practically without a head. Well, whilst disposed in every way to have a kindly feeling to the hon. gentleman who has the misfortune by illness to be away from his department, I think it is very well understood that there is not a probability of that hon. gentleman again administering that department. He has been out of it for a long series of months. It has been practically taken over by another gentleman who is not responsible in the way that a minister is. I am not at all saying that he would not make a very good responsible minister, but no man can in a lay position, so to speak, administer a department with the same power and with the same sense of responsibility as one who is specially appointed under the law. So that, in reference to that the maxim which has been so often mentioned here of late that the King's government must go on applies. The King's government must go on. It will not wait even for illness or for death or for any of these circumstances. The affairs of the country are over and superior to all these and there is not the least doubt in the world that the department suffers from the lack of a responsible head.

Saying no more about that, if this department is, for the reasons that the right hon. First Minister stated, vacant and has been vacant for ever so long it ought to be an additional reason and a very strong additional reason why other departments which are vacant or virtually vacant in this House should be filled up. For instance, take the Department of the Interior. The minister himself of that department for a long time, by reason of illness, was unable to be at the department. I suppose there is no department of this government which has so varied a range of interests and requires so much a constant, steady and firm head as the Department of the Interior. The hon. gentleman who was the minister has been away from that department for a considerable length of time. Changes took place whilst he was away, changes which have never been explained to this House. The deputy minister retired or was forced to retire, I do not know which, and a new man was placed in the department. There is an additional reason why there should be some responsible head of the department. With its varied interests, with its multiplied avenues of approach—approach for all kinds of influences extending from the administration of the gold regions in the far north down all through an immense range of territory in Canada itself, with its branches all over the United States of America and all over Europe as well there is not a department which lends itself so much to abuse and to results which inevitably arise from the want of careful and firm handling than that very same department. There have been things said against that department and they are said against that department now. The right hon. gentleman has not read the newspapers and moved up and down Canada without knowing all these things. For that reason then, and when a new deputy minister takes hold, nominally, there should be a strong, firm and responsible man at the head of the department. During the whole session we have not been able to get any information from the Interior Department such as we should have got. There has not been a question of moment brought up because there has been no person in the House representing the department to answer for the department. The right hon. gentleman who leads the government says : I am nominally the head of the department. 'Nominally' that is the correct word. It is absolutely impossible for him to master the details of that department with the multiplied duties that he has as premier—absolutely impossible and still that portfolio remains open? Why ? Because of lack of material ? The Prime Minister will not say that. In his easy way he has rather attributed it to an embarrassment of riches. Well, the right hon, gentleman cannot delay for ever. He can make up his mind quickly enough if he wishes to. He can delay just as long as any other man if it suits him to delay, but we know that at this very moment he has within his mind's eye the man he proposes to appoint as Minister of the Interior. Why does he not have him go to the west? Is he afraid that his Bill will be through before the election can be carried out. I think he can possess his soul in patience so far as that is concerned. He will have ample time to send his man to the Northwest Territories and give one single, solitary opportunity, the only one, of permitting the Northwest a voice of allowing one portion at least of the people of the Northwest Territories to pronounce upon the policy of this Bill which is so all important to that great western country. The right hon. leader of the government, stickler for precedent that he is when he is out of office, puts it lightly away when he assumes the badge of office. He erects into a constitutional principle what had never before been taken is a constitutional principle in order to serve a purpose. The purpose once served he throws away his invention, he has no use for it, until another circumstance arises which will call for another constitutional principle. What is his constitutional principle ? It was adverted to by my hon. friend here (Mr. R. L. Borden). It was the result of a circumstance which was none too creditable to the government of my right hon. friend. An hon. gentleman went into a department in the temporary absence of another minister meddled in a matter of its administration and so brought about some considerable confusion in the government of this country. It was then that the new constitutional principle was devised, invented, brought out brand new, that there was a geographical ministerial responsibility as well as a constitutional responsibility—all very good for the occasion and yet when you have a great part of this country to be erected into provinces, to be, by an irrevocable decree fashioned, moulded and formed the right hon. gentleman refuses to consult with the representatives of the government of that country. He brings down here at his own express request and call the only representatives that are available of these two great Territories—the premier and one of his cabinet, backed up, as I said the other day, by a third member of his cabinet. When he gets them here he throws them lightly aside, at least the Tory part of the represensation, he finds sources of information in his own way and he refuses almost absolutely upon the most important part of his Bill to recognize the legal and constitutional representative of that portion of the country for which this Bill is being specially provided. As he himself says this is the most momentous of questions before the House affecting absolutely and particularly that portion of the country, and yet he will not either test the feeling of the people of that country, or what is of much more im-

portance than that, he will not give to that portion of the country its minister with geographical responsibility as well as constitutional responsibility.

Now, a circumstance occurred not long ago which rather lends force to the argument and which affects some men in the right hon. gentleman's cabinet. What did we find in October of last year ? We found the right hon. gentleman coming down to the province of Ontario, getting down upon bended knees before a luminary of the law and saying to him in so many English words : My dear Mr. Aylesworth I have colleagues and representatives in the government from the province of Ontario who have been with me for some time, but I find that in Ontario my hold is growing gradually weaker. I am not only not increasing the strength, but I see that strength diminishing. I do not want to turn these out to pasture, poor as they are, and so I must have you come in and save the remnant in the province of Ontario. The right hon. gentleman needed some strength, and if ever there was a practical illustration of that need we have it this year. The lynx-eyed minister, the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock), is not here, and I suppose I may venture to mention him to-day without his inflicting upon this House that oft-repeated story repeated so well along the concessions and side lines of North Ontario, learned and conned and repeated so often up and down the province of Ontario, and repeated so often in this House, that it is becoming a tale oft-told, with the little interest that attaches to a tale oft-told. I suppose that I may refer to the fact that he slept at his post while the most important legislation was being performed for these orphan territories in the Northwest. Is there not some reason why there should be a brave, bright, strong, wide-awake man brought in from the west who will not sleep at his post, but who will know what is going on and see that his geographical ministerial responsibility is fully exercised in the representation of the people in the country from which he comes. If the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) can keep constitutionally portfolios open for one month, he can keep them open for two, three or four months. He was the gentleman who, in opposition, pleaded always for a full cabinet, for the ministerial responsibility to be properly divided and distributed, and that there should be at the post of power in each department a responsible head. He knows as well as we all know that that is proper constitutional doctrine, and that it is necessary for the good government and good administration of the country. Yet he does not fill the vacant position, and he does not give us any valid reason why.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). The First Minister has referred to the fact that after the death of the late Hon. Thomas White the portfolio of the Interior was vacant for some time. That is true, but he also knows that at that time a new principle in constitutional government, the principle that there must be a responsible minister for the district, had not been engrafted on the constitution of this country. The First Minister has given us that new line in the constitution. At that time also there was no great crisis in the Northwest, as there is on the present occasion, for it must be remembered that the vacancy in the portfolio of the Minister of the Interior to-day is caused owing to the fact that legislation is before this House which the responsible minister from the district refused to endorse and which he claims is not satisfactory to the people of that region. Therefore, the circumstances are entirely changed, and, as far as the parallel goes, the Prime Minister's argument will not hold godd. The custom in all these matters in the old country is that there shall be a responsible minister at each post. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has referred to a case in point, where, in 1871, objection was simply taken in the House of Commons to the fact that Mr. Childers, First Lord of the Admiralty, was absent during illness, and within one month thereafter Mr. Childers resigned. This is even more important than the case of the absence of a minister through illness. We have before us an important measure which is going to affect that Northwest country for weal or woe. The minister refuses to sanction that measure and retires from the cabinet, but owing to certain pressure, I do not know what the pressure or arrangement may have been, time may solve it, but owing to some negotiations—and they are good at carrying on negotiations and bringing about mediations in the cabinet—the ex-Minister of the Interior has agreed to vote for the government's emasculated measure, as he terms it, although on every solitary point in the Bill he differs essentially from the First Minister and the cabinet. The circumstances are such that I maintain they warrant the action of the government in filling the post at the very first opportunity. The First Minister has stated that this Bill cannot wait, that it must become law by the 1st of July. It is not very long from now until the 1st of July, and if the First Minister is anxious that the measure shall get through by the 1st of July it might be advisable for him to seriously consider whether or not its passage would not be facilitated by the appointment of a new Minister of the Interior, who might go before his constituents, seek re-election and test the feeling as to the reception which the Bill will likely meet when it has been passed by this House. The Prime Minister would likely make time if he adopted such a course rather than trusting to the Bill being passed with-

out opposition and becoming law by the 1st of July, so that he could thereafter have the election of the Minister of the Interior.

I want to say a word about the position of the Minister of Public Works. The acting minister (Mr. Hyman), I regret to say, has just gone out. No man regrets the illness of the present minister—I refer to the Hon. Mr. James Sutherland—more than I do myself. He is a gentleman for whom I have always had and always shall have the very highest personal regard, and no one will more heartily welcome him back to health and to this House than I. But what are the facts of the case? It is generally understood, in fact a gentleman whom the minister himself has consulted, has stated that the Minister of Public Works has asked the First Minister to accept his resignation, but for some reason or other this resignation has not been accepted. That responsible position, which the constitution requires shall be held by a member having a seat in the parliament directly responsible to the people, has not been filled, and one of the largest spending departments of the public service is without a responsible head in this House to-day. I am not saying one word about the hon. member for London, the minister without portfolio (Mr. Hyman), a gentleman who I believe undoubtedly stands head and shoulders over his colleagues from that province. I am not saying one word about his fitness, and that is all the more reason why he should be made the responsible minister. He occupies a peculiar position. His position in the cabinet is simply that of a minister without portfolio. He is not responsible for any department, and has not appealed to the people for re-election after his appointment as minister. I am sure the First Minister will bear me out when I say that the position he now occupies is entirely unconstitutional. It is pointed out in Todd, page 483, volume 2, in reference to the case of Lord Russell, spoken of by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden):

> On March 9 the Earl of Derby took notice in the House of Lords of 'the very great inconvenience and injury to the public service' occasioned by the absence from the country and from his official duties of the Colonial Secretary——

It was only in February that Lord Russell went to Vienna.

> ——more especially as no Under Secretary had been yet appointed to represent the department in the House of Commons.
>
> Earl Granville (the president of the council) replied, that for the present the Home Secretary (Sir George Grey) would also take charge of the Colonial Department, being 'formally and technically' competent, as a secretary of state, to control any branch of the secretariate.

As a matter of fact, Lord John Russell returned and resumed his seat on April 30.

Although the Prime Minister was in his place, the minister who was both formally and technically responsible returned in less than two months, and that satisfied the House and the country. The case of the Minister of Public Works was entirely different. The member for London is not technically qualified. He may be formally qualified as a member of the Privy Council, but he is not technically qualified for the office of Minister of Pubilc Works, and therefore I maintain that there should be no delay in accepting the resignation of the Minister of Public Works. Then the member for London, one of the most popular men in the country, will have an opportunity of proving whether or not the present cabinet has the confidence of the people of this Dominion, not only in regard to the Public Works Department, but in regard to their general conduct of other matters. The custom of the English constitution is that all important measures involving important principles, such as that involved in the Bill before the House, should be pronounced upon by the people before becoming law. The First Minister knows that this measure was not at all discussed before the electorate. No one dreamed that there were going to be the contentious matters in this Bill that have been found in it. Therefore I maintain that the duty of the Prime Minister is to hold this Bill off until the feeling of the country in regard to it can be tested in a general election. I maintain that there is only one of two courses open to him at the present time. One is to go to the country and test the feeling of the electors in a general election; another is to appoint a new Minister of the Interior and put him in the field in some riding in the Northwest and test the feeling of the country in that way. The portfolio of the Interior should not be held open a moment longer than is absolutely necessary.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I beg to say a few words on this question before the motion is disposed of. it seems to me that we are face to face with a very unusual state of things both in this House and in the country. We are confronted with what may fairly be regarded, under constitutional government, as a very grave crisis. Confederation is yet on its trial. It was adopted many years ago to overcome difficulties which experience had shown to exist in our previous form of government, and with the object of doing justice to every interest and every locality. The fathers of confederation wisely and carefully considered this constitution before it was adopted, for the purpose of endeavouring, as far as the experience of the national life would enable them to do up to that time, to avoid the troubles of the past and to provide a proper government for the future; and the principle they laid down was representation by population in the popular chamber—this

is, that every member should represent a certain number of the electors or population. But they provided that every member should represent a certain area as well. The delimitation of the areas each of which should elect a member was made in the first statutes, and that was observed and carried out in our first election. The fathers of confederation believed that we required an upper House as well as a lower House—a corrective chamber that would not be subject to the excitement of elections but that would be appointed by the Crown; and the selection of the men who were to form that chamber was made on the principle that each should represent not only a certain province, but a certain district in that province. From Quebec there were to be twenty-four, from Ontario twenty-four, and from the maritime provinces twenty-four and each was to represent a certain district within his particular province. There were not only twenty-four members of the Senate assigned to Quebec, but the British North America Act says :

> In the case of Quebec each of the twenty-four senators representing that province shall be appointed for one of the twenty-four electoral divisions of Lower Canada specified in schedule 'A' to chapter 1 of Consolidated Statutes of Canada.

I am giving this recapitulation to show that the designers of confederation had in view not only representation by population, but representation of locality as well, and that this principle applied not only to the popular chamber, which was to be elected, but to the Senate, which was not to be elected, and to the cabinet ministers. With regard to ministerial representation, we find that a certain number of ministers were assigned to Quebec. Originally it was three. Now it is four, with an extra one, which makes the number five. The same number was assigned to Ontario and the same number to the maritime provinces ; and these were so arranged that each locality would be represented. That principle was followed for years as strongly as any other principle to be found within the four corners of the constitution. It was a part of our unwritten constitution, and we lived up to it carefully and closely, because it was believed that by doing so we did justice to all parts of the country and to all interests involved, and no injustice to any. A certain number of cabinet ministers was assigned to each province in proportion to its population, its importance and its area. As time went on and settlement went westward, we were obliged to change that a little. We dropped some of our representation in the smaller provinces in the east, and endeavoured to give representation to the west ; because it was felt that so long as there was a section that had no voice in the cabinet, we were not fully carrying out the principle of representation that was adopted by the fathers of confederation. What was all this intended for ? That every locality should have its voice and its spokesman in the parliament of the nation and in the cabinet, so that justice might be done to all parts of the country. That was the aim and the reason why this unwritten constitution was followed as closely as any portion of our written constitution.

There are two objects in view in organizing a cabinet. What are these two objects ? The first is to select men who are fitted for the position. The second is to make the selection so that each menber of the cabinet may represent a certain locality and the special interests in that locality. These interests may be commercial or maritime or something else. And the selection should be such as will receive the endorsation of the people. These are the two objects in view in filling a cabinet. In a well balanced cabinet, every district has its voice at the council board, every district has its representative in council. But applying this principle to the present condition of things, what is the situation today. We have in this confederation about 2,100,000 square miles of territory. How much of that territory is represented in this cabinet ? Take the combined provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, and they only represent 564,000 square miles. Take the balance of the territory which is not represented, which has no voice in the cabinet, which has no say at the council board, and we find that it comprises 1,558,888 square miles.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What is the population of that ?

Mr. SPROULE. I am not going into details as regards population, but if you take the map of the Dominion and draw a line straight through it from south to north, going as far west as you will find a cabinet representative at present—that is the city of London—you will find that two-thirds of the territory of the Dominion is without a cabinet representative. Is that just or unjust ? Is that carrying out the design of the fathers of confederation ? Is that doing justice to all and injustice to none ? I say it is not. Two-thirds of the Dominion to-day have no voice at the council board. Whatever policy may be introduced and decided upon there, they have no opportunity of expressing their dissent or assent or of shaping it any way whatever. A rather eminent writer on confederation said that it was the solemn duty of each province keenly to watch and promptly to repel any attempt faint or forcible which the federal government might be disposed to make on the rights and privileges of any one of them. That is Mr. Watson's idea of the duties of the provinces. But how can a province exercise this scrutiny unless it has its full representation, not only in the House of

Commons, but on the council board of a nation. And if this large portion of the Dominion has no voice in the council, surely it is deprived of a portion of its undoubted rights. I find that two-thirds of the area of this Dominion is not represented at the council board, and that at the very time when a most important question, one vitally affecting the interests of that country, is about to be decided. One of the provinces to-day has almost been driven into revolt, if we can believe what we read in the newspapers. I refer to the province of Manitoba. The absolute refusal of the rights of that province to have its boundaries extended, the absolute refusal to do its claims justice when these new provinces are being created, has irritated it to such an extent that its government has threatening to resign as a protest against the conduct of this administration. Are we not then face to face with a very serious crisis?

A great question is now before us for determination, namely, the establishment of two new provinces out in the Northwest Territories. What ownership shall these provinces have in the soil? What representatives shall they possess? What legislative power shall be given them? What interference shall we make with what they believe to be their undoubted rights in the future? All these great questions are being discussed by this parliament, and these Territories have no voice at the council board. They had a voice there not long ago, but their representative resigned as a rebuke against the high-handed and unwarranted conduct of the government on the Autonomy Bill. A Minister of the Crown, representing that country, gave practical expression of his dissent from that policy by resigning his portfolio. Under the circumstances, it certainly is the duty of the government to fill that portfolio at the earliest possible moment and have a united cabinet on the policy which they are submitting to parliament. Why are they not acting in accord with the principles of constitutional government? Why do they not appoint a minister and let him go before the people, so that the people may have an opportunity of endorsing or condemning the policy of the administration? The reason, Sir, is evident. They dare not do it. They want to force the Bill through without giving the people chiefly interested an opportunity of declaring their will regarding it. They refuse to respect the sovereign rights of the people. They are acting in utter disregard of the great electorate which can make and unmake parliament? Are they afraid to appeal to that power? I am justified by their conduct in coming to the conclusion that they are afraid to trust the people.

Then, are we not justified in raising our voice in rebuke of the conduct of the government? Are we not justified in calling public attention to that conduct as a violation of the principles of constitutional government under which we live? We should clearly be doing less than our duty if we refrained from inviting public attention to the present condition of affairs. As I have said, it is clear that the government dare not allow the people to speak, to signify their agreement or disagreement with the measure now before the House. At best, the representation of the Northwest in regard to this measure could only be indirect so far as the cabinet is concerned. The people of the Northwest Territories sent their Prime Minister, their accredited representative. Except for this delegate they are represented only by a few members in this House whose voices are but little heard. The government has acted in a most high-handed and tyrannical fashion in its treatment of the rights of the people of Manitoba and the Northwest.

Now, when a member is selected for the cabinet, he is selected on two grounds—his fitness for the position and the locality he represents. And who is to determine his fitness? First, the Prime Minister who chooses him. But the judgment of the Prime Minister must be endorsed by the people, for, according to our constitutional forms, a minister, on his appointment, must go before the people to be endorsed by them. Have the government dared to appoint a minister and so seek the judgment of the people on their policy? They have not. This policy was not before the people in the last election, and so there has not been the opportunity for the people to express themselves upon it. The only conclusion that we can come to is that the government are afraid of the people and dare not take the step of appointing a minister to fill the present vacancy because the effect of that would be to give the people an opportunity to express their opinions upon this important measure. The financial interests of that great country in the Northwest are involved; their whole future is involved. Yet, they have no one in the cabinet to speak for them or determine their rights,—the people of the Northwest must go into the 'Blind pool' to which the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) referred last year. Yet, the Prime Minister declares over and over again that he admires the British constitution and tries to follow it. His conduct, in my opinion, is the very reverse of all that; he violates every principle of constitutional government by the course he pursues. He acts like the Czar of Russia, deliberately against the people's rights and wishes. The people are given no opportunity to determine what their legislative rights shall be with regard to their property, their financial relations to the Dominion or any of the other great questions involved in this measure. And their accredited representative, their Prime Minister, is spurned when he comes here and seeks to speak on behalf of his people.

The conduct of the government is a direct

invasion of provincial rights. The present Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) should be the last man in Canada to disregard or ignore provincial rights in carrying on our government. The fathers of confederation, when they were determining what form of government we should have, were compelled, owing to the sentiment of Quebec to favour a federal union rather than a legislative union. Under the federal union the boundaries of provincial rights are clearly marked and held as sacred, while, under a legislative union the provinces would have only such powers as were given them by the central authority. I find the following passage in the life of Sir John A. Macdonald. Speaking of the discussions which took place before confederation was consummated he said :

> But, on looking at the subject in the conference, and discussing the matter as we did most unreservedly, with a desire to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion, we found that such a system was impracticable.

This refers to a legislative union. And why was it impracticable ?

> In the first place, it would not meet the assent of Lower Canada.

And why not ?

> Because they felt that, in their peculiar position—being in a minority,with a different language, nationality and religion from the majority—in case of a junction with the other provinces, and their institutions and their laws might be assailed and their ancestral associations, on which they pride themselves, attacked and prejudiced.

And, for that reason, they would not accept a legislative union. So, they secured a federal union, in order that their provincial rights might be maintained. But the Bill now before the House infringes provincial rights, determining in advance the course of action of the new provinces in the Northwest. It deprives these new provinces of the right to manage their own affairs as the older provinces are free to manage theirs. In this respect, the measure does not carry out the principle of confederation. And it comes with doubly bad grace from a Prime Minister who comes from Quebec, a province that insisted upon a form of confederation which would make their provincial rights secure. Now that the rights of his own province are established, the Prime Minister attacks the provincial rights of the new provinces in the west. In view of all this I say we are face to face with a great crisis and there is strong excitement throughout our country. And why ? Because of the outrage upon the feelings and opinions of the people who have no opportunity to help themselves. Should this continue ? I say it should not. I have called attention to the fact that disregard of our constitutional system almost drove one province into revolt, and, if it is persisted in, it may arouse to revolt the people of the new provinces. The sooner the government place themselves squarely upon the principles of the constitution and give to the Northwest a representative in the cabinet, the better it will be for everybody. We shall then have an opportunity to work out our constitutional system to a success, instead of making it the discouraging failure it undoubtedly will be if this government and their successors set constitutional principles at defiance.

Mr. A. A. STOCKTON (St. John City and County). Mr. Speaker, I think the points made by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) are well taken. I hope the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will pardon me if I say that I do not think that he met the question asked by the leader of the opposition with the frankness which the circumstances demanded. It will be remembered, that, after the introduction of the Bills which have produced so much discussion in this House, the question was asked of the Prime Minister whether the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) would be back in time for the discussion of these Bills. The First Minister replied that he did not know when the Minister of the Interior would be here, meaning that he did not expect, and did not care whether the Minister of the Interior were here or not, since he, the First Minister, had charge of the Bill.

Now, let me say that the First Minister has not answered the question put by the leader of the opposition except by citing the instances which took place ten, twelve or more years ago. What is the opinion of the First Minister with respect to those instances? Did he approve of them, or does he approve of them now? Does he think that citing those instances is a sufficient answer to the question put him by the leader of the opposition ? I would like to know what the opinions of the First Minister are upon those instances. I say, Mr. Speaker, that if there ever was a time in the history of this country when it was necessary that a responsible minister from that Northwest country should be here on the floor of this House, it is to-day. We know that the proposition has been put forward that the ministers represent localities, and that they are to be trusted to a large extent with the administration of affairs in those localities. How stands the matter to-day? Is there any representative from the great Northwest here to-day to look after the interests of that great country, which is causing so much discussion and occupying so much attention in this House and in the country at large? Not one, Sir, and so far as any information is given by the First Minister to-day, there will be no representative in the government from the Northwest until after these Bills are passed. Is that fair to the people of that country?

Is it fair to the representatives of that country in this House to force this measure through without the people of the Northwest, by their responsible minister, having a voice in the consideration of the measure? I think not, Sir, and I think it is unfair to that country that it should have no responsible minister here while this discussion is going on, and while this measure is being passed through the House.

But, Sir, there is another phase of the question. When the ex-Minister of the Interior appeared here, apparently to the confusion of the First Minister, two days after he had introduced this Bill, what took place? The resignation of the Minister of the Interior. Why? As a protest against the action of the First Minister in introducing the Autonomy Bills in his absence, and particularly against the educational clauses thereof, which the ex-Minister of the Interior could not endorse, and he vacated his seat as a protest against the action of the First Minister and of his government. That was a challenge thrown down to the First Minister and to his government upon their policy with respect to these Bills. There is a vacancy in the government now, the government is without a Minister of the Interior. Let the First Minister test the feeling of the people of the Northwest upon this question by selecting from his plethora of ability that he has behind him a gentleman to fill the position of Minister of the Interior, and let him send that gentleman back for re-election in order to test the feelings of the people of the Northwest with respect to his policy. That would be the manly way, that would be the bold way, that would be the proper way on the part of men who are willing to trust the people. Is this government willing to trust the people in connection with these Bills?

Mr. SPROULE. No.

Mr. STOCKTON. The conduct of the government apparently shows that they are not willing to trust the people. I say, don't gag the people of the Northwest, give them an opportunity to say whether they want this legislation or not, give them an opportunity to say in a constitutional way whether they are in harmony with the government with respect to this measure. The right hon. gentleman has an opportunity of doing that. If he and his government do not do it, they show that they do not trust the people; although the right hon. gentleman is reported to have said that he was a democrat to the hilt. Now, Sir, I should say no more on this question. I felt that I could not remain silent while a question of this importance was before the House. I repeat that the conduct of the government in keeping this seat vacant is not fair to the people of the Northwest, it is not fair to the people of the rest of Canada, and, furthermore, it is contrary to the constitutional usages which obtain in the mother country and all the great self-governing colonies of the empire.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe). I did not intend to speak on this question until the main question came again before the House. But I do feel that this is a time for hon. members of the House to speak out, and say distinctly what they think of the conduct of the government. I had hoped, there being seven representatives in this House from the Northwest supporting the government, that they at all events would defend the interests of their own section in this matter. When I find that the First Minister has been able so far to influence and to control those hon. members, I think it necessary that the rest of us should speak out definitely on this subject. Now the First Minister has been perfectly consistent, and with my great respect for the First Minister, I shall take the liberty of addressing a few plain words to him in the English language which I hope he will fairly understand. I hope that the people of this country will become seized of the situation, and although it is vain to hope that the government will listen to the voice of reason on this subject, there is one power in this country great enough to arrest the action of the government, and that is the press. I hope that they will take this matter up and agitate from end to end of Canada before this measure goes through, in order that we may guarantee the interests of the great west in this House. I say that the First Minister to-day has been consistent in his attitude throughout this whole matter, not only in this matter, but during the last two sessions, in treating lightly subjects of great importance and in treating the representatives of the people with levity by neglecting their just demands. The First Minister must apprehend that he has not on any occasion when the leader of the opposition, either to-day or previously, asked for information which this House has a right to obtain, given a fair, square and honest answer to a question.

Now the First Minister says, we know where we are. Well, perhaps they do. It is rather recent information, for they did not know where they were two or three weeks ago. A portion of their followers were in rebellion two or three weeks ago, but the party lash has been applied. They know where they are to-day but they do not know where they will be to-morrow. They do not know where they will be a week hence and I warrant there are some hon. gentlemen opposite who do not know yet quite what is going to develop during the course of this discussion, and who do not know where they will be a week hence. Probably the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) thinks he knows where he is. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) probably thinks he knows where he is

or where he is going to be, but, they do not both know it. One of them will probably get the office and we will then see a display of the anger of the one who has not got the position he desires. The right hon. First Minister says that it is only thirty-one days' delay, and he also said that in 1888 it was a matter of months or probably more that the position of Minister of the Interior was vacant. Does the right hon. gentleman want that to go to the country as the honest, statesmanlike utterance of the First Minister of the Dominion of Canada? But, if we have, as was said by hon. members on his own side of the House, and as is the fact, before us one of the most momentous questions that have at any time involved the consideration of this House, a question that will affect the future of the west, half a million miles of the best territory of this Dominion and the best agricultural country that exists to-day, is there any analogy between this case and the case of the Minister of the Interior in 1888 ? 'Only thirty-one days ago,' says the right hon. First Minister, and in a while when it suits my convenience, when I get entirely ready, after I have held at bay the office-seekers who want the position and whom I dare not now offend because I want to dangle before them the plums of office and not offend any one of them until after this crucial period has gone by, then, after the 1st of July, after I have riveted upon the west and established the system of fetters that I desire, then, at my convenience, as the great Czar of Canada—for the time being ; not for all time to come, thank God,—I will announce what I will do. He says that he is embarrassed by a wealth of material. Very likely. The right hon. First Minister is perfectly sincere. He has a wealth of material in this House. One man says that he is as good as the other. Each man says: I am the big man for the situation; and this is a source of embarrassment perhaps to the right hon. First Minister. He dare not fill that position because he is afraid that some of his followers whose votes he depends upon might not be available in this crisis. I do not know that I need say much further in reference to what the right hon. First Minister has said. The right hon. gentleman is more remarkable for what he does not say on these occasions than for what he says. But, he asks : Would you expect us to have an election and to have this discussion going on at the same time ? What does the right hon. gentleman mean by that ? Does it require his personal supervision to engineer the election in the west? Does it require that the strength of the cabinet shall be transferred to the west or to any of the most important points of the west while an election is going on ? Does the right hon. gentleman feel that the situation is so delicate and dangerous in the west that it will require all the power of the government, and probably more to bring about the result that he wants ? Does he anticipate now that when the 1st of July has gone past and when he does appoint a Minister of the Interior the people of the west will visit with condemnation the administration which is now in power at Ottawa ? Or, does he simply mean that it will require so much manipulation that it would be impossible to carry on this discussion in the House and carry on an election in the west at the same time ? What is the meaning of it ? Is it an admission to the people of Canada (wrested from the right hon. First Minister) because we have not had such an admission made often in this House, that he realizes that it will take the most superhuman effort on his part to win in the west if he were to open a constituency there at the present time ? In other words that he has not, with all the wealth of material that he has in this House or out of it, because he could select a minister for this position out of the House as well as in it—he could send Mr. Aylesworth up there if he could be elected,—the least chance of electing his Minister of the Interior if he will accept the challenge which is a fair and square challenge, to give to those people who have not been allowed to voice their opinions the opportunity of testing this question and of saying whether they want this measure proposed by the right hon. First Minister or not.

Now, I had intended to refer to another aspect of this case, but I find that I have got excited and that is not usual with me. I must excuse myself. I believe I am justified in asking for the indulgence of this House if I do get a little excited on this occasion. I believe as the right hon. minister says, that our passions on some of these occasions are not wholly ignoble, it is probably 'the exaggeration of a noble sentiment,' the right hon. minister says and perhaps there is a little exaggeration of noble sentiments from time to time as the debate goes on. I think that when we cannot get a solitary member representing the west on the government side of the House to stand up and advocate the rights of the west, when we cannot get the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) who was an advocate of opinions which are in direct conflict with the proposition of the government to-day, when we cannot get that great democrat to rise up and say that in this day the people shall be supreme, when we cannot get back into the House that champion of national schools, the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), to speak one word on behalf of the great people of the west, a place which is to be the garden of Canada in the future and the grandest agricultural territory within this country,—when we cannot get these hon. gentlemen to stand up and say one word on behalf of the great people of the west, then, I feel that I am justified in having got a

little excited and not being able to pursue a distinct and logical argument as I intended when I rose to speak.

Mr. J. B. KENNEDY (New Westminster). Mr. Speaker, I rise for a little information, not that I expect to get any from the solon who has just addressed the House. But, the principle has evidently been laid down this afternoon that a province is not represented in this House unless it has a member of the government. In this case it seems to me that there has been a rather gross insult addressed to the ten men who represent these Territories in the House to-day.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). Mr. Speaker, in the opening remarks of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition this afternoon he referred to the course pursued by the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) when he was leader of the Liberal opposition in this House some years ago. The right hon. gentleman on that occasion drew the attention of this House to certain rumours going the rounds of the newspapers of this country coupled with the fact that His Excellency the Governor General had postponed a trip that he anticipated making. He thought the circumstances sufficient to warrant him in calling the attention of the government of the day to the importance of these rumours. One of the arguments he employed in that case was to the effect that the government was not in the position in which it ought to be before asking parliament to transact the business of the country. He said :

> The government, I submit, has no right to ask parliament to vote a single penny under the circumstances.

What circumstances? The circumstances arising from the rumours going around the public press of this country that certain seats in the government were vacant. It seemed to him a remarkable thing that he found some of these seats vacated, vacated by whom ? By the representatives of the west ? No ; the right hon. gentleman seemed to be exercised particularly about the representatives, not of the Northwest Territories, but of the province of Quebec. Why was my hon. friend so much exercised on that occasion ? It was not because of any particular or important question brought up in this House on that occasion. In 1895 parliament met on April 18. This matter was brought up by the right hon. gentleman on July 9, and that session closed on July 22, thirteen days after he had given the government notice of the fact that certain ministers had not been in their places the day before. Why was he so much exercised over the fact of these ministers not being properly representative of the province of Quebec ? Was it because parliament was liable to vote a penny unwisely in their absence ? Every man who knows anything of the political history of this country knows what was taking place at that time ; he knows that an issue similar to that which is being discussed to-day was being considered by the people and the government, and it was more due to that fact, I venture to say, that the right hon. gentleman objected to these ministers not being in their places on that particular occasion. My right hon. friend has been asked civilly and often lately by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) why it is that the position of Minister of the Interior is not filled. The right hon. gentleman rises in his place and says that the leader of the opposition again has another little joke. And what is the little joke ? It is not the spending of a small amount of the people's money, but it is the passage of legislation for all time affecting the Northwest Territories, that will involve millions of dollars, and yet the Prime Minister says this is a little joke, and that there is no occasion to have a Minister of the Interior appointed to perform the special duties of that portfolio. The right hon. gentleman has submitted to the House, in the speech from the Throne, this paragraph :

> The rapid growth in the population of the Northwest Territories during the past two years justifies the wisdom of conferring on these Territories provincial autonomy. A Bill for that purpose will be submitted for your consideration.

Before I deal with that, let me refer to a rumour or two that we have recently heard, because if the hon. gentleman was justified in those days I am justified to-day in referring to these rumours. A rumour went abroad in this country previous to the 23rd of November last that certain gentlemen met at Three Rivers, in the province of Quebec, and that certain arrangements were entered into by the government with respect to provincial autonomy in the Northwest. Again I say that I cannot understand how the right hon. gentleman and his government placed that paragraph in the speech from the Throne and submitted it to this House, and then come to this House and told us, as members of this House, and told the people of the country, that he had not consulted the Minister of the Interior upon this important plank in the platform in the speech from the Throne. What did the right hon. gentleman say when he introduced this Bill in this House ? I shall quote his own words. He said :

> How many provinces should be admitted into the confederation coming from the Northwest Territories—one, or two or more ? The next question was : in whom should be vested the ownership of the public lands ? The third question was : what should be the financial terms to be granted to these new provinces ? And the fourth and not the least important by any means was the question of the school system which would be introduced—not introduced, because it was introduced long ago, but should be continued in the Territories.

Of the four questions which are to be embodied in provincial autonomy, the education question was in the mind of the right hon. gentleman the most important. I again ask the Prime Minister are we to believe, are we to suppose, that in the preparation of the speech from the Throne, which was prepared during the early part of this year, the Minister of the Interior was in no wise consulted in respect to these four planks ? I for one refuse to take that view, because I do not think the ex-Minister of the Interior is so ignorant with respect to the contents of this Bill as he would leave this House and this country to believe. Reference has been made to the creating of a vacancy. What do we find in the city of Toronto ? We find a bargain day for the Conservative party. Why have we a bargain day now ? Is this the old system of the Liberal party of this country, when they have a government backed up by a large majority and a seat becomes vacant, is it now the new Liberal policy to give the Conservative party a bargain day and to allow them to elect their candidate by acclamation ? I have here the statement of the executive of the Reform Association of the city of Toronto. We have the candidate in the last contest coming to the city of Ottawa, consulting with the Prime Minister and his cabinet, going back to Toronto and advising the Liberal executive of the city of Toronto not to put up a candidate, refusing to be a candidate himself and saying that it was not a wise policy to put a candidate in the field ; and, therefore, the Liberal party are going to allow the Conservative candidate to be elected by acclamation. Why is this ? Is that the way to ascertain public opinion in this country on an important question of this kind ? I venture to say that if the right hon. gentleman had an election in Toronto he would find that the policy which he is now pursuing would be rejected, not only by the Conservative party of Toronto, but by a very large number of the Liberals as well. I would like to ask the premier, if he has any influence upon the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) or upon the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway), one the late premier of the province of Manitoba and the other one of his ministers, to kindly whisper into the ears of these gentlemen the suggestion that they should stay a little more in this chamber and give the people of this country the benefit of their presence and advice, even as private members. Is it any wonder that members of the opposition find fault with the government, when we find important members like these absenting themselves when one of the greatest and most important issues ever brought up in parliament is being discussed from day to day ? They absolutely refuse, by their absence from this House, to take part in the discussion. I am sure it would allay, to some extent, the feeling of the people of this country if they knew that men entertained the views which the late premier of Manitoba did entertain—I do not know if he does now or not—but certainly the views entertained by the ex-Minister of the Interior, were to stay in their places in this House and give us the benefit of their views from time to time as occasion requires. Then probably they would assist in allaying the strong feeling that exists in this country that these gentlemen are overlooking the interests of the North-west Territories by their undue absence from this House. The Prime Minister referred to-day to the fact that the opposition are making a great deal of capital out of the thirty-one days of non-appointment of a Minister of the Interior. Let me point out to my hon. friend that the Minister of the Interior has not been in this House during this session. He came in after the introduction of this Bill. Let me remind the premier that since 1896 we have had minister after minister absent from their duties during the session, and no one has been a greater sinner in that respect than the Minister of the Interior. To-day he is seen passing by this chamber, paying attention for a moment or two to the proceedings here, but then, in his high and lofty way, he retires from the chamber and allows the members to discuss these important matters in his absence. It is high time that these hon. gentlemen fully understood that it is their duty to attend in this chamber and give us the benefit of their advice on these important matters. If the right hon. gentleman and his friends were correct in 1895, when they said that it was important for ministers to be in their places, they should take a little of their own medicine to-day, and see that their ministers are in their places in this House.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I usually agree with the leader of the opposition, but I think he is rather too exacting this afternoon. My hon. friend asks that the First Minister should go back on his official record since he has been premier of this Dominion, and start from this day on a new course. That is altogether too much to ask of the First Minister, and I think my hon. friend the leader of the opposition is rather drawing on his imagination when he expects that the First Minister will do it. My hon. friend referred to the fact that the First Minister found fault with the government of Sir John Thompson on one occasion for not filling up his cabinet and complained that at that time for nearly two days two ministers had absented themselves from the chamber. Well, Sir, the circumstances were very different then from what they are now. Neither of these hon. gentlemen had resigned his seat ; the present premier was not in a position to know that either intended to resign his seat ; but the fact that they had not been in their places, and some newspaper comment which he saw on the cir-

cumstance, suggested to him the idea of dividing the House on the matter, and he did divide the House. What do we see on the present occasion ? We see the Minister of the Interior absent from the first day of the session. Whether his absence was owing to ill-health I know not, and I think the public are very little concerned about it. But we do know that as soon as the First Minister introduced certain legislation into this House, the Minister of the Interior was here to dissent from the proposition of the government ; and we know that as a result of his dissent he has gone out of the cabinet and is out of it to-day ; and every one knows that the First Minister and his cabinet are afraid to take the bull by the horns—I am speaking metaphorically—and test popular opinion in the west, just as they are afraid to test popular opinion in the province of Ontario. What is the report of the hon. gentleman's own political friends from the city of Toronto ? it is that he has become a Czar and an autocrat. Mr. Robinette, their candidate in the last election came down here the other day ; he was seen here ; his presence was reported in the newspapers ; and because Mr. Robinette informed the First Minister that he would not be a supporter of the government's policy in regard to the Northwest, the Czar, the leader of this administration, says there must be no contest in Centre Toronto. Now, I am going to appeal to the First Minister to remember the watchword of the late premier of the province of Ontario, his own right arm, which was paralyzed on the 25th of January, when the people got a chance. What was the watchword of the Hon. George W. Ross ? It was : 'Build up Ontario.' What did that mean ? It meant to build up Ontario in every possible way—mentally, morally, educationally and commercially ; and I appeal to the First Minister to build up Ontario to-day. In the first place, build it up morally by keeping faith with the public there. The First Minister went through the province of Ontario last November—but I will not harrow up his feelings by mentioning the places where he spoke, because every one knows what followed—desolation and disaster to the Liberal candidates. He came to East Simcoe, and the result there is seen. He went to the city of Toronto and to other points and said, it is true, my cabinet representatives from Ontario are a rum lot ; I have one in the Senate who is past four score years ; I have Sir Richard Cartwright on my hands, but he is to be transferred to the Senate at an early day ; although the Minister of Customs is a benevolent, good-hearted soul, he is not known beyond the confines of his own bailiwick. But, he said, I am going to strengthen the cabinet in Ontario ; I am going to bring in a big man in the person of Mr. Aylesworth. The First Minister has not got Mr. Aylesworth yet, but there is a chance to get him. There are two counties in Ontario which he could carry, and only two. Why does he not give Mr. Aylesworth a chance to run in Russell or in Prescott ? I know he will not trust himself in North Oxford, nor will he trust himself anywhere else in Ontario.

An hon. MEMBER. Centre Toronto.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Aylesworth knows Toronto ; he lives there. Now, the First Minister has not kept faith with the electors of the province of Ontario. He promised them last November that if they would only support him, he would build up a stable aggregation from Ontario. What has he done? There was a time in this House when our dull moments were enlivened by the oratory of Sir Richard Cartwright ; but he has stolen Sir Richard Cartwright from the House and sent him to the Senate. We have left only our benevolent friend the Minister of Customs and our soporific friend the Postmaster General. I think it has come to a pretty pass in the province of Ontario that we have to content ourselves with the cabinet representation that we have. But let us go a little further. Let us bear in mind that these two gentlemen are seriously restricted—that they are not allowed to perform any acts of importance. They are allowed to manage departments which extract money from the pockets of the people ; neither of them is allowed to spend a dollar, practically ; but when it comes to spending money, all the departments for that purpose go to ministers from the other provinces. True, the Minister of Public Works for a time had some disposition of patronage, but the Minister of Marine and Fisheries came up and filched that from the province of Ontario, and to-day what is left for the Minister of Public Works amounts to practically nothing, and even that is not controlled by a minister who has the consent and approval of a constituency in Ontario. It is quite true that my hon. friend who represents North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), and whose absence we all regret just as sincerely as any gentleman on the other side of the House, is practically out of politics. The kindly reference made by the hon. leader of the opposition did not deserve the reply which it received from the First Minister. We all acknowledge that circumstances sometimes arise in politics to deprive both political parties of some of their friends and leaders; and it is to-day a notorious fact, admitted by hon. gentlemen opposite, that Mr. Sutherland is not coming back to this House. Nay, I go further and say that I saw a letter myself the other day, written by a friend of Mr. Sutherland in Mexico, where he is, in which it is stated that his health was precarious, and that no one seriously believes

he will resume his duties in the Public Works Department.

And the First Minister knows, just as well as he knows that the sun will rise to-morrow, that Mr. Sutherland does not intend to come back and take charge of that portfolio, and we all regret it. He knows equally well that the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) has been named for that portfolio—named months ago—and has been discharging the duties for the past year. Yet in the face of that fact, this government are so much in terror of the Ontario electorate, that they dare not open the seat in London to-day. You may boast that you have a majority of five hundred or six hundred for the hon. member for London in that city, but that majority was reduced to something like twenty in the last campaign. The excuse given by his friends is that they were over-confident or he would have received his old-time majority. Well, this is the time and place in which, if the government have a scintilla of confidence in the people of Ontario, to show that confidence by throwing down the gauntlet and opening up the constituency of London. But if they should, the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) knows, and the cabinet knows, what will be the result. Here we have a cabinet in this humiliating position that it has only two ministers of the Crown on the floor of this House from Ontario. True, there are two in the Senate, but I do not suppose the public are much exercised about them. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) has been over the stony path and the thorny places. He spent all his life in the constituency of South Brant but that constituensy finally turned him out. Then he went over the corduroy road in North Grey but did not dare return there, and finally sought solace in a haven of rest with a solid Liberal majority of 1,000, but that hon. minister knows that so low has his party fallen in the estimation of the people of Ontario that nearly every seat went against it in the last local election. And what is the position of the hon. member for North York (Sir William Mulock)? That riding was long in the Liberal fold, but the hon. gentleman knows that if it were open to-day it would return an opponent to the present government. Then there is my hon. friend from Centre York (Mr. Campbell), who, we all know, is knocking at the threshold for admission to the cabinet, and who represents a riding specially constructed for him. He has been standing at the door waiting and watching long, but they dare not open it for him. and it is a notorious fact that another gentleman who has been aspiring to cabinet promotion, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has openly gone out in revolt against the government on this question. Yet the government intend to rush this Bill through the House this session. If we were in the last days of a last session of parliament, the government would never be able to put their Bill through, but if this Bill cannot be killed in this House, the government which brought it down will be killed when they go before the people of the Northwest. This government may force the Bill through by means of what I would call a machine, if it were parliamentary, or what I would call a servile majority, if the rules of parliament would allow it; it may be voted through by a majority who have promises of preferment and place; but all I can say is that the government will not get preferment at the hands of the electorate when they go before the country. There is one power which is irresistible and that is the power of the people, and those gentlemen who vote for this measure will certainly stultify themselves in the eyes of their constituents in the Northwest Territories. They know that they are stultifying themselves to-day. Their own leaders have told them, as the hon. member for St. John (Mr Stockton) told them a little while ago, that this cabinet is afraid to trust the people who are most vitally interested. It knows that it cannot have a cabinet minister elected in the west. What is the standing of the government to-day in the great city of Toronto? Why, a large number of their friends want to precipitate a fight there, but they will only do it on one condition and that is that the policy of the government on this question must be condemned. What a pitiable spectacle does not this government represent? In a riding like Centre Toronto, which was only carried by the late Mr. Clarke, probably the most popular man in that city, by a bare majority of three hundred in the last contest, this government and their followers dare not put up a candidate to-day. They call however on their followers to vote for this measure and to trust that in time it will be forgotten. They should remember that there was a statesman named Stratton in Ontario who asked the people to forget, but the people did not; and we have a spectacle presented to-day by this government exactly similar to that which was presented by the Ross government in Ontario, and in like manner when this government does go to the people it will have as little chance as it expects to have in Centre Toronto and share the same fate which overtook the late local government. It may win Russell and Prescott but will be beyond help in the rest of the province.

Motion (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjourn negatived.

THE ONTARIO BOUNDARIES.

Mr. SAM. BARKER. Before the Orders of the Day are called I might ask the right hon. leader of the House if there has been any correspondence between his government or any member of it and the late government of the Hon. G. W. Ross or any member of it, with regard to any extension of the boun-

daries of Ontario and whether, if there be any such correspondence, he will lay it on the table.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not aware of any, but if there should be any, there is no objection at all to bringing it down.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 69) to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta, and the amendment of Mr. R. L. Borden thereto.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT (West Assiniboia) If, Mr. Speaker, the Bills before the House to create the two provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan constitute to representatives from the other parts of Canada the most important measure that has been submitted to parliament since confederation, how much more should their importance be impressed upon one, who, like myself, is entrusted with the duty of representing in this House a very considerable section of the country which it is proposed to form into these new provinces. I may say, Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity that I regret to a very much larger extent to-day than on any former occasion that I am not gifted with that felicity of expression which has distinguished so many of the speakers who have preceded me, and that consequently I shall not be able to embellish the remarks I shall have to present to the House with flowers of oratory such as have adorned many of the speeches we have had on this question.

Of the magnitude of the subject, of course, there can be no question. We are proposing to round out the confederation of half, and probably the richer half of the North American continent, affecting an enormous area of exceptional fertility and capable of sustaining millions, if not tens of millions of people. We are fulfilling the dream of those far-sighted men, the fathers of confederation. We are, once for all, placing upon the half million of people who, at present, constitute the population of these areas and upon the future millions that will constitute that population, the duties of self-government according to free British principles. And we are, at the same time, fixing for all time to come the financial status, setting apart the financial resources, upon which these people shall be enabled to carry on their duties of self-government. We are giving by charter to these new provinces many powers which the people there have been exercising up to the present time, as well as a number of powers, which, until now, have been exercised on their behalf by this parliament. We are proposing to make these people fully responsible for their own self-government in the important matters of education, public works and all affairs of internal development which, it may be said, are the most vital, the most constant, and the most intimate affairs affecting the life of the people of any country, and the management of which, it may be said, is so much more difficult in a sparsely-settled country such as these areas are at the present time, than in old communities. Upon the importance of the subject of education there is no occasion for comment here. In my opinion, the House has been, during the present debate, giving more attention to a matter which has developed into an extremely sentimental issue, than to the practical, substantial phase of the education question. I may say that I am more concerned, and I am satisfied that the people that I represent are more concerned, as to whether they are to be enabled by the powers which parliament proposes to confer upon them and the financial resources the House proposes to place at their disposal, for all time to come to keep up an efficient system of education than they are as to the extremely narrow issue which divides the proposition of the government from the proposition of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden)—no, I beg the pardon of the opposition,—of the hon. member representing the county of Carleton. The matter of local public works, the matter of bridges, the matter of fire guards, the matter of drainage, and in some localities the matter of domestic water supply—these are all affairs of exceeding importance to the people now, and will be of importance to the millions of people who, we expect, will be in that territory in the years to come. And these matters now must be dealt with, and, for a considerable time to come, will have to be dealt with, by the provincial government more than is the case in older communities where these affairs are handled municipally. These are matters which lie at the very root of the existence of a people in a new country and upon these things depend whether the settler in these new provinces is to be encouraged to wage the battle of life under the conditions to be found in that country, or whether he shall labour under disadvantages too great to be borne—as unfortunately, has been the fate of some who went into those Territories in the past, though not, I am glad to say, in the very recent past. The condition of the settlers' land as to drainage ; the state of his range,—whether devastated by the prairie fire or properly protected—the existence of a bridge over the creek or river so that the settler may pass over with his team without risking his life at a crossing ; the efficiency of his school —upon these matters, I say, depends to a very large extent the whole future of the new provinces which parliament by these

measures proposes to create. The subject of transportation is one to which very great attention has been given by this parliament in recent years. The subject of railway transportation is a very important one; but I may point out that in these Territories at the present time, I think it is not going too far to say, the matter of wagon roads is of quite as great an importance as the matter of railway communication. Railways of course, are necessary. But the railway cannot be brought to every man's door, and, to reach the railway, the wagon road is necessary. A computation has been made which goes to establish the fact that the settler or farmer who is fifteen miles from the railway shipping point is under as great a cost in getting his wheat to the shipping point—supposing that that point is Regina, where I live—as he is under for the carriage of that wheat from the shipping point to the head of the Lakes, nearly 800 miles.

Therefore, there can be no question of the importance and magnitude of the questions involved in the Bills. I have, on several occasions before, had the privilege of addressing this House; but on no previous occasion have I felt so greatly the responsibility resting upon me as upon this occasion. And, whether my tenure of office here as the representative of a constituency prove long or short, I do not think that at any future time it will be my duty to address the House upon a subject of such importance as I feel the subject now under discussion to be.

In replying to the admirable speech with which these Bills were introduced by the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. R. L. Borden) devoted a good deal of attention—more attention than I had expected him to give—to certain aspects of the case which had formed the subject matter of discussion up and down the township lines and in the school-houses of the Northwest up to the third of November last, but which did not seem to me to be quite in keeping with the kind of discussion which might be expected from the leader of the opposition speaking upon such an occasion, and dealing with such a measure as this, before a body as this House. The hon. gentleman sought to establish the proposition that the right hon. First Minister and his government had made a right-about-face since last session upon the question whether or not provincial autonomy should be granted to the people of the Northwest Territories. And, in his endeavour to sustain a very weak position, he sought to make use of a remark or rather an ejaculation of the Prime Minister on one occasion about two years ago. It was alleged that the Prime Minister had said 'Hear, hear,' when the hon member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) had made some remark to impress the idea that the government was not favourable to provincial autonomy. I do not know whether my hon. friend—in fact I must take it for granted that my hon. friend was not aware that before the end of that session the First Minister had set himself right on that point, and I will read a passage which may be found in the 'Hansard' of 1903, page 13907:

> Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I stated that I was putting the Prime Minister's sentiments correctly before the House to the effect that for many years to come the Territories need not expect autonomy at the hands of this government, and the Prime Minister said 'hear, hear.'
>
> The PRIME MINISTER. If I said 'hear, hear' it was not affirmation. On the contrary, it was negation.

Why, it is within the knowledge of everybody in Canada, and should be within the knowledge of every member of this House who was in the last parliament, that on several occasions responsible ministers of the Crown stated their opinion authoritatively that the time had nearly come when full provincial powers must be conferred on the people of the Northwest Territories. The hon. member for Brandon, then Minister of the Interior, as long ago as three years, stated in the House that he had arrived at the conclusion that provincial autonomy must very soon be meted out to the people of the Northwest Territories. During the session of 1903, the Minister of Finance, in the most explicit terms, stated two or three times that the government had arrived at the conclusion that the time was near at hand when full provincial powers must be conferred on these people.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the able address given to the House last evening by the hon. gentleman who represents the district of Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) in this House. If it would not be presumptuous on my part to say so, I would congratulate the House, I would congratulate the Northwest, and particularly I would congratulate our hon. friends opposite upon their acquisition of that hon. gentleman, who was elected last November to represent the district of Qu'Appelle. Of course, I do not quite agree with every one of the statements made by that hon. gentleman; but I will say this for him, that he made the class of speech that friends of the Northwest Territories desired to be made before this question of provincial autonomy was determined, before the details and terms were determined; it was the class of speech which the true friend of the Northwest felt it proper to make, and just the class of speech I have made myself the first session I came into this parliament. But I cannot agree with quite all the things which my hon. friend stated as facts. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that Mr. Haultain's draft Bill, prepared, I think, in December, 1901, or January, 1902, was unanimously endorsed by the assembly of the Northwest Terri-

tories, with the exception of one point, that point relating to the number of provinces, whether there should be one province or more. I think I can convince my hon. friend that he was mistaken in that regard. One strong objection was raised, not by a Liberal in the assembly, but by one of the Conservative members, a gentleman who acts in conjunction with the member for Qu'Appelle, and who was a Conservative candidate in one of the districts of the Northwest Territories last fall, Dr. Patrick, of Yorkton, who took violent exception to the terms of the draft Bill, because, as he said, it was attempting to grab too much, the terms were extravagant and would do damage to the interests of the Territories by attempting to grab too much. Then, I understood my hon. friend to lay down the proposition that because that draft Bill had been endorsed by the assembly, and because it was before the people of the Northwest Territories last fall during the general election, therefore no member representing a district of the Northwest Territories had any mandate or right to do other than object to any kind of a Bill which was not framed entirely upon the lines of that draft Bill, voted upon by the Northwest legislature. If that was the position taken by my hon. friend, and I think it was, for I listened to him carefully, I may tell him that he is entirely out of accord with his mentor, Mr. Haultain. Mr. Haultain never took such a position. My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle, as well as myself, heard Mr. Haultain declare himself explicitly, in a meeting of the legislature towards the end of 1903, that he never expected to get all he asked for, they were simply laying down their proposition, and were asking everything that was possible, leaving to those on the other end of the bargain to say how much the terms had to be cut down.

However, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that in this discussion it is rather the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. R. L. Borden) which is engaging the attention of the House. That amendment reads :

> All the words after the word 'that' to the end of the question be left out and the following substituted therefor :—
>
> Upon the establishment of a province in the Northwest Territories of Canada as proposed by Bill (No. 69), the legislature of such province, subject to and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1886, is entitled to and should enjoy full powers of provincial self-government including power to exclusively make laws in relation to education.

That is a proposition, Mr. Speaker, that commands my warm approval in some respects, but I am sorry to say that my hon. friend's speech did not quite fit in with his amendment. It is a proposition that, on the face of it, would be looked upon with favour by every resident of the Northwest Territories. But when we look at it a little more closely, it may not be such a favourable proposition. As the members of this House can readily believe, particularly when they listen to such representatives from the Northwest as the hon. member from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and the hon. member from Brandon (Mr. Sifton), the people of those western prairies like to have things placed before them definitely, and I may tell the hon. member for Carleton that before the residents of the Northwest Territories will be able to accept his proposition they will want to know what class of schools he means, whether he means absolute freedom to settle their school system or whether he means anything else ; whether he means, for instance, the application of section 93 of the British North America Act, which would not leave the people of the Northwest absolute freedom to settle this question for themselves. And upon another phase of the question, that concerning the lands, I am sorry to say that my hon. friend's speech entirely disagrees with his resolution. With reference to the matter of the retention of the lands by the federal power, to which proposition he takes exception, giving his opinion that the land should be transferred to the provincial authorities, he said :

> May I not further suggest that even if there were any danger—and I do not think there is—it would be the task of good statesmanship to have inserted, if necessary, a provision in this Bill with regard to free homesteads and the prices of those lands.

We had a suggestion in the discussion that took place this afternoon and we had a more particular suggestion in the discussion that took place some days ago as to there being at the present moment no friend of the Northwest in the government. The friends of the Northwest must be looked for amongst hon. gentlemen opposite. Well, I am bound to say that I think the friendship of the hon. member for Carleton will bear a little analysis. If it has a sentimental feature, something that is not going to cost anything, something that is not going to bear on any other section of Canada, our hon. friends opposite are great friends of the Northwest, but, whenever we come down to a substantial matter like limiting the self governing powers of the people of the Northwest in regard to their actual and substantial resources the boot is on the other foot. That is an entirely different aspect of the case. There are hon. gentlemen behind my hon. friend from Carleton who are great friends of the people of the Territories too. It would be such an awful thing if any power of self government were denied to the people of the Northwest Territories, but they are anxious to take away about half the territory of the people of the Northwest Territories.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask my hon. friend, without wishing to interrupt him

unduly, at what page he quoted from my speech ?

Mr. SCOTT. I have not the page here but I will ask one of my friends to hunt it up.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will quote it. The hon. gentleman began in the middle of a sentence and did not give the whole quotation.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the hon. gentleman quote the whole sentence ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will. I had first stated that I believed in handing over the lands to the people of the Northwest absolutely and had pointed out the objection that the right hon. Prime Minister had made to that. Then, I said :

> Are they not the people chiefly interested ? May we not rightly conclude that if these lands are handed over to them, they will so deal with them as to best conserve their own interests by forwarding and assisting a vigorous policy of immigration ? May I not further suggest that even if there were any danger—and I do not think there is—it would be the task of good statesmanship to have inserted, if necessary, a provision in this Bill with regard to free homesteads and the prices of those lands, and obtain to it the consent of the people of the Northwest Territories.

My hon. friend began in the middle of a sentence and closed his quotation before the end of it. That is all I desire to call attention to.

Mr. SCOTT. I fail to see what difference there is in the meaning between the portion that my hon. friend has quoted and the portion that I quoted, except the suggestion added that the consent of the Northwest might be asked. And let me tell him that he will very much more readily get the consent of the people of the Northwest Territories to leaving in perpetuation a system of schools which is absolutely satisfactory to Protestant and Catholic alike than he will get their consent to any such invasion of their rights as is involved in his suggestion. On the sentimental question of lands, on the sentimental side of the school question hon. gentlemen opposite or a section of them, headed by the leader of the opposition, are great friends of the Northwest Territories, but when it comes down to substantial things, as I said, the boot is entirely on the other foot. Talk about invading autonomy. Why, Sir, no such radical and substantial invasion of Northwest autonomy as this suggestion involves—as read and repeated again here now by himself—could be imagined by an avowed enemy of provincial rights.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CENTRAL COUNTIES RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 64) respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—Mr. Stewart.

On section 16,

Mr. SPROULE. All of this Bill is expunged except the preamble and section 16. Is this railway company already in existence ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. This Bill asks for a great many powers which the Railway Committee did not see fit to give them. They granted them only an extension of time in their old Bill. Clause 16 only gives an extension of time on the charter obtained a few years ago.

Bill reported, read a third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 60) to incorporate the Algoma Copper Range Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY IN THE NORTHWEST.

House resumed consideration of the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 69) to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta, and the amendment of Mr. R. L. Borden thereto.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT. When you left the chair at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was commenting upon the violent difference between the purport of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. R. L. Borden) and the direct suggestion contained in his speech. The proposals of the government contemplate a payment in lieu of the public domain to these two new provinces aggregating $750,000 per annum at the beginning ; as the population of the provinces increases, this payment is to increase to an amount in the future of $2,225,000 per annum. The gentleman from Carleton (Mr. R. L. Borden) objects to these proposals and suggests instead that the public domain should be transferred to the management of the provincial governments, but with the proviso that those provincial governments shall be limited in their management of this public domain, the suggestion being, if I understood my hon. friend accurately, that the homestead lands should continue to be given away as they are now given by this government as free

homestead lands, and that the odd-numbered sections should continue, in accordance with the policy of the present government, to be sold at low settlement prices, probably not greater than $3 per acre. The proposition then of the hon. gentleman is to turn over that land to the provinces, to saddle on these provinces all the expenses of administration and say to them: You must give away free your own property or you must dispose of that land at low settlement prices, as is now done, to induce settlement. Much of this land might be disposed of to great immediate profit if a purely revenue policy was applied. You say to those provinces that they must use their own property for all time to come, not for their own purposes but for the purposes and benefit of the Dominion. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that I am amazed that any man in this House would give voice to such a suggestion, for such a violent invasion of provincial autonomy, as is contained in the suggestion of my hon. friend. It needs no argument to show the difference that might be made in the receipts from this public domain by the application of a different policy. The policy which is being pursued by this government is a settlement policy which yields practically no net revenue. There has been practically no net revenue from these lands in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories since these lands were acquired thirty-five years ago.

But a purely revenue policy might be followed, as it would be the right of those provinces, if they were to assume the responsibility and the expense of administering the domain, to follow a purely revenue policy. The probability is that a provincial government, as has been well explained by my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), not having the same inducement, or the same opportunity, to reap indirect profits from the settlement policy of the federal government, would be driven by necessity to adopt a purely revenue policy; and the suggestion contained in the speech of the hon. leader of the opposition would simply amount to putting a limitation upon the new provinces amounting in the years to come to perhaps scores of millions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I dare say that it is hard for the leopard to change his spots, and it is hard for our friends of the Conservative party to do more than express sentimental friendship for the Northwest Territories. It is hard for them to get away from the policy with regard to provincial autonomy which was announced on their behalf last session, when they gave us to understand that they were anxious that the people of the Northwest should be granted autonomy, so that hereafter they should be under the expense of building their own railways and this parliament should not be under the expense of maintaining the mounted police force. It was suggested in their campaign literature that the reasonably generous money grants voted to the Northwest government were a proof of the gross incompetence and extravagance of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance; and there was the further suggestion from one of their front bench members that provincial autonomy ought to be granted to the Northwest Territories and independent legislatures should be created there and put in charge of the public resources, so that those legislatures might be able to turn handsprings with those resources in favour of the corporations.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of important details embodied in this provincial autonomy proposal; and different items in this collection of details gave different members who felt the seriousness of the proposals different difficulties. My hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) explained to the House a week ago to-night that the school phase of the matter constituted the most serious difficulty for him. I have to confess that another detail constituted a very serious difficulty for me. That was with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway tax exemption embodied in section 23 of the Bills. This is one feature in these provincial establishment proposals with regard to which I think that less than justice has been meted out to the people of those new provinces. As a matter of fact, as the Prime Minister can testify, and as my fellow Liberal members from the Northwest Territories know, in my opinion the unsettled position of that tax exemption matter was a sufficient reason to justify further delay in granting autonomy to the Territories; and if act, protest or influence of mine could have prevented the preparation and presentation of these Bills, the Bills would not be before the House. But when I found this Dominion government unanimously, together with the Northwest government and a majority of the Northwest members all determined to proceed now, I had to come to a decision which would either prevent me from exercising any influence in the details of autonomy or agree to forego my own opinion on the point, agree to action now, and take my part in obtaining a settlement of terms and conditions according to the wishes of the electors whom I represent. Even now, were I not satisfied that the financial terms as a whole are so ample and generous as to offset in a great measure the financial handicap meant by the exemption feature, I should deem it my duty to myself and the Northwest Territories to oppose the Bills. I may say further that the overturning by the Supreme Court of the decision given by the Manitoba Court in 1903, does seriously lessen the force of the position I held against creating these provinces at present, and my reluctance is also relieved in some degree by the intimation given by the premier of probable

action in the future by this government towards removing the incubus of the exemptions. The mention in the Bills of specific compensation to the provinces on account of the exemptions was deemed unwise for the reason that such mention might complicate such action at a future day. While voting for the Bills, I hold myself free to perhaps move an amendment in some direction in committee to section 23.

One of the questions which had to be considered in connection with this matter was the question of the number of provinces—whether there should be one province, as was contemplated in the request made by the Northwest government and legislature, or more than one province. I may be permitted to say that I was myself quite strongly in favour of the proposition that only one province should be created ; and even yet, looking at the question purely from the local and territorial point of view, I can see no reason why one government, one legislature, one set of machinery, should not have been sufficient for that territory. But, on the other hand, I was bound to recognize, as the people of the Territories generally have recognized, that the other partners in confederation had a right to an opinion in this matter, and the decision which has been come to, to create two provinces, is, I think, generally satisfactory to the people of the Northwest as a whole. Except for the protest in the letter of Mr. Haultain, which was given a mild echo by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) last evening, I know of no protest raised in the Northwest Territories against the creation of two provinces. Those of us who originally favoured one province were finally compelled to recognize the impossibility of having the whole of that great area erected into a single province while leaving Manitoba in its present size, and the people I represent were unanimously against the extension of the Manitoba boundaries westward. My duty to the people I represent, therefore, seemed to be clear, and I believe that I have done my duty by those people in assenting to the proposition to have two provinces created.

My hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy), speaking two or three nights ago, voiced an objection against the dividing line which has been selected, the fourth meridian, contending that it should have been farther east, and pointing out that the ex-Minister of the Interior had contended that the line should have been sixty miles farther east. Well, the question of the dividing line was not looked upon, on my part at least, as being a contentious matter. From my point of view, it would have been better for my province, in one sense, to have had the dividing line brought farther east, because if the financial position of each province were to be the same it would be better for the province the smaller it was. But on the basis that each should have equal financial strength, each member in giving advice was under great responsibility as regards the line to divide the area. I may say that my own advice was that the present eastern boundary of Alberta should be selected as the dividing line and I still believe that the future will show that that would have been the most equitable dividing line between the two provinces, looking to their future populations. It must not be forgotten that the province of Alberta will have in the extreme north a large habitable area, the counterpart of which the province of Saskatchewan will not possess. My hon. friend from Calgary suggested that the area covered by the foothills in the Rocky Mountains should, so far as population is concerned, be eliminated. I do not agree with him at all in that regard. There are immense coal deposits in that area, and I have no doubt that in the years to come there will be immense coal-mining towns in the southern part of Alberta in the Rocky Mountains.

A question has been raised regarding the interests to stockmen and the branding of cattle. Well, if there should be any difficulty in that regard, it is one that will be very easily overcome by such a means possibly as the creation of a commission by the two provinces acting conjointly to deal with the administration of brands. But no matter how far east you might put the dividing line, the whole ranching country would not be included in the western province. There have been years when the town of Yorkton, at the extreme east side of the eastern province, was the largest cattle exporting point in the Territories.

In the matter of representation, as well as other non-contentious matters which have been dealt with in the Bill, the people of the Territories have nothing but satisfaction to express. The provision for a census to be taken next year and for a redistribution for the purposes of this House on the basis of such census is entirely satisfactory, as is also in a general way the provision with regard to representation in the Senate.

Now I come to the matter of the compensation for the lands and the financial terms. I may say at once that the financial terms and the compensation for lands command together my very hearty endorsation. I propose to trouble the House with a few details. They will be pretty dry, but I am inclined to think that they have more bearing on the case and should interest the people concerned considerably more than a good deal of the matter that has been presented to the House. Taking the two provinces together the financial terms include a grant for government of $100,000, a per capita subsidy at the rate of 80 cents per head on a basis of 500,000 population—a very generous computation at present—amounting to $400,000 ; an annual payment as

debt allowance of $810,750 with a land allowance of $750,000, being a total annual subsidy to the two provinces of $2,060,750. And in addition to that there is a grant in the first five years towards public buildings in the two provinces of $937,500. In some respects these terms are even better than those which were demanded by the people of the Northwest through their legislature and government. We must bear in mind that Mr. Haultain's draft Bill contemplated only one province whereas now we are creating two provinces. The draft Bill asks for a grant for government of $50,000 and we are giving a grant of $100,000. The original draft Bill asked for a debt allowance which would have yielded only $405,375, being calculated on a population of 250,000 for the whole area, whereas the population to-day is estimated at 500,000 and the allowance is just twice the amount in the draft Bill. The claim in the draft Bill with regard to the per capita subsidy was 80 cents up to a limit of population of 1,396,000, that being the limit applied in the case of the province of Ontario, whereas this Bill provides for payment up to a limit of population of 1,600,000. This will mean a difference eventually of $163,200 annually to the advantage of the two provinces. In these respects the proposal of the government is better than the petition made by the people of the Territories through their legislature. To put the thing briefly, each province will start with a revenue as follows :

Grant for government	$ 50,000
Per capita subsidy	200,000
Debt allowance	405,375
Land allowance	375,000
	1,030,375

When each province has 400,000 population, it will receive :

Grant and debt allowance	$ 455,375
Per capita subsidy	320,000
Land allowance	562,500
	1,337,875

When its population reaches 800,000, its revenue will be :

Grant and debt allowance	$ 455,375
Per capita subsidy	640,000
Land allowance	750,000
	,1,845,375

And when it has 1,200,000 population, it will get :

Sundry items	$1,095,375
Land allowance	1,112,500
	2,207,875

Analyses show that these revenues will yield at the beginning on the present population $4.10 per capita. When the population reaches 400,000, they will yield $3.33 per capita, when the population amounts to 800,000 they will yield $2.30 per capita, and when it reaches 1,200,000 they will give $1.84 per capita.

Of course any autonomy proposition is a matter of comparison. There is no such thing as absolute autonomy. We are not professing to grant absolute autonomy to the people of the Northwest Territories. All we are professing to do, and all we are asked to do, is to put the people of the Territories in an equitable position compared with the other provinces. All the Territories asked was that in the matter of local self-government, they should be put on an equal footing with the other provinces. It is therefore necessary to make some comparison between the conditions which these new provinces will enjoy and those enjoyed by the other provinces. I find that the province of New Brunswick during the year 1903—which is the last year for which I was able to obtain reports—had an approximate population of 331,000 and drew a subsidy of $491,361. That province derived from its public domain a gross revenue of $176,570, from which ought to be deducted the expenses of administration ; but taking the gross figures, that province received $2 per head of its population as compared with $3.33 per head which the new provinces will receive when their population is 400,000, and $4.10 which they will be entitled to receive as soon as this Bill goes through. The balance of the revenue of New Brunswick was of course derived from local taxation, such as receipts from licenses, &c.

In the same year the total population of Nova Scotia was 460,000, and it drew a subsidy of $432,807 from the Dominion. From the Crown domain its gross revenue was $681,731, making a total of $1,114,538 or $2.42 per head, whereas the province of Saskatchewan, with the same population, will receive $1,337,875 or $2.90 per head. And, in 1899, four years earlier, Nova Scotia had only a total of $336,000 from the Crown domain, and, from the two sources of subsidy and lands derived only $1.60 per head.

In 1899 Quebec drew a subsidy from the Dominion government of $1,086,714 and derived from the Crown domain $1,029,473, or a total of $2,116,187, which, with an approximate population of 1,600,000 meant $1.32 per head. The province of Saskatchewan, with a population of 1,200,000 will draw $2,207,875, or $1.84 per head ; and, with a population equal to that of Quebec, or 1,600,000, will draw $1.38 per head, as against $1.32 per head in the case of Quebec.

In 1899, Ontario, with an approximate population of 2,180,000 drew as subsidy $1,339,287, and derived from Crown domain $1,302,562, gross, a total of $2,641,849, or $1.20 per head. And, with an equal population Saskatchewan will draw $2,217,875.

or only $1.10 per head. With Manitoba I will make no comparison, because that province, I think every one admits, is not under fair terms. In 1899, with an approximate population of 250,000, Manitoba drew only $524,281 from lands and subsidies, as against a little over $1,000,000 for Saskatchewan with the same population. For the last two years Manitoba has been selling railway lands and increasing her annual revenue. But that cannot long continue. In 1903, even with these sales of nearly $300,000, Manitoba's total lands and subsidy revenue was $826,175 with a population of 255,000.

I think, that as a whole, these comparisons will show that the terms which have been granted to the people of the Northwest Territories while not over-generous, are fair; they simply place the people of the Northwest Territories, judging by the conditions of the other provinces, in a fair and equitable position to carry on their affairs of local government.

Attention has already been called to the fact that I gave expression to some opinion in this House on the matter of dealing with the lands when the question of autonomy came to be settled. That is perfectly true. I may be permitted to read again some of the very good doctrine that I then uttered, as it is preserved in 'Hansard.' In 1901 I said:

> If the proper principle is adhered to, if the principle of absolute equality be observed, if parliament places the new provinces upon an equitable basis, the local government will be given a proper grant for government, also the per capita subsidy, and be given what may be shown to be due as the debt allowance; and they will be put into possession of the public resources, lands, timber and minerals, in the same way as the other provinces were put into possession of these resources.

I might point out that that is not an absolutely accurate expression. These other provinces were not put in possession, but left in possession of these resources. Very young members sometimes fall into these inaccuracies.

> I appeal to the House whether it would not be unwise and impolitic to create provinces on any different basis from that on which other provinces stand. Entire equality is the only sure guarantee of the permanency of the confederation structure.

I think that is a perfectly true sentiment.

> Is it not a fair proposition that the citizen of the Northwest should be looked upon in all respects as equal to the citizen of any other province. The proper policy for this parliament to pursue is to make the Northwest citizen in all respects equal to the citizen of any other province of Canada. The subjects that come under the purview of the local government affect the people more closely than those subjects dealt with by this parliament, and the best way to promote the progress of that part of Canada will be to give as much financial ability as possible to the local legislatures to deal with their local affairs, so that education, public works, and all local services may be efficiently and adequately dealt with. My opinion is that by no other means can parliament do as much at one stroke to promote the progress and the true welfare, not of the Territories alone but of Canada as a whole, as by placing the main portion of Western Canada in a strong, efficient, capable position as concerns its local government.'

It will be observed that the burden of my statement related not so much to the question whether the lands should be transferred to local management as to the question whether these local governments should be given an equitable financial status in comparison with the local governments in the other provinces. And that object is achieved in these propositions presented by the government, not precisely, as I then urged, by actual transfer of the lands, but by a method, which, I am convinced, is financially even better for the local governments. I was a strong believer in the principle of the ownership of the lands by the province, or at all events, that the province should have the right of the beneficial interest in them. I am a strong believer in that principle still, and it is that principle that is practically assented to in this measure. But I may say, that in 1901, when I made that statement, and even later, the principle found no general acceptance in this House or amongst any of the people east of the great lakes; and my main purpose in uttering these words here was to try and impress upon the people of eastern Canada the necessity of recognizing the right of possession or, at least, of the beneficial interest in the lands of the Northwest Territories by the people of these Territories. Now, this House has already heard the very clear and ample statements made on this subject by the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) and by my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). They have made arguments which in my opinion are unanswerable. There has been no genuine attempt on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to answer them. At all events those arguments were sufficient to convert me to the proposition that it is absolutely better for the people of those new provinces to have the lands administered here, so long as the provinces obtain a sufficient sum in lieu of lands to place them in an equitable position to carry on their educational system, their public works, and, generally, their local affairs. And I am the more confirmed in that view by the expressions which have fallen from hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), who, we assume, is the chief financial spokesman for the Conservative party in this House, gave expression on the 15th of March, to the following with regard to the financial terms embodied in these Bills. Addressing the Minister of Finance, he said:

His financial terms will bring upon him every province in the Dominion. Take it on any ground you like, and by the proportions which you have meted out to the Northwest, you have gone beyond the financial conditions of every other province of this Dominion.

What did the hon. gentleman mean? There is no difference in the item, grant for government. No one will contend that that is a better grant than the other provinces are drawing. There is no substantial difference in the per capita subsidy. There is just one province, Nova Scotia, up to the present time, exceeding the limit of 400,000 souls. Their population now is 460,000. But, except in that case there is no difference at the present moment in the per capita arrangement made for these provinces and the arrangement at present in existence with other provinces. There is no difference in the debt account;—no other suggestion would be listened to with regard to the debt. The only meaning that can be attached to the hon. gentleman's words is that too much money is being paid to these provinces in lieu of their public lands. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) gave expression to this sentiment on March 23rd:

I would like to point out, as a member from the province of Quebec, that it would be a great calamity indeed if the Minister of Justice and the government did not arrive at a conclusion that it is necessary to modify that section which has regard for instance to lands. . . . As to us in the province of Quebec, why, Sir, we have twenty-five million acres of good land for settlement, which we are trying to settle, which we are doing our best to settle. Instead of devoting all our energies and all our moneys and public resources to settle the lands in our own province, under the terms of the constitution, we are going to pay this enormous indemnity, these millions of dollars to keep a hold on the lands of the North-west.

It is evident from these expressions that our hon. friends in the Conservative party, if they had the making of these proposals, would not have granted as good financial terms as we have now, would not have granted the amounts which are stated in the Bills to be paid to these new provinces. Now I find, in looking up the public records, that in pursuit of a proper and wise policy of settlement and development, this government has derived practically no profit from the Crown lands in the Northwest Territories since the Dominion first acquired them. From 1870 to 1880 the administration of Crown lands in Manitoba and the Northwest cost $1,244,499.34 in excess of receipts. In the years 1881-1890 the accounts show $753,576.53 in excess of expenditure. In the years from 1891 to 1900 there was again an excess of expenditure amounting to $184,398.95. In the years from 1901 up to 1904 there has been an excess of expenditure over receipts of $11,733.49. Taking the whole period from 1870 up to date, therefore, the administration of lands in the Northwest has cost this Dominion $687,055.25 in excess of receipts, to which must be added refunds amounting to $329,950, making a total of $1,017,005.25. But if we take into account certain lands granted in redemption of scrip issued for rebellion services, half-breed claims and other purposes, amounting to $3,758,490, there is shown a favourable balance of $2,741,484.75, or an annual average of $78,328.13. As has already been stated, the Dominion profit from the policy so wisely pursued has to be looked for in other quarters,—from the customs and other receipts and from the generally improved conditions throughout Canada. The total revenues of Canada have increased in the last seven or eight years by about 100 per cent. In 1896 the total revenue was $35,000,000 or $36,000,000, last year the total revenue was over $70,000,000. We have been spending money in administering the lands, not for the purpose of making direct profit, but, on the other hand, we have brought about an exceedingly favourable result, in seven or eight years doubling the total revenue of this Dominion.

The particular benefit to the provinces in the plan that is being adopted as opposed to the plan of transferring the public domain to the local governments, is found in the fact that we have from the start an assured revenue; whereas, if the lands were transferred to the local governments, and if no change of policy were put into effect by them, they would have great difficulties, in the initial years of their provincial experience, in getting enough revenue to carry on the affairs of government. Moreover, their financial position is assured in the far future years, fifty or one hundred years hence, as long as this confederation lasts; whereas, on the other hand, and in the case of some of the other provinces fifty or one hundred years hence, the Crown domain cannot be worth very much to those provinces so far as concerns their revenues. The principle of the provincial right to a beneficial interest in the land is recognized in the most substantial manner, and I am pleased to be able to say, because I believe it to be the truth, that the people of the Northwest are eminently satisfied. I venture to say that there is scarcely a man in the Northwest, who is not actuated by partisan sentiment, but has stated, either to himself or to his neighbours, that this is a better proposition than would be the proposition to turn over the lands to local management. I may be permitted to give to the House some actual expressions of opinion on this point. So far as possible, I will not give partisan opinions. The 'Standard' newspaper of Regina, published by a gentleman of independent tendencies, neither Conservative or Liberal, since the publication of the terms of these Bills, has written:

It is difficult, at the present stage, to pass judgment upon the terms proposed in the Autonomy Bills. It is, however, quite evident that

the Dominion will retain control of the Territorial public lands. Perhaps, under the circumstances, this is best for all concerned. The two great needs of the new provinces at first, will be population and railway development. To secure the former, the inducement of free homesteads must continue to be offered, and to secure railway extension, lands, or the proceeds of lands are usually granted. Thus, we see, that if the new provinces owned the unallotted lands they should have practically to give them away. At the same time the cost of land administration would have to be borne. The duties of the Immigration Department, too, would follow the land. The new provinces could not be easily equipped for these onerous duties. It took the federal authorities many years to bring immigration work up to its present status. They have it now in a state of high efficiency, with experienced agents at work in various parts of the world. It is important that the good work shall continue to go on undisturbed. A handsome equivalent, either in cash or in interest-bearing credit, will suit the new provinces much better than the extra responsibilities which are involved in the ownership and control of the public domain.

The circumstances of the old provinces were altogether different. They had railways and population long before confederation, and they also had the lands and their respective land departments in full organization.

By all means let Saskatchewan and Alberta have each an adequate allowance ' in lieu of lands,' but let parliament take due heed of the full import of the term ' adequate ' as it applies in this instance.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, I could find any better authority on this subject than Mr. Haultain. In that famous letter of protest which Mr. Haultain directed to the Prime Minister, and which, it strikes me, was merely a formal protest in that regard, he stated at the conclusion :

> But I am not unwilling to admit that an immediate income, increasing with population and certain in amount, may in the long run prove quite as satisfactory as any probable net income resulting from local administration of the public domain.

Now, I am going to read to the House a portion of a letter which came to me from a gentleman in Regina, dated February 24th, three days after these propositions had been presented to the House and had been reported in Regina. This letter was not sent me for publication, or with the idea that its contents would ever reach any person but myself. I think a letter of this kind is the best sort of evidence to show the actual situation as it struck the gentleman who wrote the letter :

> So far as the feeling here is concerned, it could hardly be stronger in favour of the government's propositions.
>
> Such pronounced Conservatives as C. E. D. Wood, S. B. Jamieson, W. B. Pocklington, Norman Mackenzie and James Brown voluntarily expressed not only their surprise at the generosity of the terms but their complete satisfaction with them. Mayor Laird stated to me. that as to the lands what the people wanted was money and if they received from the Dominion as much as they would realize by handling the lands themselves there would not be the slightest complaint.

All these gentlemen whose names are here contained are well known Conservatives. Mayor Laird is a gentleman who took a very prominent part in the campaign of last fall.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the name of the writer?

Mr. SCOTT. I have not the slightest objection to sending the letter across to my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule), but I would rather not publish the name of the writer. I think I have advanced a fair measure of proof that as far as concerns the treatment given to the provinces in connection with public domain it is treatment that is eminently satisfactory to the people chiefly interested.

I come now to a subject which is perhaps more contentious in its nature, although I am obliged to repeat again that I think that a totally disproportionate amount of attention has been given to what is only a phase of the educational matter. The matter of education is one of very prime importance, the most important matter to the people of any province and the most important subject that could possibly be dealt with by any parliament or local legislature. But the matter that is being debated in the House is the narrowest kind of an issue as between the proposition of the government and the proposition, as it is explained by himself, of the hon. member for Carleton. However, before actually taking up the educational clause, let me make another brief reference. The year of confederation, 1867, chances to be also the year in which I was ushered into this world and it will not be a matter of surprise, therefore, that some of the negotiations and some of the events that occurred prior to that time are not very definitely within my recollection. I was thrown into circumstances which did not conduce to a great deal of research or study historical or constitutional. Probably there are many people in Canada, in Ontario, in Manitoba and in the Northwest Territories who may be like myself in this regard. We have had it in our minds, from what we have seen in the newspapers and from the sentiments we have heard expressed by people around us that the responsibilty for the insertion of the clause protecting the rights of minorities in the Canadian constitution, the British North America Act, was upon the Roman Catholic hierarchy, that they had in some way engineered that provision into the Confederation Act and that it was probably only the Roman Catholic people of the Dominion of Canada who were interested in the observance of that principle. Or, to state it the other way, we have had the impression that the Protestants in Canada were and

ought to be antagonistic to the observance of that provision for the protection of minority rights which is embodied in the British North America Act. I have to admit that it came with a kind of a shock to me in the first instance to hear that it was not the Roman Catholic hierarchy but the Protestant people of Canada who stood up for the insertion of that protection in the constitution. The House has heard the indisputable proof of that fact which was given by my hon. friend the First Minister in his speech in this House on the 21st of February and again in another speech on the 22nd March of this year. But, perhaps, it will do no harm if I quote from another gentleman for whom some hon. members on the other side of the House may have a higher regard. The late leader of the Conservative party, Sir Charles Tupper, referred to this matter in a speech delivered in this House in 1896. Sir Charles Tupper was one of the fathers of confederation who took part in the negotiations which resulted in confederation, and he speaks as a man having knowledge. He said:

I say with knowledge that but for the consent to the proposal of Mr. Galt, who represented especially the Protestants of Quebec, and but for the assent of that conference to the proposal of Mr. Galt, that in the Confederation Act should be embodied a clause which would protect the right of minorities, whether Catholics or Protestants, in this country, there would have been no confederation. I draw attention to the fact that when you contrast our present position with that which Canada occupied when Mr. Geo. Brown and Sir John A. Macdonald felt impelled, by the necessities of the case, by the condition of their country, to seek some change in its constitution which would relieve it from the terrible war of religion and race that had been maintained in old Canada down to that time, it is significant that but for the clause protecting minorities, the measure of confederation would not have been accomplished, and no man can say how humiliating might not have been the position either of Canada or any of the smaller provinces if that great work had not been accomplished.

I find that at that same time the hon. gentleman who at present represents North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in this House said of that provision that it was the sine qua non of the Protestant minority of their entrance into confederation. I may just at this point read a little further from the speech made by the then Minister of Finance:

And so the first paragraph——

Referring to section 93 of the British North America Act.

——the educational clauses of the confederation resolutions gave by general consent to the provinces the power to deal with respect to education;

Saving the rights and privileges which Catholic or Protestant minorities in both Canadas may possess as to their denominational schools at the time when the union goes into operation.

Mr. SCOTT.

The only change which took place in that clause was this——

That is the change that took place in London.

——that instead of its being confined to both Canadas, it was broadened to include the provinces which entered confederation. . . . It was the sine qua non of the Protestant minority of their entrance into confederation.

There cannot be any doubt, if we accept that statement, that this provision which was put into the British North America Act referred, not only to the two Canadas, but to all provinces entering confederation, and, I take it, to all provinces that will enter confederation in the future.

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask the hon. gentleman this question: In the original resolutions that were moved, and upon which the British North America Act was founded, is that provision not strictly confined to Ontario and Quebec?

Mr. SCOTT. That is just exactly Mr. Foster's statement. This was the original resolution adopted in Quebec:

Saving the rights and privileges which Catholic or Protestant minorities in both Canadas may possess.

And he went on to say that the change which took place in the clause was this, that instead of its being confined to both the Canadas, it was broadened to include all the provinces that might enter confederation. Of the fact, therefore, that this provision was inserted for Protestant interests, and not for Roman Catholic interests, there cannot be any successful dispute. It was not inserted for the Protestants of Quebec alone, but it was inserted for what was expected to be the Protestant minority in the territory lying west of the great lakes. Parliament, in 1870, in creating the province of Manitoba, provided for minority rights in separate schools, not for Catholic interests in Manitoba, but for what were believed to be Protestant interests. There was just as much expectation that the minority in Manitoba would be a Protestant minority as that it would be a Roman Catholic minority. Let any gentleman read the 1875 debates, read the debate that took place when the Northwest Territories' Act was passed, and it must be plain to him, if he has an open, impartial mind, that the parliament of Canada in 1875 provided, not specially for Roman Catholic minorities, but provided for expected Protestant minorities in the Northwest Territories. At all events, let any gentleman read these 1875 debates impartially, and he cannot possibly deny that Blake, Mackenzie, Sir John Macdonald and Sir Alexander Campbell—I believe that none of these gentlemen was a Roman Catholic; each one of them bears an honoured name, and each one of them was a Protestant—supported the separate school clause in the Northwest Territories' Act,

having clearly in mind that he was legislating, not temporarily, but for all time to come.

And George Brown who did not support the legislation ; what did he say ?

> The moment this Act passed and the Northwest became part of the union, they came under the Union Act, and under the provisions with regard to separate schools.

In the face of that language if the late Mr. Brown were still alive and had a seat in this House and were confronting the legislation which we have before us, what would he do ? Support the protection to minority rights ? Certainly. That therefore should I do even though I be as violent an opponent of the separate school as was Mr. Brown.

Take the late Mr. Dalton McCarthy ; he proposed in the year 1894 in this House to do what was the duty of any one who had a seat in this House, and believed that the separate school in the Northwest Territories was an iniquity, an impropriety or an injury to the Northwest Territories. He proposed that they should be abolished so far as this House was concerned. He proposed to leave the people of the Northwest Territories free to abolish separate schools if they wished to do so, and one of the very reasons he urged was that if the separate school provision was not abolished until the moment when the Territories entered the union as provinces then it would be impossible ever to abolish separate schools in that Territory.

But looking at the whole history of the matter, we must remember that it was for Protestant minorities as well as for Roman Catholic minorities that this protection was placed in the British North America Act. I want to speak with perfect sincerity. This is a serious question especially for those of us who come from the Northwest Territories. I want to say, speaking as a Protestant, not as a member of the minority, that in view of the history of this matter I would be ashamed of myself as a Protestant and ashamed of the Protestant majority if we would wish now, merely because we have the power and because it is no longer our rights that will be affected, to use that power, to deny the very thing which we as Protestants stood out for when a Protestant minority was affected. The principle is there clear and distinct to me, as I think it must be to every man with an impartial mind.

It is urged against the Liberal party to-day that they are taking a course contrary to their course in 1896 in the Manitoba case. I do not think so. In 1896, as the right hon. gentleman who to-day fills the position as leader of this House expressed it :

> The government is proposing a course which is a violent wrench of the principles on which our constitution is based.

Was he speaking truly or falsely ? Was the course proposed in 1895 and 1896 a violent wrench ? I think that nobody who understands the situation, especially nobody living in the country west of the great lakes and familiar with the sentiment of Manitoba, could deny that he was telling the truth. It was such a violent wrench that if that action had not been prevented by the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) the chances are that confederation would have been split into its original fragments. The hon. gentlemen opposite were taking a different course from what they are taking to-day, but then as now they were forgetting that constitutions are made for the provinces, not provinces for the constitution. The right hon. gentleman who now leads the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was standing then for respect for established rights, the established right of the people of the province to have such a school system as they saw fit to have within its constitution. He is doing the same to-day, he is standing to-day for respect for the established rights of minorities in that area of country which is going to constitute these new provinces. Is he proposing any wrench of the principle of the constitution as the government of 1896 did ? Why Sir, he is proposing the very opposite as has been conclusively proven by the extracts from speeches which I have read to the House. The principle of protection for minority rights is there in the constitution, and no impartial man, no man who wishes to be fair, can disregard the existence of that principle in the constitution ; whether it is there by letter of law, whether the letter of the constitution would bear this interpretation, or not, there can be no successful denial of the fact that in providing as these Bills do, for the continuation to the minorities of exactly the rights they are enjoying when they enter this confederation as provinces, the government is purely and simply regarding the spirit of the Confederation Act.

There has been a good deal of cavil upon the point as to whether that area should be considered as a province before its entry or as a Territory. No person will deny or seek to deny that it is only a Territory but after all the human beings on the areas out there are just the same as they would be if they were in provinces, and their interests and conditions are practically not different at all from the conditions under the same institutions if the areas were provinces instead of being territories. On this point perhaps it will not be out of place for me to quote from a gentleman whose authority is very considerably respected at least by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). Mr. Haultain said, speaking in the legislature at Regina in 1900 :

> We have been created what I may be allowed to call a political entity. We are for purposes

of self-government as separate a part of the Dominion as any of the provinces. We have a legislature and form of government bearing a very close analogy to that which exists in the provinces, and in every respect, therefore, except in respect of the necessary means for carrying on those institutions, we stand in very much the same position as a province, and we may for present purposes be fairly called 'an integral part of the Dominion'.

Mr. SPROULE. What were the present purposes ?

Mr. SCOTT. (reading).

We have been created what I may be allowed to call a political entity.

Of course that is for present purposes.

Mr. SPROULE. I have no doubt he was speaking of rights which were quite within their power and which they were entitled to exercise ; for present purposes they were to all intents and purposes a province, but that would not give them the same rights as if they were really provinces.

Mr. SCOTT. As I have something more to say on this point later on I will not take up further time at this moment.

A great deal of discussion has taken place throughout the country and I am afraid there has been a good deal of misconception with regard to this school matter. I am afraid that some of it has not been entirely honest misconception. I am afraid that some public journals in this country are not very careful to create a proper conception with regard to this subject. In one paper we have a motto appearing day after day.

A FREE WEST, A COMMON SCHOOL, PROVINCIAL RIGHTS AND RELIGIOUS EQUALITY.

Articles and inflammatory cartoons under that motto have led the innocent citizen to believe that the proposals of the government are entirely in the teeth of this motto. I say that every item proposed by the government is in strict observance of these principles. Where is there to be found any religious inequality in the proposition of the government. Read over the resolutions; are Roman Catholic minorities especially singled out ? The protection is for Protestant as well as for Roman Catholic. It may be that the Roman Catholics as a whole in the Northwest are in the minority but that is not the interpretation of this section ; it is the minority in each public school district that is concerned. It may be that in time to come there will be—there may be now for all I know—as many Protestant minorities as Catholic minorities in the two provinces. At the present moment I believe the majority of the Roman Catholics in the country are in groups. They do not constitute minorities. Provincial rights, as I have already said, is a comparative term. I believe—and the large majority of the people in the Northwest Territories that I have heard from since these proposals were brought down also believe—that provincial rights are being granted to them in the fullest sense in which they are enjoyed by any other province of Canada. A common school—that is just what we are asked to vote for in this proposition; a non-sectarian school, absolutely under state control. A free west—that is, a reasonably free west; just as free as Ontario. Talk about throttling the west ! Then two-thirds of the people of this Dominion live in provinces which are throttled, are they feeling very badly? They have in Ontario, I understand, what are called church schools, and I believe they have church schools in Quebec also. Are they feeling badly ? If this proposition were placing a severe hardship on the people of the west, it is not as severe a hardship as has been placed on the people of these other provinces, because it is giving the west, not an ecclesiastical school, not a church school, but a free common school under state control. At all events, two-thirds of the people of this Dominion are living in provinces not more free, not so free,—provinces that have always been looked upon as being autonomous provinces, and apparently doing very well. The Bill, I believe to be in strict harmony with that motto: 'A free west, a common school, provincial rights and religious equality.' These provinces will be as free as any other province if we are to regard and apply the principles of the British North America Act—I for one believe more free, because, by section 16 of the Bill, we restrict and diminish the full and complete application of section 93 of the British North America Act.

Autonomy, as I said before, is a comparative term. As was pointed out very well by the hon. Postmaster General last evening, there are no two provinces of Canada with the same constitution. I venture to say that the average citizen of the Territory, if he had been asked if he would accept the autonomy that British Columbia has would have said: No, the limit of population would not suit either of these new provinces. If asked if he would accept the autonomy that Manitoba has, he would say certainly not, notwithstanding that Manitoba is absolutely free in regard to the school matter, because the financial terms given to Manitoba would be entirely unsatisfactory to the new provinces. For the same reason as in the case of British Columbia he would not be prepared to accept the autonomy which the maritime provinces possess. Make the suggestion to him that he accept the autonomy which Quebec has, and what would he say? Quebec is limited in the matter of language; it is obliged to recognize officially two languages, and it is limited in other respects. He would not ac-

cept that. The average citizen of the Territories, if asked to accept the autonomy of the province of Ontario, would at first blush say yes; but some of us on inquiring a little further would say: Certainly not; there is a limitation in Ontario with regard to schools which we do not want to apply in Alberta and Saskatchewan, and in these Bills it is not applied.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I ask the hon. gentleman one question? I understood him to say that the Northwest provinces are getting exactly the same provincial autonomy as the other provinces. Is it not a fact that every province in confederation today, except Ontario and Quebec, has the absolute right to legislate with regard to education?

Mr. SCOTT. I have endeavoured to explain to the House very clearly my position on that point—that there are no two provinces in Canada with exactly the same measure of autonomy, and probably the people of the Northwest Territories would not be willing to accept the exact position occupied by any other single province in Canada. I believe that the provisions of these Bills will place the Northwest Territories in a position as nearly as possible of absolute and satisfactory average equality with the other provinces of Canada. I know that the hon. member for East Grey, in the depth of his sincerity, would like to have a contrary impression created. I said a moment ago that there were some misconceptions prevailing, and we have heard some of them voiced in this House. I am going to read to the House a communication which I have received which puts those misconceptions a little more bluntly than we hear them put in this House, but it expresses the same spirit. This letter reached me this week. To satisfy my hon. friend from East Grey, I will say at the beginning that I am not going to give the name.

Mr. SPROULE. Then you should not read it. If a letter is quoted in this House it should be laid on the table. I appeal to the Speaker if I am not correct.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. It is only official documents which are to be laid on the table, not private letters of members.

Mr. SPROULE. A member has no right to quote anything in this House that he is not willing to give the authorship of.

Mr. SCOTT. In this particular case there need be no dispute, because there was no name on the letter. It was signed 'A Lover of Freedom,' and is as follows:

Walter Scott, Esq., M.P.,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—It is with a feeling of shame I read your letter from a clipping sent me from Ontario addressed to A. Banner, of Maple Creek, and I must say I feel ashamed of those representatives of the citizens of Canada who purpose voting for such an infamous measure as the separate school clause makes, of the Autonomy Bill, with which it is the purpose of the Laurier government to shackle for all time to come the new provinces of Canada. Rather than vote for such a measure I would drown myself or commit suicide in some way, or flee to some place of exile or desert island where no self-respecting man could look me in the face. Have you no eyes? Have you never read history? Are you not conversant with the current newspaper news—

The writer, I suppose, must have been reading the Toronto 'News.'

—or have you not any conscience, that for the sake of party-politics or for the sake of the emoluments and patronage of the party in power, you propose to shackle the poor ignorant Roman Catholics of these new provinces with the fetters of Romish priesthood, and keep them in ignorance for all time to come? Look at the peasants of Russia, and of Spain and of Italy and Mexico and Cuba, and all the petty republics of South America where the hierarchy of Rome have the ruling of the people. Look even at your own province of Quebec, and at Manitoba, before it was set free by the Liberal party; and behold the result of the power of Rome in educational matters; and with all that before your eyes, you still declare that, as far as your vote will do so, you will put shackles on the Catholic element who do not know enough to resist, as well as the coming generations of Catholics for all time to come, in a territory ruled by British freemen, and in extent nearly half a continent.

An hon. MEMBER. That sounds like Sproule.

Mr. SCOTT (reading):

—Why are the Russian peasantry so ignorant? Is it not because it suits the purposes of the Greek and Roman churches to keep them in ignorance? And what is true of Russia is also true of every country in the world where the hierarchy of Rome holds sway. You have a Roman Catholic premier in power at Ottawa, and a servile majority at his back whom he purposes to control in the interests of the hierarchy, and is making an attempt to shackle the greater part of the territory of Canada as it has done the laity of the Roman Catholic population of Ontario and Quebec. Be warned in time. Do not permit your name to go down in history as one who was a party to such infamy and calamity to a people that ought to be free. Be a man, do the right thing, and let the Roman Catholic hierarchy go to the devil where they belong.

A LOVER OF FREEDOM.

Mr. INGRAM. Is this one of the hon. gentleman's electors?

Mr. SCOTT. I am proud indeed to say that that letter was not posted from my constituency, and for the benefit of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), I will add that I absolve him entirely from any connection with that letter, I merely give it as an expression of a spirit which unfortunately is evident sometimes in this

House, though not quite so plainly expressed as it is in this communication, and as a proof of the entire ignorance and misconception under which are labouring the people who are complaining against this measure. What we are legislating for is a common school—not a church or ecclesiastical school—but a common school system to be entirely governed and controlled by the people of those provinces through their legislatures and administrations. I have received a very large number of communications, petitions and protests of various sorts in connection with this measure, from which I ask permission to read just two or three extracts. Here is a resolution which came to me from the Orangemen of Maple Creek :

That the Orangemen of Maple Creek feel it incumbent upon them to protest in the most earnest manner against any question of separate schools being established in the Territories, and, believing that the great majority of the population of the Territories are against the idea, earnestly entreat the premier of the Northwest assembly and his co-delegate at Ottawa, and also the members of the Dominion parliament for the Territories to fight the introduction of separate schools even to the refusal of provincial autonomy with that as a condition thereof.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are not proposing to introduce separate schools. What we are proposing to do is to perpetuate conditions which exist in that area at present, and which have given, and are giving, entire satisfaction to practically everybody in that country. I have a communication from an important body, the Baptist Convention of Manitoba and the Territories, the third clause of which is as follows :

This is a scheme which will provoke discord and defeat one of the main purposes of public school education, which is the unification of all classes. A confederation cannot be sound in which the elements lack the first essential of harmony.

Well, this system which we are perpetuating by the proposed legislation is one which has been in force in the Territories for fourteen years, and I have yet to learn that it has caused any discord. The first essential of harmony therefore must be in that system, or discord would have broken out under its administration at some time or other during the fourteen years it has been in force. Another petition very largely signed contains the following :

We, the undersigned citizens, respectfully urge you to use all influence you may have against the separate school clause in the Bill now before parliament.

The majority of these petitions are directed against the original clauses, which some of us, at all events, claim were not identical with those now before the House. In a petition, dated March 7th, from the Ministerial Association of Winnipeg, the second clause reads as follows :

Mr. SCOTT.

Whereas, the rights of the minority are sufficiently protected by the British North America Act in any particular case.

But we are certainly not increasing that protection by this measure. If we should let the British North America Act, section 93, apply mechanically or automatically, we would not be giving any less protection to the rights of the minorities, but would leave the matter in a position of uncertainty, and there can be no doubt that where you leave uncertainty you give opportunities to agitate, and you create, not only the possibility, but the strongest likelihood, that the first years of the new provinces, when the attention of their legislatures should be directed to more profitable things, will be misused in an agitation which my hon. friend from East Grey might take some opportunity in helping to raise for the abolition of that remnant of the separate school which does exist in the Territories.

Mr. SPROULE. I should think that the statement I made would have exonerated me from any such charge. What I asked was that the right be left with the provinces to deal with the school question as they saw fit. I did not ask that they should do away with separate schools or introduce separate schools, but be left free to deal with them as a matter pertaining to themselves, about which we are not concerned, and in which I do not propose to meddle.

Mr. SCOTT. I do not know that it will be possible for me to arrive at an exact understanding with my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule).

Mr. SPROULE. That depends on your mental capacity.

Mr. SCOTT. I would ask my hon. friend whether anybody in the Territories communicated with him in regard to this matter before he commenced communicating with the people out there ?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, several of them.

Mr. SCOTT. I understand my hon. friend to contend that he has had no part in endeavouring to engineer an agitation in the Territories. That is a statement which I accept.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman asked me a specific question, and I gave him a specific answer.

Mr. SCOTT. I accepted last evening the frank statement of my hon. friend that he had not written people in the Northwest Territories urging upon them that this was the time for them to get rid of their separate schools.

Mr. SPROULE. And I adhere to that still.

Mr. SCOTT. I do not know that it is of any consequence to anybody that I should pursue this matter further with my hon.

friend, but the fact remains that there were people in the province of Ontario who, in last January, before these Bills were brought down, were writing to people in the North-west Territories; and if I had the file of the Calgary 'Herald' here—which is a Conservative organ—I could read a very strong article advising the people of Ontario to mind their own business and not meddle in this affair of the people of the Territories, who are well able to look after it themselves. But to continue with these communications and resolutions; here is a resolution which was adopted by a public meeting at Moosejaw :

That the school system now in force in the Territories was brought in force by our local legislature and is giving entire satisfaction, and we respectfully urge that the new provinces be given full control of educational affairs.

Mr. SPROULE. Hear, hear.

Mr. SCOTT. It is evident, on the face of it, that right in that clause there is a misconception. As a matter of fact, this legislation was not brought into existence by the local legislature, but initiated by this parliament. Practically all the protests and communications and complaints which have been raised are based upon misconceptions, though not of so violent a character, I must admit, as those which exist in the mind of the writer of the letter who signed himself 'a lover of freedom.' And a good deal of that misconception exists apparently in the city of Toronto. A gentleman who for many years held, first in Manitoba and then in the Territories, the important position of superintendent of education, spoke at a recent public gathering in Toronto—a gathering held as a protest against the legislation submitted to this House. I refer to Dr. Goggin. I read from the report in the Toronto 'News' that he said :

I take it that we meet here to-night as a body of Liberals, intent upon setting before our party our views on this subject, whether they be right or wrong. That I believe is one of the qualifications of a good party man.

We have all had experience with 'Old Liberal,' 'Disgusted Liberal,' 'Long-standing Liberal,' and various other classes of Liberal who come to the front during a general election or at other periods of excitement. In my own hearing the name of Mark Twain has been used twice in the course of this debate. On one occasion Mr. Clemens, more widely known by his pen-name 'Mark Twain,' was inspecting a group of statuary in the house of a friend. One statue was that of a young woman coiling her hair. The great humorist had a puzzled expression, and, when asked what he thought of the statue he said, 'Well, it isn't true to nature ; she ought to have a mouth full of hairpins.' We in the west have been acquainted with Dr. Goggin for many years, but no matter how full of political hairpins he was even his best friend would fail to recognize him from this description given of him in the Toronto 'News.' We have always known him as a very estimable, a very genial, but a very thorough-going Conservative. I entirely refuse to believe that Dr. Goggin is correctly reported. I venture to say that the Toronto 'News,' pursuing its very frequent policy of misrepresentation, has incorrectly reported Dr. Goggin, in representing him as belonging to the class of 'Disgusted Liberals.' Dr. Goggin later on referred to Mr. Haultain's draft Bill :

I would like to say a few words in regard to this draft Bill. Certain things are asked for, including provincial control of public lands, but they make no demand for the incorporation of any provisions for separate schools under the new constitution. They do not say one word about it. Nor at the elections did Mr. Haultain say one word about it. No ! They trusted to the British North America Act.

I will make some further reference to that later on :

Sir Wilfrid Laurier has said that he did not think there was much to be accomplished by discussion. We know where Mr. Haultain was, and we know where we were. That is what he said. I might ask, in view of subsequent events, whether he knew where he was or not. One of our objects in coming here to-night is to help him to discover where he ought to be. We know that the people of the Dominion were not consulted; neither were the people of the west. We know that Mr. Haultain and his colleagues were not consulted. we know that neither the Minister of Interior nor the Minister of Finance were consulted. Do you know whether anybody else at Ottawa was consulted ? Have you heard whether the Papal Legate was consulted ? . . . Are you people of the west to be trampled upon by him? it is as a western man that I appeal to you to-night, and especially to the Liberal party, to let its voice be heard in no uncertain sound.

And we had one of the representatives for Toronto rising in this House one night a week ago, at white-heat of indignation because the Minister of Finance had stated that some religious considerations were being imported into this discussion. Is there no religious suggestion in the statement I have just read, no insinuation calculated to excite the prejudices and passions of the Protestant people of Ontario ? Let me say a word with regard to what has been discussed a great deal—'We know that Mr. Haultain and his colleagues were not consulted.' Now Mr. Haultain in his letter has stated that he was consulted in regard to everything except the matter of education.

Mr. SPROULE. Hear, hear—the important one.

Mr. SCOTT. I may remind the hon. member for East Grey that Mr. Haultain came here just after New Years and was here almost continually until the 21st of February when this measure was brought down.

There were consultations going on nearly every day. If there were no discussions between the members of the government and the representatives of the Northwest Territories with regard to education whose was the fault? Was there any prohibition resting upon Mr. Haultain against bringing the matter of education into the conference? I will point out to you a little later, Mr. Speaker, that in not bringing up the matter of education Mr. Haultain was doing exactly what he had been doing in the Northwest Territories. For years he had been discussing this autonomy matter, and yet until the time of the general election last October you will fail to find any reference he ever made in any discussion to the subject of education. If there were no long discussions between him and the members of the government with regard to education, I venture to say that Mr. Haultain and his colleague are at least as much to blame as are the members of the government.

Now I revert to a matter that I mentioned a little while ago,—I will have something to say with regard to Dr. Goggin a little later—whether this Territory should be treated in these measures, as a territory or a province. There has been a good deal of discussion coming from the other side of the House on that point. I find that the opinion from Mr. Christopher Robinson, K.C., read by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) had that idea in it—in fact that idea was the basis of Mr. Robinson's opinion. Mr. Robinson said:

> There is not in any part of the Northwest Territories as a province any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools possessed by any class of persons, created by the province, or existing at such union.

Mr. Haultain, too, in his letter, remarks in reference to this matter:

> The first subsection of section 16 of the Bill is drawn in direct contradiction of this principle. It is an attempt to create a province retroactively. It declares territorial school laws passed under the restrictions imposed by the Northwest Territories Act to be provincial school laws. It clothes laws imposed by the federal parliament with all the attributes of laws voluntarily made by a free province. It ignores territorial limitations and conditions. It denies facts and abolishes time. It declares what was not to have been and seeks to perpetuate as existing what never was or is.

Very definite language. Hon. gentlemen on the other side have been using similar language. They have been fairly 'rampaging' through the fields of ridicule so far as concerns that feature of the Autonomy Bill which proposes to treat these areas as provinces. I do not know that it would be any harm just to look for a moment at what was the demand of the Northwest Territories in this regard if we take the view expressed by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) that the draft Bill of Mr. Haultain constituted the demand of the people of the Northwest Territories. Section 2 of the draft Bill is as follows:—my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) I hope, will pay particular attention to this, for he also had something to say about the ridiculousness of treating that area as a province. The name of the province is left blank in the draft Bill, but I supply the name:

> On, from and after the said first day of January, 1903, the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, except those parts thereof which are in terms made or by reasonable intendment may be held to be, specially applicable to or to affect only one or more but not the whole of the provinces under that Act composing the Dominion, and except so far as the same may be varied by this Act, shall be applicable to the province of Saskatchewan in the same way and to the same extent as they apply to the several provinces of Canada and as if the province of Saskatchewan had been one of the provinces originally united by the said Act.

As if Saskatchewan had been a province and not a territory! Create a province retroactively! Treat territorial school laws as provincial school laws! Ignore territorial limitations and conditions! Deny facts and abolish time! Declare what was not to have been and perpetuate as existing what never was nor is! Ridiculous when proposed by this government! But high statesmanship when proposed by Mr. Haultain! That draft Bill, the famous draft Bill, was prepared, I think, in January, 1902. I have discussed that clause with lawyers, and with laymen, and I venture to say there is not a lawyer in this House or in this country who dares chain his reputation to the opinion that that clause would not have fixed ecclesiastical separate schools certainly and irrevocably on the new provinces if it were adopted or at least have fixed certainly and irrevocably a system of separate schools. I go farther and I say that when that draft Bill was prepared Mr. Haultain, nor any of his colleagues, nor any of the members of the Northwest legislature, nor any of the people of the Northwest Territories who were taking an interest in the matter, ever had any intention of asking for greater freedom in this matter of schools than they had been enjoying for the last fourteen years. Dr. Goggin, as I said, was superintendent of education in the Northwest Territories for a number of years; he was practically the deputy of Mr. Haultain in the educational department at the time this draft Bill was framed. Dr. Goggin moved to Toronto a little more than two years ago, at about which time he was interviewed on the subject of autonomy by the Toronto 'News.' He was asked his opinion as to the reason of the delay by parliament in dealing with this matter of autonomy, and this is what he said:

> There are those who assert that the delay in granting autonomy is owing to the difficulties

anticipated in connection with separate schools and the use of the French language. It is said that the legislature will insist upon being left perfectly free to deal with this as with all other questions of internal administration, though I have not seen any declaration to that effect by the premier or the legislature.

Dr. Goggin knew the contents of the draft Bill, he was in Regina at the time it was prepared, and was then Mr. Haultain's superintendent of education. He was there during the local election in 1902 when, as is stated, the people of the Territories voted upon and endorsed the demand made by the government for autonomy, and after he came to Toronto a year later he declared he had seen no declaration by the premier or legislature of the Territories that they wanted additional freedom in the matter of the schools constitution. I say, Mr. Speaker, and I say it solemnly, because it is a weighty statement, not to be made lightly, I say that in view of the fact that in his own draft Bill, Mr. Haultain asked for a provincial charter in which separate schools would be imposed and guaranteed in the new provinces as if the Territories were one of the original provinces, a charter having the effect which the Nova Scotia charter would possess with regard to separate schools if a separate school system had been in existence in Nova Scotia in 1867—I say that the ground taken in this letter of protest by Mr. Haultain can only be classed as a piece of the rankest and most patent partisan misrepresentation ever witnessed in the Dominion of Canada. I ask the hon. member for Qu'Appelle who was a member of the legislature, and was one of Mr. Haultain's closest associates, if, up to April, 1903, if up to the time of the Moosejaw convention in 1903, when Mr. Haultain was dragooned by his party associates at the instance of the leader of the Conservative party here—if the hon. member for Qu'Appelle ever understood that Mr. Haultain, or his government, or the legislature intended to ask a constitution with regard to education different from the constitution that they had at that moment ?

Mr. LAKE. I thoroughly understood that the draft Bill provided for absolute freedom of action to the new provinces in the matter of education.

Mr. SCOTT. Well, the draft Bill speaks for itself, and it asks that these areas be not treated as Territories but be treated as if they were at this moment provinces. And Dr. Goggin had no such understanding as my hon. friend professes. Nor had I. Nor had the assembly generally. I think it is proper for me to point out that this particular conduct on the part of Mr. Haultain is strictly of a piece with his whole conduct of political matters since the convention two years ago when he was dragooned at Moosejaw.

Mr. LAKE. I strongly object to the suggestion being made that I knew Mr. Haultain was dragooned ; nothing of the sort, I think he acted entirely of his own free will.

Mr. HERRON. I do not think the hon. gentleman from West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) would dare go into Alberta and make a statement of that kind.

Mr. SCOTT. Well, my present sphere is sufficient for me now, perhaps I may have an opportunity some time to make this statement elsewhere. Mr. Haultain knows since last October and November whether I have fear or hesitation about making the statement elsewhere. I say his conduct in this matter is of a piece with his conduct during the last two years. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) remembers that in the fall of 1903 we had a discussion about a certain matter of capital advance. I read a telegram from Mr. Haultain which practically asked me to get a capital advance on certain terms which he said would be satisfactory to him. Well, later in the assembly he declared that they were not satisfactory, and it is to the knowledge of everybody that that declaration had absolutely no other motive than partisanship and had no other result that the detriment of the people of the Northwest Territories.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood Mr. Haultain's objection was this, that if the increased amount of money was given out of expenditure it was to be regarded as paying off so much debt, it was to be counted as a debt against the province and taken into consideration when autonomy was given, because, he said, we have no right to be saddled with that as a debt.

Mr. SCOTT. That of course may be called a side issue. Mr. Haultain asked us by telegram to get a capital advance on certain terms, we got it on those terms, and he said in his telegram that he would be satisfied. But later on he stated in the legislature that it was not satisfactory, and for purely partisan reasons, which nobody can successfully deny.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not understand that the money was got on the terms that he asked for at all.

Mr. SCOTT. Absolutely. Then as this matter has become one of some interest as we hear it said that here is the opinion of the duly accredited, constitutional representative of the Northwest Territories, their Prime Minister, I think it becomes our duty to look into his credentials. What is his position at the present time ? He is the reputed head of the legislature, but I make the statement on my responsibility as a member of this parliament, that Mr. Haultain does not at the present moment possess the confidence of

the Northwest legislature. If he had a meeting of the legislature to-day I know positively that he could not command a majority. There are seven vacancies, since the last meeting of the legislature seven gentlemen have resigned, and I verily believe that if these constituencies were to elect new members, Mr. Haultain tomorrow would not be able to control a majority. He is in a sense, of course, Prime Minister, but if we are going to stick to the constitution as strictly as our friends this afternoon have argued for it, Mr. Haultain must admit that he is not the constitutional representative of the people of the Northwest Territories at this moment. Is further evidence needed ? Mr. Haultain made this very autonomy matter, as my hon. friend from Brandon knows, an issue in the Northwest Territories in the last general election as far as he could to obscure the Grand Trunk Pacific. He stumped the Northwest Territories on it and what was the result ? Seven Liberal members returned, every one with an average majority of 1,200, as against three Conservatives with an average majority of less than 150.

Mr. INGRAM. You ought to have an election for the Minister of the Interior now.

Mr. SCOTT. We had a good deal of discussion this afternoon and many brave statements were made by hon. gentlemen opposite. We had very similar statements made last year. We had a number of fingers pointing across the floor of the House then as they were pointing across this afternoon and from month to month in 1904 and during the previous session of 1903 hon. gentlemen said: Only dare to come down to the people; only dare to do it. Well, the government did dare do it and the result is as I have said, that in British Columbia there were seven Liberals returned and not a single Conservative, in the Northwest Territories seven Liberals, with a majority averaging a little over 1,200, as against three Conservatives barely squeezed in, and in Manitoba seven Liberals as against three Conservatives. And when we got before the people their complaint was that we had taken them unawares. Let the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) not concern himself. Whether a new Minister of the Interior is selected from British Columbia or the Northwest Territories or Manitoba, I venture to say that the government will be able to carry the election of such a minister in whatever district they may choose to select him from.

Some references have been made to Mr. Bulyea, the colleague of Mr. Haultain. Some serious insinuations have been made against Mr. Bulyea. Some were made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) a few days ago. He insinuated, and because no direct denial was made he took it as an admitted fact, that Mr. Bulyea had been, as he put it colleaguing with the right hon. Prime Minister and the Liberal members from the Territories apart from Mr. Haultain. I think I am revealing no secret when I say that I have been present at no conference at which the right hon. Prime Minister was present and at which Mr. Bulyea was present. We have had numberless conferences with the Prime Minister and his colleagues, but at none of these conferences was Mr. Bulyea present. Let me turn that proposition around. I am sorry that the hon. member for North Toronto is not here. Is there anybody here who is prepared to state—

An hon. MEMBER. The hon. member for North Toronto did not make that statement at all.

Mr. SCOTT. Is there anybody present who is able to state—and the hon. leader of the opposition will have an opportunity of answering this question—that Mr. Haultain was careful to have Mr. Bulyea with him every time he was in meeting and in discussion with the hon. leader of the opposition in regard to this autonomy matter? Several hon. gentlemen opposite have suggested that Mr. Bulyea had deserted the position of the Northwest Territories in failing to sign the letter of protest which appeared over the signature of Mr. Haultain. I have already read the letter and it is patent to everybody that the only protest of any kind contained in that letter is in regard to this school matter. He does not lay stress on the matter of the number of provinces, he does not lay stress on the matter of lands; the only thing he does lay stress on is the matter of the schools and I have proved to the House, I think, to the satisfaction of every lawyer and every layman in the House, that Mr. Haultain's own draft Bill, which was assented to by the legislature and the people of the Northwest Territories, asked for the continuation of the separate school system. Is it Mr. Haultain or Mr. Bulyea who has deserted the position of the Territories ? If, as alleged, Mr. Bulyea declined to sign that letter, I think Mr. Bulyea was simply performing his duty. He declined to turn from the position that the people of the Territories had taken on that matter.

The hon. member for North Toronto, too, stated something in connection with the question that had been asked by Mr. Haultain in regard to schools at the time of the last general election and the answer given by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). That is perfectly true. He went on to say that a question was put to all the Liberal candidates in the Northwest Territories as to what their action was going to be in regard to schools if they were returned to parliament and that they told the people that they must trust to the govern-

ment. If the hon. member for North Toronto were here, I would put the question to him—perhaps the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) can answer it—what basis is there beyond their imagination for such an assertion as that?

Mr. SPROULE. What assertion?

Mr. SCOTT. That the Liberal candidates were asked as to what their action would be if returned to parliament on the matter of schools and that their answer was: You must trust to the government. I make this statement here, that beyond the question that was put by Mr. Haultain in Regina to the then Minister of the Interior, who was going to Regina a week later, I never heard the question mentioned in the whole of my campaign. The question was never put to me; I never gave an answer in regard to this question. Everybody knew that the Northwest Territories were to be granted autonomy very early in the new parliament and no Roman Catholic or Protestant ever came to me privately or ever put the question at a public meeting or asked me in any way, prior to the 3rd November, what my action would be in that regard. This is further proof of the most convincing nature, if any were needed beyond what I have already given to the House, that the Northwest Territories were not asking for any more freedom in regard to schools than that which they have enjoyed for the last 14 years. The hour is late—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. SCOTT. Some hon. gentlemen appear to be very much concerned about the meaning of the new section 16, about the meaning of the Bills as they at present stand. The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. McCarthy), the other evening, expressed what he considered a doubt about it and this doubt was repeated last night by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake). They are doubtful whether any change has been made in the Bills. I am not very much concerned with the meaning of the original section 16, because we are not dealing with that. But, of course, we are very much concerned with the meaning of the Bills in the shape in which they are going to be adopted, we hope. I would ask the House just for a moment to try and wipe away some of the technical and constitutional rubbish with which some hon. members seek to confuse our minds. The main question as presented by the original section 16 had reference to the provision for the distribution of the money to all classes of schools. In the first place the right was given to minorities to establish separate schools and in the next place it was provided that an equitable division of the funds should be granted to them. There was no connecting link, so it appeared to us, which would keep the separate schools under state control as they are at the present time. The new section 16 simply validates and keeps in effect ordinances Nos. 29 and 30 of the Northwest Territories passed in 1901. My hon. friend from Calgary advanced the contention that these ordinances which, when they were of questionable validity, as some men think, yet did undoubtedly effect the total abolition of the church or religious school, will by the process of acquiring unquestioned validity effect the restoration of the ecclesiastical school. It seems to me that the proposition only needs to be stated clearly to constitute its own answer. The right to separate schools is very clearly laid down in section 41 of ordinance No. 29, as follows:

> The minority of the ratepayers in any district, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish a separate school therein, and in such case the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate school shall be liable only to assessments of such rates as they impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

I believe this is the exact language imported from section 14 of the old Northwest Territories Act. But that is governed in the ordinance by section 4, which says:

> The department shall have control and management of all kindergarten schools, public and separate schools, normal schools, teachers' institutes and the education of deaf, deaf mute and blind persons.

The department, subject to the legislature, in turn subject to the people, shall have the control and management of separate schools and if that were not sufficient we also have section 45 which states:

> After the establishment of a separate school district under the provisions of this ordinance such separate school district and the board thereof shall possess and exercise all rights, powers, privileges and be subject to the same liabilities and method of government as is herein provided in respect of public school districts.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if we just keep our minds free from being confused by technicalities, keep our minds on the point which is as to whether or not we are to have a separate school controlled by the church or a separate school controlled by the state, there is no liability of any conflict of opinion about the legislation which the government asks the House to adopt. I am not going to take the time to read the various regulations in these ordinances, they have already been placed in 'Hansard,' but I say that there is in them no limitation of power to control, vary, improve or do anything in relation to the management of schools, all the schools, the separate school and the public school, except that the province must by legislation provide for public schools and permit minorities to have separate schools, both of which, conducted in the same way and

yielding the same results, must receive the same public aid. This is the minority right which is enjoyed in the Northwest Territories at the present moment.

To me this is not so much a constitutional as a practical question. What is the best thing for parliament to do in the interests of the people who live in those Territories ? I may say that the legislation is no compromise for me as it was for the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). It is exactly what I wanted, I would not care to assent to anything else. It is just what the Northwest wanted, it is in fact, stated a little less clearly in his Bill, just what Mr. Haultain asked for in his draft Bill. It is just what the Northwest people voted for in the general election of 1902 and what the assembly more than once unanimously voted for, or thought they were voting for. I would ask again if the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has ever heard a protest from any one in the Territories against the condition of things existing there. I say there is no objection so far as I have ever heard. There are I think in the Northwest Territories 11 separate schools, nine Roman Catholic and two Protestant. One of them is at Edmonton, and the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has already spoken ; I venture to say he has not heard in the town of Edmonton any protest from anybody against the existence of that separate school there. Another one is at Strathcona and another at Wetaskiwin and the same remark will apply to my hon. friend for Strathcona (Mr. P. Talbot). The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) spoke the other day and he did not enter any protest against the separate school. There is one at Lethbridge and one at MacLeod. If the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) is still here he may be able to say whether there is any protest in his district against the existence of the two separate schools in that district. There is another one at Regina and another one at or near Wapella. Speaking of the Regina separate school, I say that it is satisfactory to all the people in Regina and that any proposition to abolish the separate school in existence in Regina would be more unsatisfactory to the Protestants who live there than to the Roman Catholics. I admit that there is some objection against the permission of separation in school matters. That is the only possible objection there can be to separate schools in the west, the objection against separation, but in the practical operation in town school districts there is no practical objection, because, as in the case of Regina, the separate school takes the place of a ward school in the same way as it does in Nova Scotia, as I am informed. For instances, in towns in Nova Scotia there is one ward school set apart for Roman Catholics. It is managed entirely by Roman Catholic trustees and attended entirely by Roman Catholic children. It is merely in effect the system we have in the Territories. The word 'coercion' used in this case is a deliberate attempt to deceive the people of this country. To speak of coercion in this matter is to distort the meaning of the word. You cannot find a protest in the Northwest Territories against existing conditions. You cannot find an advocate of any alteration in the separate school feature of the existing law. We will have the separate school whether you pass section 16 or not. The most vehement denouncers of these Bills on the ground of provincial rights in the same breath proclaim their satisfaction with our separate school. The provincial rights cry in this case has no substance. It is a cry for a shadow and such a cry becomes ridiculous. I say as a member of the Liberal party that I protest against this attempt to bring ridicule on what is a good sound principle of the Liberal party. Provincial rights with substance is a principle worth fighting for, and the Liberal party has always fought for that principle when it was challenged.

Mr. SPROULE. How is it that so many Liberals from the Territories have signed petitions to this House praying that the right be left to them to legislate with regard to schools ?

Mr. SCOTT. Some of these people have signed under a misconception. There are people in the west, as I shall prove to my hon. friend before I get through, who do not know that we have a separate school system and they signed petitions under the impression that this parliament was trying to introduce a separate school system. I ask my hon. friend now to be candid about it. Would it not be simply and absolutely ridiculous for me coming from the Northwest Territories as I do to be crying for a right and demanding a power and in the same breath protesting that I would not exercise that power if I had it ?

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all.

Mr. SCOTT. That is exactly the position Mr. Haultain takes ; he is crying for the power to deal with this matter and protesting in the hearing of the whole people of Canada that he would not exercise that power if he had it.

It is said that if the privileges of the minority are safe in the hands of the people of the west, we should leave this question for them to settle. That is the position of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. R. L. Borden). He says : Leave it to the provincial legislatures and trust to the justice of the people of the province. That question cannot be put to me. I am not one of the minority who are chiefly concerned ; I am

a member of the majority. The question must be put to the representatives of the minority in this House. I presume that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is to-night representing the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. R. L. Borden), and I would ask, when the leader of the opposition put the question to the representatives of the minority who sit with him in this parliament how many of them expressed their willingness to have the guarantee left out and to leave the matter to the justice of the majority. It is not for me as a member of the majority to answer this question, it is not to the majority, it is to the members of the minority that that question is put. If they say they are willing I would say that possibly we might consent to leave out the guarantee, although as a matter of fact I prefer to have the guarantee left in this shape so that there will be no uncertainty in these provinces. Can we blame the members of the minority after all when we look at the history of Manitoba and the Territories ? We have cut the minority privilege down there from what it was originally interpreted to mean. It was originally interpreted by the legislature of the Territories, the old Northwest council, to mean that there should be church control for Roman Catholic schools. We have cut that down. We all know what occurred in Manitoba and what occurred in regard to the French language. As soon as the Northwest legislature obtained the power to deal with it, it abolished the dual system, and I say as a representative of the Northwest Territories that it did the only reasonable thing. It would have been absurd in that country to have continued the official publication of all laws and court records in French, because not one out of 500 of those who could read laws at all could not read them in English. I say looking at the history of Manitoba and the Northwest, that if I was a member of the minority I would not consent to have the guarantee cut out, because I would fear that the time would come, and that not in the very far future, when the final vestige of the separate school would disappear.

Mr. BERGERON. Will my hon. friend allow me to put a question to him ? Will he tell us what he understands by separate schools ?

Mr. SCOTT. I understand that the minority, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, in any school district have a right to set up a school of their own ; and that school comes under the same government as the public school, its teachers have to be certificated in the same way, with the same qualifications and the same normal school training, it has the same text books and has to produce the same results to earn the same money grants.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the difference between the two schools then ?

Mr. SCOTT. Not any difference, only the one I have mentioned.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is the separate school then ?

Mr. SCOTT. It is certainly a separate school, though it is not a religious school.

Mr. BERGERON. It may be in a different building, but it is the same school.

Mr. SCOTT. It is the same class of school. When our friends of the minority decline, as, in my judgment, they have good reason to decline, looking at the history of the school question in the Northwest, to have the guarantee cut out of the Bill, then it is reasonable for me as a member of the majority, in view of the fact that it is not going to violate any principle of sound public policy, to leave the guarantee in. Indeed, as I have explained, I prefer to have the guarantee left in in this shape, and, so far as the educational provisions are concerned, I vote for these Bills without any hesitation. This is exactly the proposition I want, for the following reasons :—

1. It removes all uncertainty.
2. It respects the minority conscience without violating any sound public principle.
3. It provides securely against agitation in future.
4. It perpetuates a system which has in practice proved to be eminently satisfactory to all classes.
5. It means coercion in no sense or adaptation of the word, because it merely guarantees what would be continued by the almost universal will of the provinces.
6. It continues a system preferable in its practical working out to the public school system of Manitoba, where the minority have a theoretical grievance, which interested parties are constantly able to exaggerate, and who continue to chafe under what they believe to be an infringement on their rights.
7. It furnishes a possible common ground of action by the members of this House, and thus maintains unity. No common action was possible either upon the original section 16 or upon the amendment of the leader of the opposition.
8. More than all, it is satisfactory to me as a citizen of, and one of the majority in, the Northwest, because it not only reasonably secures minority rights, but it absolutely secures majority rights against such invasion as was attempted by parliament in 1896 in the case of Manitoba. It is the only absolute guarantee of educational autonomy contained in any suggestion made to this House, excepting only that of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), to specifically make the provinces free and get imperial ratification of the free charters. Mr. Haultain's draft Bill left the door specifically

open for the sectarian or ecclesiastical school.

Mr. LAKE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to state that Mr. Haultain deliberately did that ?

Mr. SCOTT. If my hon. friend has listened to me at all carefully, I think there can be no doubt in his mind as to what I have stated. I say that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, Mr. Haultain, until that convention two years ago, when he changed from being a non-partisan in local politics to being a partisan all along the line—in fact, down to the time of the last general election in October, 1904—had no intention, as nobody connected with the public affairs of the Northwest had any intention, of asking for any different constitution in regard to schools than that we have had in force for the last fourteen years.

Mr. LAKE. Of course, the hon. gentleman is entitled to his legal opinion as a layman in regard to this question ; but I can assure him that Mr. Haultain holds an entirely different opinion from that which the hon. member for Western Assiniboia has expressed in regard to the effect of the draft Bill ; and I may say that Mr. Haultain has been responsible for the drafting of the vast majority of the ordinances of the Northwest Territories during the last thirteen years, he being an experienced draughtsman.

Mr. SCOTT. As I have already stated, Mr. Haultain not only apparently neglected, during all the conferences held with the government here, until two or three days before the Bill was presented to the House, to mention the subject of education, but neglected during all the discussions that took place on the subject of autonomy in the Northwest—and there have been discussions of that question for years—to mention the subject of education. He pointed out the advantages that autonomy would give, and the changes it would mean, but never once referred to the matter of schools. I will read to my hon. friend the description which Mr. Haultain himself gave in 1900, in a formal address, of the advantages and changes that would be brought to the Territories by provincial establishment. He said :

> But, to put it shortly, in order to show what a very slight difference there is between the powers enjoyed by the Territories to-day, so far as political institutions are concerned, and those which are enjoyed by the provinces, I will state in a few words the exact differences which exist. I need not take the House over a description of the powers which we do enjoy.

The educational power was one we did enjoy, and so he made no mention of it. He went on :

> We have nearly all the principal powers a province has. Where we fall short of provincial powers is in these points : We have not the power to amend the constitution outside of the power to deal with certain phases in our election law ; we have not the power to borrow money ; we have not the power to deal with the public domain ; we have not the power to establish certain institutions, such as hospitals, asylums, charities—eleemosynary institutions as they are called in the British North America Act ; we have not the power to take cognizance of public undertakings other than such as may be carried on by certain sorts of joint stock companies ; and our powers are limited to the extent that we have not the administration of the criminal law in the Territories. That, I think, will suffice for any reference which it is necessary to make to the eighth recital.

Take all the speeches that were ever made by Mr. Haultain, or by anybody else in the Territories, for that matter, and there never was any reference to the question of schools. And if there had been in the mind of any person a desire for more freedom in the matter of education than the Territories already possess, is it not ridiculous to think that, when the cue was given by Mr. Haultain last fall, in the heat of the election, there would not have been some one to present the matter to the candidates, and to seek to obtain an expression from them as to the position they would take on the subject if elected to parliament ?

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say earlier in the debate that during the election the question was not brought up or discussed, nor was there any truth in the statement that the government, through Mr. Sifton, had requested the people to trust the government and they would do the best for them. I understand him to say there was no such statement made during the election.

Mr. SCOTT. I say that the question was never presented to me, and I met Mr. Haultain himself twice, once at Medicine Hat and again at Moose Jaw, and he never asked me any question about it. Nobody asked me anything about it.

Mr. SPROULE. Will my hon. friend allow me to refresh his memory ? The hon. gentleman lives in Regina. That is in his riding. The Manitoba 'Free Press' of October 20, 1904—during the time the elections were going on—reports Mr. Sifton as having spoken at Regina as follows. After referring to the question of annexation to Manitoba, Mr. Sifton said :

> I believe that Haultain has further suggested that I should be asked to state what the policy of the government would be with regard to public schools. I do not believe that Haultain is doing the people of the Territories any service when he makes suggestions of that kind. Any man of ordinary intelligence in public life, and Mr. Haultain is a man of more than ordinary intelligence, knows full well that one member of a government consisting of fourteen members would not come here and without consulting his colleagues, undertake to bind them and the parliament of Canada on questions of such importance. Therefore the suggestion is made in a spirit of mischief. Let

me say to you in all seriousness that the subject of school legislation in Canada is a serious and important subject. I have had a good deal to do with it in my own province and I know the difficulties that beset it. But let me say this. We shall endeavour with every possible thought, with every possible power the Lord has given us to settle this question in such a way as will not raise a racial or religious cry in this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. My question was whether he was not asking the people to trust the government then. He went on to say :

But I want to say that the man who gets up in the heat of a political contest and makes his strongest endeavour to bring that question into political discussion is not a friend of the Territories in any sense or shape. He is endeavouring to do a thing which might bring very serious results to the people of these Territories. I have no authority whatever to say anything with regard to the subjects Mr. Haultain has mentioned, but we shall be in the position of having not four but ten members from the Territories in the next parliament and we will get their views ; and while we do not say that their views will prevail—for the entry of the Territories into confederation is a matter of contract with the other provinces—and while the terms we will be able to give you will be those we can get the other provinces to agree, yet I can say for myself that I will do my best to get the most liberal terms possible.

Yet the hon. member will have us believe that the people of the Territories were never asked to trust the government and that they never heard the question mentioned.

Mr. SCOTT. I appeal to the House if my hon. friend has not taken up quite a bit of my time in a wholly unnecessary fashion. What he has just read is exactly what I said. I have stated, as is described in what the hon. gentleman read, that the cue was given by Mr. Haultain, that Mr. Haultain, as a Conservative partisan, endeavoured to start the flame even then with the idea that it would injure the Liberal candidates. Mr. Haultain gave the cue and put the question, and the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) gave the very sensible and proper statement in reply.

Mr. SPROULE. The answer was, you must trust the government.

Mr. SCOTT. I was never asked the question. I never heard the question raised except as it was asked by Mr. Haultain and replied to by the hon. member for Brandon. The very best proof which can be advanced to convince any reasonable man, who wants to arrive at a just opinion of the sentiment in the Territories on the question, is the fact that not one of the candidates, so far as I know, was asked what he would do in the matter of the schools.

Mr. TURRIFF. Let me in reply to the question of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) say that I had thirty-nine meetings in my constituency last fall. At every one of these there was an able lawyer representing the Conservative candidate. At every one the question of autonomy was discussed, and I was never asked at any one of them by anybody, Liberal, Conservative, Catholic or Protestant, one word about the school question in any shape or form.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. member excuse me just one moment ? I want to settle a question of fact. We are told that there is absolutely no difference between the conduct of the minority schools and the majority schools. We are told that the qualifications of teachers are the same, the inspection, the curriculum, the text books, and that the only difference is the last half hour in the day.

Mr. SCOTT. There is not even any difference then ?

Mr. SPROULE. Well, here is the annual report of the Department of Education of the Northwest Territories for 1903. What does it say with reference to the readers :

The Ontario readers (part one, part two), second, third and fourth (The Canada Publishing Company); the new Canadian reader, book V (W. J. Gage & Co.); the Dominion reader, first (part I, part II) and second—these are optional for Roman Catholic, separate schools.

Surely that is a difference.

Mr. SCOTT. Does my hon. friend think the point is essential ? If he will study the effect of the legislation we are passing, he will find that we are giving the provinces full autonomy in the matter of those very text books.

Mr. SPROULE. I was setting right the statement that the schools both of the minority and the majority are conducted exactly the same in every respect with the exception of the last half hour.

Mr. SCOTT. I was about to make a sort of confession to my hon. friend. I would have had no objection at all to stating my views during the election regarding what would be the proper action for the Dominion parliament to take on the school question. I will give my hon. friend the proof of this. Two years ago his leader put on the order paper a motion with regard to autonomy, concerning which I prepared some notes. The debate came on very late. I spoke on the question after midnight and did not use all of my notes. In the next session of 1904, I expected the leader of the opposition to again raise that question and I amplified my notes. The question never did come up ; but if it had, I have here exactly what I intended to say and I shall read a portion of it for the benefit of my hon. friend :

To-day 95 out of 100, probably 99 out of every 100 of the Northwest people are eminently satisfied with our present constitution and system

as regards schools. Technically the minority in Manitoba lack the guarantee of separate schools, while in the Northwest Territories they possess the right. Practically the Northwest Territories system is just as satisfactory to the majority as the Manitoba system is to the majority in that province. In the Northwest Territories we have public and separate schools under uniform inspection, uniform training and certificates for teachers, and uniform text-books.

The difference my hon. friend alludes to is so slight that it is generally not considered worth referring to. There is a difference in the authorized text books used in the first two standards, but we are giving the provinces full autonomy to deal with this question of text books themselves.

In Manitoba prior to 1890, there was popular complaint, and very well justified I believe it was—against the conduct of the separate schools. In the Northwest Territories there is not a vestige of popular complaint against our separate school management.

I intended going on to say that I believed the legislature of the Northwest Territory did not intend and Mr. Haultain's draft Bill did not contemplate any change with regard to schools. I had Dr. Goggin's interview given two years ago, a portion of which I have read, in which he said that he had not seen any declaration by the legislature or the premier that they intended to ask for any change with regard to schools. The interview is a very considerable one and I shall not read any more from it. In the manuscript which I had written out, I went on to say :

Doubtless there are extremists on both sides who will seek to foment trouble over the school question when autonomy is dealt with, but speaking not as a member of the minority but as one of the Protestant majority, I have no hesitation in expressing my belief that if our legislature and people were free to act to-morrow thy would retain the present school system which permits the minority to have their separate schools. In Regina, where I live, we have excellent public schools and we have also an excellent separate school, and I verily believe that any step taken to abolish that separate school would find its most active and resolute opposition amongst members of the Protestant majority.

That was typewritten some time in June or July last, and it was really amplified from notes made nearly two years ago. If the question had ever come up, I should have had no hesitation at all—and this is the truth—in expressing my opinion on the separate school matter prior to the election that was supposed to be impending, or in the campaign for that matter, just as I am expressing it here to-night. I consider the proposition before the House is better for these provinces than any other suggestion that has been made. The proposition of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. R. L. Borden) to permit the application of section 93 of the British North America Act, even if his interpretation were correct—which other able lawyers deny—and 1870 was the time of union for the purposes of interpretation, would leave the provinces subject to the cast-iron rock-ribbed, irrevocable—as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said—system of church and ecclesiastical schools which this Dominion parliament, by a majority of eighteen, at the instance of hon. gentlemen opposite, endeavoured to force upon the people of Manitoba in 1896. Who can guarantee that a similar juncture is impossible at some time in the future, when parliament, regardless of the sentiment of the people, may be cajoled and coerced, by threats, by intimidation, by any of the devices known to unscrupulous political leaders—by the same means that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) knows better than any of us were used in 1896, parliament might be induced to attempt to invade the autonomy of these new provinces. The hon. member for East Grey knows that if the remedial legislation of 1896 had been enacted there was no power in the Dominion of Canada that could have repealed it. I find that this Bill not only protects minority rights to a perfectly justifiable extent without coercion or invasion of substantial provincial autonomy, but it is also intended to protect the majority rights in the way I have described. It embodies a charter, secure and safe against the possibility of a later invasion of the political autonomy of the provinces, which the application of section 93 as intended by Mr. Borden's amendment would leave room and invitation for ; and this Bill is a far more complete and secure measure of autonomy than is the proposition of the leader of the opposition.

Mr. Speaker, since the opening of the present session this House has lost one of its valuable and prominent members, the late hon. member for Centre Toronto, Mr. E. F. Clarke. He was prominent not only in this House but in the organization of which the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is an ornament. Amongst all classes of people and in this parliament he was recognized as a very broad-minded man. It is fortunate, perhaps, that he has left his opinion with regard to this very subject. In his newspaper the 'Orange Sentinel' of which he was the editor for many years is the following statement, published in the issue of February 9 :

It is not certain whether the people of the Northwest Territories and their representatives object to having separate schools fastened upon them. There has been no organized or official protest against such a course, although it has been known for two years or more that the change was imminent. This makes it appear that the people interested are satisfied. If that is the case, there is nothing for the other provinces to do but to acquiesce with what grace they may. The attitude taken in 1896 was that a province should not be co-

erced. It is strong ground still. But if a province should not be coerced into establishing separate schools, it follows that it should not be coerced into rejecting separate schools. Consequently the logical position for Ontario electors is to remain silent and allow the measure to become law if the Territories are satisfied.

Mr. SPROULE. I may say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) that it is not proposed to coerce them even to doing away with separate schools to-morrow. We do not ask the question whether it is wise for the people of the Northwest to do away with separate schools or whether they desire to have them. We do not even take the opportunity to give advice. We only ask that the people of the Northwest should be allowed freedom to legislate on this subject.

Mr. SCOTT. That is my hon. friend's (Mr. Sproule's) position. But his colleague's position was, 'The logical position for Ontario electors is to remain silent and allow the measure to become law if the Territories are satisfied.'

Now, perhaps the House will bear with me while I deal with this point. I appreciate the fact that I am infringing upon the good nature of hon. members. I propose to give the House some proof that the Territories are satisfied, and that there is no agitation, no well founded agitation, no widespread agitation in the Northwest Territories. I will quote first an expression of opinion from the Calgary 'Herald.' This is a Conservative newspaper, probably the chief Conservative newspaper in the Northwest Territories—certainly the principal one in Alberta :

Mr. HYMAN. What is the date ?

Mr. SCOTT. It is subsequent to the revised Bill—I think it is March 15 :—

If the news from Ottawa that there is to be no interference with the present educational system of the west is true, the agitation which has arisen, mainly in Ontario, will in all probability subside. A creed disturbance is always of a most rancorous kind—it spreads like a prairie fire and in its train leaves a bitterness where harmony prevailed. Sir Wilfrid's decision is sure to be regarded with strong favour throughout the west.

With regard to the existing separate schools the Calgary 'Herald' goes on to say :—

All regulations have been made by the Regina government, and he must be blind indeed who cannot see that even if separate schools were detrimental to the country's true interests, all objectionable features have been clipped off. Harmony prevails : why disturb it ? It is worth repeating that the west is glad that the federal premier has changed his mind.

I have here an expression of opinion of a member of the Northwest legislature, a gentleman who voted for Mr. Haultain's draft Bill. I withhold the name. This letter was written on March 25 :—

I must congratulate you on the Autonomy Bill. It is almost impossible to find a person here who is dissatisfied with it. Of course, some people, for political reasons probably, are very sorry that the public lands have not been given us, that Canadian Pacific Railway exemptions are to be allowed to remain, and that the separate school question has been forced upon us, but their opposition is so very faint that no one has for one instant any idea but that everybody is more than pleased with the way things have been managed by our representatives, and the generous treatment we have received from the Ottawa government. As far as I can see we have got everything that we hoped for and a good deal more than we expected, and I think the sentiments I express are only those of the people at large throughout the country.

One of the newspapers of the Northwest Territories which took strong ground against the original section 16, the Medicine Hat 'News,' speaks as follows :—

A general feeling of relief and pleasure is being experienced throughout the Territories by reason of the announcement that the Autonomy Bill has been re-introduced with the educational clauses modified to meet the wishes of the people principally concerned and their representatives in parliament. The provisions affecting the school question are now so framed as to maintain in the west the same system which has been in vogue in the past and under the conditions of which educational matters were conducted most harmoniously. The amended clauses have already met with the endorsation of the leading papers in the Territories, including the Calgary 'Herald' and others which were greatly concerned as to the effect which would be the outcome of the clause as originally presented.

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) was present when the hon. member (Mr. Lake) who spoke last night read the account of the meeting of the Reform party convened at Indian Head, which passed a strong resolution against interference with the Territories.

Mr. SCOTT. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) surely understands that you will never get unanimity of opinion over a great area like this. The people in some quarters hold a contrary opinion to that of the government, sometimes a contrary opinion from that of their neighbours. The Reform party has always been specifically a party in which divergence of opinion has existed and is not only permitted but expected.

Mr. J. J. Young, who is a Conservative member of the legislature for Calgary, and the proprietor of the Calgary 'Herald,' made a statement immediately after the introduction of the original Bills, in the course of which he said :

As to the school question, the present arrangement is working satisfactorily, and as long as the federal authorities leave things as they are, I apprehend that there will be no serious opposition from the intelligent portion of the electorate.

The Toronto 'Globe' had a correspondent in the west at the time these Bills were in-

troduced, Mr. Ewan. In one of his letters he stated :

Their attitude towards the school question is similar. Without exception all those I have spoken to have no apprehensions with regard to that feature of the settlement. They know by experience the system they have got. They are perfectly satisfied with it, and if its continuance is a part of the settlement there will be no objection from the people of the Territories. The Catholic portion of the population have at times exhibited dissatisfaction, but it has never been very serious, and the general expression is that if the present system is continued, practically everybody will be satisfied.

Mr. SPROULE. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he read the last letter in the series, the one written from Moosejaw ? In summing up the situation he declared emphatically that the sentiment of the people was against it. I think that was written by Mr. Thompson.

Mr. SCOTT. I have a large number of friends in Moosejaw, and I have heard from numbers of them since the modifications were made to these Bills, and I think I may say that they are quite satisfied with the modified Bill. Moosejaw is in my own constituency. Now take the expression of opinion at Regina, my own town. When the Bills were first introduced and it was thought that the school clause would continue the present situation, the Winnipeg 'Free Press' the next morning contained the following despatch from Regina :

Now that the people of Regina have had an opportunity of studying full details of the autonomy measures, the approval is even more pronounced than was expressed over the forecasts. The final terms are accepted on all hands as not only satisfactory but generous, in fact one and all regard the terms as much more favourable than could reasonably have been expected. So far your correspondent has not heard one word expressed that was not in praise of the measures submitted to parliament by Sir Wilfrid Laurier yesterday.

In last evening's Toronto 'Globe' there was an account of a protesting meeting in Toronto.

Rev. Dr. Chown said he was in Regina when the news of the details of the Autonomy Bills arrived. Every detail of these Bills was talked about except the school clauses, and the same was the case in other parts of the west.

In Lethbridge there is a Conservative paper called the 'News,' which stated on March 16 :

The separate school question in respect to the new Northwest provinces continues to exercise politicians in the east, and to read some of the articles published, one would be led to conceive the idea that people in the west were violently opposed to a continuation of the system that has been in existence since the opening up of the country, which, in fact, has given such general satisfaction that but few people have ever been induced to inquire into the basis on which separate schools in the west were founded. These people in the east who are doing their best to stir up religious strife are no friends of the west, which is wide enough in area, aspirations and religious toleration, to permit a system of schools which are a concession to religious views without being a detriment to the educational standard adopted for the country and inflicting no injustice on any one in the community.

It concludes with the statement :

It is stated that the Northwest members will give unanimous support to a clause continuing the present privileges, but no more, and in taking this stand we believe they are fairly representing the feelings of the people as a whole.

I have another expression of opinion from the Calgary 'Herald,' with particular reference to a gentleman in Toronto who is so much exercised on this question—the Calgary 'Herald' is a Conservative journal :

A few journalistic firebrands in Ontario are as busy these days as hens in the month of April. The basis of their activity is to be found in a pathetic anxiety for the educational fate of the new northwestern provinces. We have not asked them to be anxious, we are not in fear ourselves, and yet they worry dreadfully lest his Holiness whose home is on the banks of the Tiber jollies or jockies or lobbies us into something really very awful.

One of the most distracted of these gentlemen is J. S. Willison, who moulds public opinion down east through the medium of the Toronto 'News.' Prior to January 25 last, he was engaged in a long and most strenuous effort to oust Mr. Ross & Co., and with the incidental assistance of tens upon tens of thousands of intelligent voters he won a victory over his foes somewhat in the style in which Bill Adams put Napoleon to flight at Waterloo. The 'News' had then a just and sensible cause to advocate and success is as easy under such circumstances as taking candy from a child.

Exhiliarated by his recent victory Mr. Willison has again removed his coat and has constituted himself the champion of a cause which affects people two thousand miles from the sanctum where he wields his anti-papal pen. He is determined that come what may Willison and not the Pope is to be the educational dictator of the western provinces. The hierarchy are to be made to run away back and sit down.

Unasked advice is seldom enjoyed. Newspaper blatherskites two thousand miles away should be heavily discounted. There is no room for any religious clash out here. We have more important duties to perform.

That is from the chief Conservative paper in the Territories. Then a letter from Medicine Hat :

All are pretty well satisfied with the school law in the Territories, and that is what is going to be continued as I understand it.

A gentleman in Regina writing on February 27 :

As to the Autonomy Bill, the satisfaction is very great, the dissatisfaction not visible to the naked eye.

Another gentleman from Regina with regard to the schools :

Prior to the reading of the Bill every one I spoke to was perfectly agreeable and satisfied, so long as the present school law was not changed.

Another gentleman from Yellow Grass, for many years a school teacher :

First let me say that the provisions of the Autonomy Bill were better than I expected from a financial standpoint. I must express my satisfaction with the terms secured by the Northwest. The result is all that could have been expected. As regards the educational clauses, I am prepared to accept the old law. I am not competent to judge of how far the proposed clauses exceed the clauses in the Northwest Territories Act, but where they do I believe Sifton and others are justified in opposing them. But I prefer that this question as an issue be removed from the provincial field. So long as the assembly retains control and enforces uniformity of teachers' qualifications, books, curricula and inspection, we have nothing to dread from the 'narrow and illiterate' separate school products. In fact I feel that we lose sight of our main privilege that we may always, when we so desire, act in unity and harmony with our Catholic neighbours, and my experience with the Catholic laity is that they will meet us half way.

I cannot but commend the unselfish interest of the Toronto 'News,' Sam. Hughes and others in our education. As for the position taken by Sifton, I hope he is prepared to agree to the re-enactment of the old law. I could not follow him further than that. I do not think there would be any difficulty in justifying before the electorate an adherence to the Northwest Territories Act. To so many of us the matter does not appeal, as the Catholic population in most settlements is so small as to have no power ; in other settlements so largely in the majority that the question is unimportant. In no case have I known of a duplication of schools when not required. Considered on its merits from a practical view-point and leaving sentiment aside the question is unimportant so long as uniformity is maintained in the course of studies and general efficiency.

I think my hon. friend referred to a meeting held at Medicine Hat where some resolutions were adopted. A gentlemen writing from Medicine Hat says :

You will get a copy of them, but don't think they express the true opinion of the people of Medicine Hat or even of the meeting, for they don't.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think we are justified in concluding that these measures in all respects are eminently satisfactory to the people who are mainly concerned. I promised to give the hon. member for East Grey some further information in regard to petitions. I believe it is a fact as I have stated, that the majority of the signatures in the Northwest Teritories to those petitions against this legislation, were given against the interpretation placed upon the original section 16, either that or they were given under an absolute misapprehension. A gentleman writes me from Moosejaw :

Moosejaw, N.W.T.,
March 20, 1905.

Walter Scott, Esq., M.P.,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I take the liberty to write you for the purpose of finding out a little more than I know at present concerning the school question. Now, Sir, I am an Orangeman ; in fact I hold the position of master in our lodge. I have already signed a petition against the government's imposing a separate school law upon the two new provinces. But this was before I stopped to consider the matter carefully. I read a letter written by you to the Maple Creek Orange lodge secretary, which puts a different light on the subject. If this is straight, which I have every reason to believe it is, we are harping about a thing which has been in our midst for years and not a new thing at all as has been represented to us here. . . . If you have time I want you to answer and let me know in brief the real meaning of the situation in this separate school matter.

I believe that expression represents the views of most of the people who have been signing these protests and petitions. I believe that practically everybody in the Territories, ninety-nine people out of a hundred, would prefer to have these schools continued in the same way as they have been carried on for the last fourteen years.

Mr. SPROULE. In reply to that statement, may I ask the hon. gentleman this question : I understood him to say that these people were directing their attention to the original clause 16 and were not aware of the modification, or otherwise they would be satisfied. Is it not a fact that most of the petitions only expressed the hope that the government would not, by any enactment or otherwise interfere with the freedom of the provinces in legislating in regard to education ?

Mr. SCOTT. I venture to say that every one of these petitions originated in Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. That is about as nearly correct as the other statement.

Mr. SCOTT. I venture to state again that most of the people who signed these petitions will later on express themselves as entirely satisfied with the school constitution. I say again that the proposition in the Bills is not a compromise to me at all. It is purely and exactly what I myself, and I believe the majority of the members from the Northwest Territories, wanted placed in the Bills. We have in the Northwest Territories in this very delicate and difficult matter of religion in connection with education reached a solution which has been in effect for fourteen years, which has no superior in any province of Canada, not excluding the province of Manitoba, not excluding the province of Nova Scotia or any other province. We have the most satisfactory solution of this difficult subject that is to be found anywhere in Canada, and why should we take away the advantages

of that solution from the people in the initiation of these new provinces ? Why should we endanger the future prosperity of these provinces by subjecting them to the possibility of an agitation over this difficult and delicate matter ? The proposition which is contained in these Bills is the most successful and satisfactory proposition that could be devised in respect to this subject. Yet there can be no doubt about the disturbed state of feeling existing in various other parts of the country—a disturbance fraught with exceeding danger. There are two men in this country who could in a day settle all further difficulty in this matter. There is practically a unanimity of opinion on this side of the House and amongst all Liberals throughout Canada on this question. There are two men who could in a day take all possible further danger out of this question. These two men are Mr. Haultain, who, notwithstanding the fact that he lacks the constitutional position to enable him to represent the Northwest Territories, is still bound to be held by a great many people as being in a sense the representative of the Territories in this matter. If Mr. Haultain and the hon. leader of the opposition together could bring themselves to the plane that was adopted by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) in this House, entirely above party politics and take a patriotic stand, I say that we would come to a satisfactory settlement in regard to this question in a day or a week, and that we would hear no more about this difficulty in connection with the Northwest Autonomy Bills. If the hon. member for North Toronto were here, I would like to quote to him some very admirable words to which he gave voice in 1896 :

> Let us plant our feet in the firm path of constitutional compact and agreement, of good faith, and of honest, fair dealing. Let us take and pass on that gleaming torch of prudent compromise under whose kindly light the fathers of the confederation marched safely through in times far more troublous and far less advanced than ours, into an era of harmony and continued peace.

The hon. member for North Toronto made a very excellent speech in 1896, which would apply with far greater and more proper force to the present situation than it did to the suggested legislation of that time ; and if he were here, I would say to him that I think that if ten years from this he reads both of these speeches—the speech of 1896 and the speech of 1905—he will be far prouder of his 1896 speech than he will be of the speech which he delivered two days ago in this House.

I repeat, in conclusion, that I am satisfied with the propositions contained in these Bills and that they are the most important that ever have been presented to this parliament nobody disputes. I am satisfied that they will result not only in the immediate future, but in the intermediate future as well as in the far future, in the existence of two provinces in no sense inferior to, in every way equal with, their sister provinces—enjoying absolute religious equality, full provincial rights, an efficient free public or common, non-sectarian school system controlled by the state and on a plan guaranteeing the perfect autonomy of every conscience and scruple —in a word, enjoying freedom in every reasonable and British sense of the term ;—and that the provisions of these Bills will enable the people of these new provinces to carry on their great work and fulfil the duties that fall upon them as self-governing provinces in this Dominion with every measure of success. When I remember that this government and this parliament are undertaking, in addition to the generous terms which I have already described, to bear the cost of the lands administration, that they are undertaking to continue the free homesteading policy, that they are undertaking to continue to maintain an active immigration policy, that they are undertaking to continue the Northwest Mounted Police in that country for some time and that they are aiding and continuing to aid great railway projects in these new provinces, I say, and I am sure that in so saying I voice the sentiment of the Northwest people, that these measures are based upon those principles of justice, equality and above these, generosity, the observance of which in his whole public life has contributed to the position which my right hon. friend the leader of the government holds in the confidence and affection of the people of Canada.

I trust, that, notwithstanding the threats that were made this afternoon across the floor of the House, the 1st of July next, the 38th anniversary of the birth of confederation, will witness the admission of these twin provinces into the full sisterhood of the provincial communion to continue in a path of development already well started and which each and every one of us may hope will lead as the years go by to greater and greater magnitude and perfection—helping to make in still more pronounced degree this fair Dominion of Canada the proudest gem in the great galaxy of nations forming the British Empire.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, April 3, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I rise to a question of privilege to call attention to a misrepresentation of my remarks of last Thursday evening, which appeared in the 'Globe' newspaper on the 31st of March. I spoke at such a late hour that I can readily understand that some mistakes might have crept in, and I am quite sure the representatives of that paper will be very glad to make the correction. In the 'Globe' report I am credited with having said that I approved of the teaching of religious doctrine in the schools, although I regretted the opportunity was not always availed of. My actual remarks were 'that doctrine and dogma should be kept to the church and to the home.' The report went on to say :

> Although many Catholics sent their children to the public schools, many desired to have separate schools.

I did not express any such opinion in the remarks I made.

PRIVATE BILLS.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 45) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Macdonald.

Mr. HAGGART. When that Bill was before the Railway Committee, there was an understanding that the Minister of Railways was to make a statement with reference to it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is the intention of the government to introduce a Bill to secure to the Intercolonial Railway running rights over the Canada Atlantic. We thought it preferable not to do it while amending this Bill, but to introduce legislation for that specific purpose.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Should not the two propositions be before the House at the same time ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think not. I said that the government would consider the matter, and had come to the conclusion to bring down a separate Act for the purpose of giving the Intercolonial Railway running rights over the Canada Atlantic. We thought it better to do it this way than by an amendment to this Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I should think it would be very proper for the House to be made acquainted with the terms and conditions upon which those running rights are to be granted before we proceed with the discussion of this Bill and the Bill following. Of course, the right hon. gentleman has made a very informal and not a very full announcement. What we were led to expect from the Minister of Railways was something of a different nature, something which would give the House pretty definite information as to what the exact proposals of the government are in that regard. and I would think that it would be only right and proper, under the circumstances, that we should have the information before this Bill goes out of committee.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Before the third reading ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No ; before this Bill and the following one go out of committee. That is the course which has been observed on other occasions under similar conditions.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What more definite statement does my hon. friend want ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We would like exactly the terms and conditions and the arrangements, generally speaking.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. How are you to get on to the Canada Atlantic from Montreal ? There are thirty miles from Montreal to the eastern terminal of the Canada Atlantic. How do you propose to connect them ? In the Railway Committee the Finance Minister promised that an explanation would be given in that committee. It was not forthcoming there, but we were promised it in this House.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I would like to point out to my hon. friend from South York that he is hardly accurate when he says there was to have been a statement made by the Minister of Railways before the Railway Committee.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The Finance Minister promised one.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no recollection of discussing the question at all.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. According to my recollection, we had that assurance from the hon. minister.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not speak on it at all.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I asked the Minister of Finance for a statement, and he said that before the Bill went through the committee it would be given. Of course, I am very glad to accept his statement ; but I am under the impression that we had that promise in the Railway Committee and also in the House.

Mr. OSLER. The Minister of Railways in the Railway Committee made the distinct promise that in this House he would make a statement.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Under the circumstances, I will ask the committee to rise and report progress.

Progress reported.

TITLE GUARANTEE AND TRUST COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 99) to incorporate the Title Guarantee and Trust Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Mr. FOSTER. Before you take up section 9, it seems to me that whoever is responsible for the Bill should give us a little information with regard to it on two points. Have we been in the habit of incorporating trust companies with these powers and how do these powers compare with those given trust companies which are incorporated by a provincial legislature, for instance, by the legislature of Ontario? In the province of Ontario, I know, legislation with regard to trust companies has been pretty stringent and somewhat exclusive; in fact the late government adopted a policy of not incorporating for the present any larger number of trust companies than were there already. Their powers in Ontario are limited, and the restrictions put upon them are very considerable. Now I see you make a trust company here, then you add to that another function, that of guaranteeing titles in a very wide manner. I should like to have more information.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman who is in charge of the Bill (Mr. Campbell) is not present at the moment. The matter was considered by the committee, and they found that this Bill was in conformity with the charters already granted by this parliament. I have not had in mind so much the practice of the Ontario legislature, but as this is entirely within the lines of charters already outstanding granted by this parliament, I see no objection to it.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister mention the names of trust companies which have been incorporated by the Dominion and are now doing business in the Dominion, that have these powers?

Mr. FIELDING. The Royal Trust Company is one I have in my mind, it is a very large company originating in Montreal, partly made up, I think, of gentlemen connected with the Bank of Montreal and other large institutions. They have, I am advised, all the powers that are given to this company.

Mr. FOSTER. The Royal Trust Company is rather a peculiar one, made up, as the Finance Minister has said, in part of the gentlemen connected with the Bank of Montreal or being an adjunct to that bank, although I believe it has large trust powers, But the trouble is this, that if capital puts itself into trust companies under a provincial corporation, of the province of Ontario for instance, and then pays its license fee to work in other provinces, there ought to be some care taken that this parliament should not step in and give extraordinary powers to a trust company which in the work of competition and business, would give it a large advantage over the trust companies which are incorporated by a province and which cannot get more than certain powers. Unless there is some very good reason that I do not see, it ought not to be done.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no special desire to press this Bill. But I fail to see that we are obliged, in passing Dominion legislation, to be governed by what may be done in any of the provinces. We might learn something of course from provincial legislation, if we can; but if we grant these privileges to one company why surely we must be prepared to grant them to other companies under equal conditions, and that is exactly what we are doing. Whether we are giving more or less powers than have been granted by a provincial legislature, is a question which I am not prepared to discuss, nor do I think it is very important to us.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, what will be the distinction between titles and trust companies, for instance?

Mr. FIELDING. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to section 18 which reads:

> The powers and authorities hereby granted to the company shall not have any force or effect in any province in any respect in which they are inconsistent with the laws of such province.

I do not know whether that covers entirely the point my hon. friend has in mind.

Mr. FOSTER. Would that cover the point I raised, that is, would it act as a bar to their doing business in the province of Ontario? For instance, suppose it is true that there are no trust companies incorporated by the province of Ontario that have these powers joined to a trust company, before you incorporate this company, does that section have the effect of making it impossible in the province of Ontario for them to carry out their business, quoad the guarantee of titles and the like of that? If that be the meaning, it meets the objection that I raised.

Mr. FIELDING. I would not like to say that it goes as far as that. That is quite a debatable point. But I would take that to mean that the general law of the province with regard to trusts, for example, would have to prevail; this company only could do business subject to the general law.

Section 8 as amended, agreed to.

On section 9,—business of company; guarantee of titles to property; 'title insurance.'

Mr. FOSTER. Would the promoter of the Bill explain that clause and the modus operandi?

Mr. FIELDING. The promoter of the Bill is not present, I do not know if he has in-

structed any hon. gentleman to represent him. I do not want to press the Bill unduly.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry to object, but it is getting too much of a habit to go on with a Bill in the absence of its promoter, and then to suppose that out of courtesy it is going through. These are important points that may be all right, but we would like to discuss this Bill a little. I suggest that the Bill better not be gone on with until the promoter is here.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not concerned in the promotion of the Bill. If the hon. gentleman wishes it to stand over I have no objection. But I do not see any objection to that clause; it is necessary in order to carry out the business of title insurance. This section corresponds with section 2 of an Act of 1903, with respect to the Dominion Burglary Guarantee Company. There is nothing new in it; it is to enable them to do this class of business, if there is no objection to their doing that class of business in Canada. It is done elsewhere to a considerable extent, and only to a small extent in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. In what way is this business carried on?

Mr. OSLER. This is purely the guaranteeing of land titles. These are powers that will never be exercised because nobody will consent to pay anything for this guarantee. It is quite worthless, but if the committee think well to pass this clause it is quite a proper and necessary clause. This is a clause governing companies which guarantee the validity of titles.

Mr. FOSTER. For a money consideration?

Mr. OSLER. Yes, they issue a policy.

Mr. SPROULE. The danger of it is that there is the possibility of it being put in the power of certain parties to go out amongst the people and create a suspicion in regard to their titles, thus securing from these people the business of guaranteeing their titles. A great many people know very little about law or about the validity of titles, and it would be the easiest thing in the world to make these people believe that there was some danger and consequently some advantage to be gained by having the company guarantee their titles, the people paying a consideration for it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This is a description of business that is known very well in the United States where it is carried on quite extensively. Any person desiring to purchase property—property, perhaps, of a very great value—will place the matter in the hands of one of these companies which has always on hand a staff of experts in regard to titles. They examine the title and then for a small consideration they guarantee out of the capital of the company that the title is a valid one and if afterwards any defect in the title arise it is made good under the terms of the policy which the company issues. It is really a description of insurance. It is the insuring of titles. They examine the titles just as an insurance company examines an individual whose life it insures, and then they come to a conclusion as to what premium should be demanded for insuring the title. Then, they proceed to issue a policy by which the title of the intending purchaser is insured against all possible claims of all possible persons. I do not think that the provisions of such laws in the United States have ever been found to bring about any injustice or difficulty. I should be inclined to think that in a province where the system of land titles is good the company would have very little business. I am sure they would have very little business in any province where the Torrens system of titles exists, because after all this is simply a private Torrens system. Instead of being insured by the government as you are by the Torrens system, you are insured by a private company which undertakes that work for a consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. This is simply combining the functions of an insurance society with those of a trust company. The question might be well considered as to whether that adds to the security. Certainly it does not with the trust company. The guaranteeing of titles would be a bond of indebtedness upon the society or the company. Their capital would be liable to it. Trust funds and their investments have always been hedged around with the most scrupulous exactness and it has been considered that everything of a speculative or hazardous nature should be eliminated. Our provincial law prescribes the kinds of securities in which trust company funds can be invested, and they can only be invested in such securities as are not of a speculative or hazardous kind. You join with a trust company which has a very important and responsible duty to perform, and with the same capital that carries it is an insurance business which is much more speculative, much more liable to loss and contingencies of risk. You subject the capital that ought to be very closely hedged as a guarantee and bond for trust funds to the more or less speculative calls of an insurance company. I can quite see that if the very greatest care is taken that none but good titles would be guaranteed and that consequently the loss will be small, you could use that sort of an argument for joining these businesses together. The provincial authorities have only gone to the length of permitting a trust and loan business to be carried on together, and unless good reasons can be shown for combining a guarantee and insurance business, I think it would be well

to consider the question before passing this Bill.

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will read section 12 he will see that provision is made for keeping the trust moneys absolutely separate and apart from the other line of business.

Mr. FOSTER. But the capital of the company would be liable for it all.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, that is so. But there is every precaution that we can take by legislation, short of separating the two businesses, that the guarantee business and the business of a trust company shall be conducted on sound principles and that all the moneys received for the purposes of the trust company shall be invested separately and apart from the other branch of the business.

Mr. FOSTER. Would it be in accordance with the policy of the Finance Department to give a trust business into the hands of an insurance company? Would the hon. member incorporate an insurance company and add to the powers of that insurance company the powers of a trust company?

Mr. FIELDING. there is a precedent for doing that to the extent to which it is done in this Bill. It has already been done to the extent to which this Bill proposes to unite two branches of business together and in the same way that this Bill proposes to do it.

Mr. FOSTER. Has it ever been the policy of the department to add to the powers of an insurance company the powers which will enable it to become a trust company? I think you absolutely prohibit that to-day. But here you are in this way really doing it. You say you are constituting a trust company but you are constituting an insurance company and you are adding to that insurance company the powers of a trust company. It seems to me that the two functions are not in accordance with each other and that they ought to be separated.

Mr. FIELDING. It is in accordance with a precedent already established. How far it is a wise precedent is a matter of debate. But we have thought that inasmuch as other companies have obtained these powers there would be no objection to this Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. Only one other company.

Mr. FIELDING. Besides the Royal there is another one. There was a Bill passed in 1904 constituting a company called the Real Estate Guarantee and Investment Company. Therefore, we have a precedent for it. It is a question whether it is wise to permit these businesses to be united, but the House and the committee that investigated this matter have thought that in this instance there is no objection to uniting these two businesses.

Mr. FOSTER. I would not have as much objection to joining the real estate business with insurance in the way of insuring titles, because they are cognate subjects, but when you propose to join an insurance, trust and loan company, I think you are joining two matters which are a long way apart, and I can see where it is not wise because you add a risky business to a business where there ought not to be the least shadow of risk allowed.

Mr. FIELDING. It has never been the policy of the department to join a fire or life insurance company with a trust company. This particular branch of insurance is the only branch which has been associated with a trust company.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is a dangerous piece of business.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. minister says it has not been the custom in the other matter. Has it been the custom in this matter?

Mr. FIELDING. In several cases.

On section 10—company authorized to transact other business; subsection (c), trustee.

Mr. FOSTER. This section provides that the company may accept certain trusts. Some words have been added in committee. May I ask, Mr. Chairman, what those words are and how they come in?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The words added follow the phrase 'and perform the duties or of such offices or trusts.' and the words added are 'as fully as and completely as any person so appointed could do.'

Mr. FOSTER. 'So appointed.' By whom?

Mr. FIELDING. It gives them all the powers of an individual.

Mr. FOSTER. An individual may be appointed to do anything. But the expression here is 'so appointed.' If it means 'appointed' by a court or other judicial authority, I could understand it.

Mr. FIELDING. The section provides that the company may:

(c) accept and execute all such trusts of every description as are entrusted to it or which are committed or transferred to it by any order, judgment or decree of any court, and may execute the office of executor, administrator, trustee, accountant, arbitrator, adjuster, auditor, receiver, assignee, liquidator, sequestrator, guardian, curator, or committee of a lunatic, and perform the duties of such offices or trusts as fully and completely as any person so appointed could do.

It means that this corporation may do anything by virtue of an order of the court that an individual could do.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not see that. It says that the company may execute trusts committed to it by a decree of that court, and may execute 'these other offices.' This word 'and' seems to indicate that these offices are outside of the judgment or decree of any court.

Mr. FIELDING. But which one of these functions might not properly be performed by a company as well as by an individual? Take them in order: Executor, administrator, trustee, and so on. It simply means that in each of these cases, what an individual might do this corporation may do. I do not think there is any danger in it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think the criticism was exactly on that point. It struck me that the words 'so appointed' were not very apt, that there should be some other expression as, 'appointed to such office' because 'so appointed' should refer to some previous words concerning appointment, but there is no previous expression of that kind. The words 'appointed to such office' would make the meaning clearer.

Mr. FIELDING. That does improve it, I believe. I move that the subsection be amended so as to read 'as fully and completely as any person appointed to such office could do.'

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would call the minister's attention to lines 43 to 46 of this section. It says: 'and in all cases where application is made to any court, judge or prothonotary for appointment to any such office or trust, such court, judge or prothonotary may appoint the company.' In some provinces, at least, prothonotaries have no such power; I do not know if any such power might be here implied. On the other hand, there are officers who have such powers but are not here named, for instances, Masters in Chancery, or in my own province of Nova Scotia, Masters of the Supreme Court. I would suggest that we modify the section so as to read something like this: 'In all cases where such application is made to any court, judge, officer or person having authority to make appointment to such office or trust, such court, judge, officer or person may appoint'—and so on.

Mr. FIELDING. The drafting of the Bill was probably made with a view to the proceedings in the province from which it comes. But, as the Bill is general in its application, it should read so as to carry out that idea. I do not think the draftsman of the Bill will object to the suggestion. I move:

That in subsection 'c' the words 'or prothonotary for' be stricken out and the following words substituted 'officer or person having authority to make.'

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 11,

Mr. FOSTER. You provide that these trust funds shall be invested in first mortgages, which is all right, but you go on and say that they can be invested in 'privileges and hypothecs.' What are the privileges? They seem to be an airy kind of security to offer a blunt, plain farmer when he talks about trust funds.

Mr. BRODEUR. In our Civil Code there is a provision with regard to privileges and hypothecs, but the word 'privileges' seems to have no meaning in the clause and should be stricken out.

Mr. FOSTER. What is a hypothec?

Mr. BRODEUR. A mortgage.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it a first mortgage?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not necessarily.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you think it wise to invest trust funds in any but first mortgages; if it is only a lien it may be a very uncertain kind of security.

Mr. BRODEUR. The law of our province provides that trust funds shall be invested only in first mortgages.

Mr. FOSTER. If that is the case, then why do you not strike out the words 'privileges and hypothecs?'

Mr. FIELDING. I should think there would be no objection to that.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. OSLER. You say in this clause that the trustees shall see that the security is 'ample.' That word 'ample' is an extraordinary word to use there.

Mr. FIELDING. It is a word used in a previous Act.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps it would make it more binding on the trustees if they had to see that the security was ample. The rule in trust funds is that 50 per cent is the utmost that should be taken, but of course on some properties you might lend 60 per cent of the value and it would be safer than to lend 50 per cent on other mortgages.

Mr. FIELDING. The practice in previous charters has not been to specify any percentage, but to insert the word 'ample.' We might hear the objections to these different clauses and still leave the Bill in committee so that the promoters may be heard.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is very important that trust funds shall be invested only on first-class security, and I am much in accord with the idea suggested by the member for North Toronto. I think we should not connect the insurance business with the trust business. At all events, the provisions of such Bills as this should be made subject to

the law in each province with regard to the investment of trust funds.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When we come to section 18 I intend to move to insert these words which are found in some other charters:

The powers and authorities hereby granted to the company shall be exercised subject to the laws of any province in that behalf.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think there would be any objection to inserting these words.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I want to tell the Minister of Finance that he will soon have to give his attention to some kind of legislation regulating the trust funds of insurance companies, and especially life insurance companies. He will need to legislate with the view of getting a higher grade of securities for these funds and insisting on more frequent publication of the investments. We need a law that any insurance company making an investment of any special fund to the amount of, say $100,000, ought to make it public within a month after the transaction. It is a question in which a good deal of interest is at present being taken. Only to-day I was talking with a gentleman who is rather well posted on the subject and he said that that was one question which would have to be taken up at a very early date. I referred to it incidentally the other day and I am again bringing it up now for it is a matter which is well worthy the attention of the minister, namely the revision of the law in regard to trust funds of insurance companies and some method of raising the standard of these investments. There should be a reform also in the direction of the publication, at frequent dates, of any large investment made by any insurance company so that the policy-holders who are really the ones interested in these great trust funds, should know the way that money is invested.

Mr. FIELDING. While it is rather broadening the question, I may say that my difficulty so far has been in keeping the standard up to the point at which we now have it placed, because insurance companies have frequently made representations to me that our restrictions in regard to investments are so severe that they cannot keep their funds profitably invested under them, and in consequence they are not able to offer as good terms in some cases as are offered by other companies with wider liberty of investment. I have so far resisted the movement to make the standard any lower than it is at present. When we restrict the investing power it follows that they get a low rate of interest.

Mr. FOSTER. Supposing that an insurance company from the United States is doing business in Canada. The United States Insurance Company has a certain limit of investment. Is that limit larger or more extensive than the limit which is accorded to a Canadian company?

Mr. FIELDING. The investment powers of American companies are as a rule broader that the investing powers of Canadian companies and the British companies have also broader powers. The Canadian companies complain that they have to compete with American and British companies on which the restrictions are not so great so that these outside companies are able to earn higher rates of interest. However, the main interest after all is to see that the funds are safely and wisely invested, and I have had to differ with some companies in the last few years which desired to have the restrictions removed.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I do not think that the minister would say that the class of investments of the Canadian companies is equal to that of the British or American companies.

Mr. FIELDING. They have powers which we do not grant; how they exercise that power is another question.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I think we will have to admit that the class of security is better in the other two countries than in Canada.

On subsection (d) of section 11,

In such securities as are specified by the terms of any trust, or by the order, judgment or decree of a court, judge or prothonotary.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose that the first part of this subsection is all right.

In such securities as are specified by the terms of any trust,——

A man puts his money into the hands of a trust company and he has a right to specify how it shall be invested, and the company should have the power to invest it in such securities as he thinks fit. It then reads

——or by the order, judgment or decree of a court, judge or prothonotary.

I do not know why the prothonotary is included.

Mr. FIELDING. I am informed that in Quebec the word 'prothonotary' has a special meaning and that he has powers that he does not possess in any other province.

Mr. BRODEUR. He is the clerk of the court, the same as the clerk of the court in the high Court of Justice. For example he exercises the power of appointing a tutor or guardian, instead of having the appointment made by a judge. I may say that this company is not likely to do much business as a tutor or guardian in Quebec because under our law no corporation is permitted to act as a tutor or guardian unless

it is specially authorized to do so by the legislature. I know it is done in some cases, because a Bill was passed a few years ago in the interests of the Toronto General Trusts Corporation giving that corporation the power to be appointed tutor in the province of Quebec. The prothonotary has the power of making some appointments of that kind.

Mr. OSLER. He would be no judge of securities, would he ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Generally when the prothonotary acts in that way he sends valuators to ascertain the value of the property.

Mr. OSLER. That would come under the duties of the judge. This gives him power to order investments.

Mr. BRODEUR. As a matter of fact it goes very far.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How would it do to strike out the word 'prothonotary' and say :

Other lawful authority in respect of any trust.

Because I think the words——

Order, judgment or decree of a court.

——should have application only to the particular judgment in Quebec.

Mr. FIELDING. I think if you say that it should be left to the court or judge you leave it to a responsible party.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Very well, that suits me, except that I think you should put in :

With respect to any trust,

What I mean is that you do not want to assume that a court or judge is to have a general power of fixing the class of securities or trusts generally. The judge may have power under the terms of a conveyance or under the terms of a will to designate certain securities as those in which investments may be made. You do not want any more than that here. It would do to have it :

By the order, judgment or decree of a court or judge in respect of any trust.

Mr. BRODEUR. That, as a question of fact, it should not be left to the discretion of the judge. The lawyer declares in what mortgage or in what security the money is to be invested, and I think we should not leave to the judge or privy court the authority to extend that to something else. I think it would be advisable then to strike out the last words, all the words after the word 'trust.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, I am inclined to agree.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Mr. Fielding moves :

To strike out all the words after 'trust' in subsection 'd' (now subsection 'c') of section 11

Subsection as amended, agreed to.

On subsection 2 of section 11,

Nothing in this section shall prevent the company from holding securities of any other kind which form or are part of any trust estate which comes into its hands, and it may hold such securities subject to the trusts and legal obligations attached thereto, but in case of the realization of any portion thereof the proceeds shall be invested as herein directed unless the will, deed, order or instrument creating the trust has provided otherwise.

Mr. OSLER. The only question about that, is that if funds get into the hands of a trust company without a will or without a trust, for instance, in an estate having varied securities that clause enables the trust company to hold the securities for all time to come. I know that in the case of the Toronto General Trusts Company, at present, if they have securities of this kind in their hands, they consider that they are bound by the law to convert them in a year or two into trust securities. But this gives them discretionary power to hold any securities that come into their hands for all time. They are not bound to apply the trust law to an estate of the kind I have referred to that comes into their hands.

On section 11,

The moneys and securities of any such trust shall always be kept distinct from those of the company, and in separate accounts, and so marked for each particular trust as always to be distinguished from any other in the registers and other books of account to be kept by the company, so that at no time shall trust moneys form part or be mixed with the general assets of the company ; and the company shall, in the receipt of rents and in the overseeing and management of trusts and other property, keep distinct records and accounts of all operations connected therewith ; provided that in the management of the money and property held by the company as trustee, or in any other official capacity, under the powers conferred by this Act, the company may, unless the authority making the appointment otherwise directs, invest the trust money in the manner provided by section 10 of this Act in a general trust fund of the company ; provided, however, that the total amount of money of any one trust invested in the said general trust fund shall not, at any time exceed three thousand dollars.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that the usual power ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is in other charters. It means that only small fractions of trust moneys may be gathered together and put into one fund.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The only danger is that to that extent it prevents the property being ear-marked and followed in case of necessity.

Mr. FIELDING. It could only refer to small matters.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Individually, but they might be large in the aggregate.

Mr. FOSTER. Trust companies are popularly not supposed to take deposits, but they may take moneys and guarantee them. They may take them for investment on trust conditions. That becomes really a form of accepting deposits. If you make the limit $3,000, you may have a very large deposit business done under this head. That will be facilitated by the fact that the company will not have to keep the money separate, but they may go into the common fund. It practically makes it possibly to do pretty nearly an over the counter deposit business.

Section agreed to.

Sections 13, 14 and 15, agreed to.

On section 16,

The company may invest any moneys forming part of its own capital, or reserve or accumulated profit thereon, in any of the securities mentioned in section 11 of this Act, or, in the bonds or debentures of any incorporated building society or loan company, or on the security of real estate in Canada or of any interest in such real estate, or on the security of the debentures, bonds, stock and other securities of any chartered bank or company incorporated by or under the authority of the parliament of Canada, or of the legislature of any former, present or future province of Canada, as the directors deem expedient.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a pretty broad clause.

Mr. FIELDING. It is the usual one.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) mean by 'usual'?

Mr. FIELDING. It is the same as is found in other charters.

Mr. FOSTER. Which one, for instance?

Mr. FIELDING. The Consolidated Trust, passed in 1903.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid that is an exception, rather than the rule. There are loan companies and loan companies, there are building societies and building societies; and, as has been well exemplified within the last few years, in some cases they are as unsatisfactory security as you can well put your money in. If you are going to allow the company's capital, which is the security offered to those doing business with the company, to be invested indiscriminately in the bonds or debentures of building societies and loan companies, without fixing any minimum of capitalization, length of time in business or payment of dividends, you open the door very wide indeed. Thomas, Richard or Henry can get up a litttle stock company called a building or loan company and, under this section, it could be paid for by the capital of the trust company. This is an important section, and I would like the minister to look into it.

Mr. FIELDING. Insurance companies are allowed to invest in these securities and we regard insurance investments as those concerning which the greatest care should be taken.

Mr. FOSTER. There is the difficulty. Without justifying the investments allowed to an insurance company, you use the law on that subject to justify the application of the same to the trust companies. But nothing should be more carefully guarded than trust companies investments. These concerns have the estates of widows and orphans, and they carry trusts for minors, and are always considered concerns whose securities should be very strictly guarded. The capital of the trust company is what it offers prospective patrons as a guarantee that the business confided to it will be properly secured. But if this capital may be invested in loan and building societies' stock, with all the ups and downs to which the securities of some of these concerns are liable, it seems to me you take away the security which that capital stock would otherwise give. You may say: Let the widow and the orphan examine the affairs of the company and learn how its capital is invested. But they will not do that—they have not the means to do it. They take it practically on the faith of its capital and its business directorate.

Mr. BRODEUR. According to my recollection of the general law of some of the provinces one range of sucurities is allowed for the trust funds in the hands of the companies, but a wider range is allowed for the investment of its own capital.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that provided for in any statute of Canada?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think it is called the Trust Companies' Act in Ontario.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister will see what I am driving at. It is not enough to provide that the trusts funds shall be securely invested. The capital stock of the trust company is supposed to be in itself a security to those doing business with the company; and by allowing too wide a range of investment, you may make this security worthless. I do not know quite how the law is. I believe there are lawyers who hold that a trust company has the right to invest its own capital as it pleases; but I know there are lawyers who very strongly advise against that.

Mr. BRODEUR. If the law provides, as I believe the general law does in Ontario and special statutes do in Quebec, that the capital of a trust company—not the trust moneys placed in its hands—may be invested in securities such as are mentioned

here that would not be a very serious objection. But I admit there is much strength in the argument made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), and I am inclined to think that we should, as much as possible, protect the moneys put into the hands of trust companies.

Mr. FOSTER. I will not speak dogmatically on the point, but I think that these powers of investment of capital are largely regulated by the corporate powers given to each company, and that the general law does not specify. But, certainly, the act of incorporation of no trust company that I know of gives it power to invest its funds in definitely stated securities of this kind.

Mr. FIELDING. I think, that, as our intention is to let the Bill remain in committee, this might be regarded as one of the suspended clauses, and, let the promoter, after reading 'Hansard,' give attention to the suggestion that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has offered.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 16 stands.

On section 17,

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the company to issue any note payable to the bearer thereof, or any promissory note intended to be circulated as money or as the note of a bank, or to engage in the business of banking or insurance, except as provided in section 9 hereof.

Mr. FOSTER. That strengthens very much the argument I made at first. The Bill, by this, expressly says that it is dangerous to join insurance business and trust business together. Somebody wants to get a certain power, and has pressed for it. That power is given in the Bill, but we feel that we must guard ourselves to some extent at least, and so we add this clause to say that insurance shall only be done as provided in section 9. But the dictum is there, as plainly as can be, that it is dangerous to do insurance and trust business together.

On section 18,

The powers and authority hereby granted to the company shall not have any force or effect in any province in any respect in which they are inconsistent with the laws of such province.

Mr. FIELDING. I believe my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has an amendment to suggest. As I heard it it seemed to be reasonable.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I propose to amend that section by inserting after the word 'company' the words 'shall be exercised in any province subject to the laws of such province in that behalf, and.'

Mr. FOSTER. If you put charters of incorporation there as well as laws, then you would make the thing safe. I do not think it is a matter of laws, though, not being a lawyer, I speak with diffidence. But I do not think this has the least check on the powers that are given here which is a charter of incorporation. You are giving a charter of incorporation to this company to do business with larger powers than any trust company in the province. You are joining insurance and trust business together, which no corporate charter in the province of Ontario authorizes. You should put in 'which are inconsistent with the charter of incorporation of trust companies, or with the laws of such province.'

Mr. FIELDING. That practically implies that we are going to make our legislation subordinate to the legislation of a province, and I do not think we should do that. We must judge for ourselves as to the merits of this legislation. But I do not think we should say, having first given a company powers, that it shall not be allowed to exercise those powers unless there is a general law of the province to the contrary.

Mr. BRODEUR. I would be in favour of subjecting this legislation to the rights of the provinces, because I do not think we have a right to pass any law here which would grant larger powers to any corporation than they enjoy under provincial Acts. I know well that in our Quebec code there is a provision denying the corporations the exercise of certain powers, and in this Bill it is provided that such corporation may exercise those powers, which is certainly contrary to the disposition of our law. I am inclined to think also that we would have no right to give a corporation certain civil rights which they cannot exercise under the laws of the provinces; otherwise those powers that we give those corporations would be absolutely contrary to the law. The only power we can exercise is to form a corporation, but that corporation must exercise its civil rights under the laws of the province, and I think this provision is a very good one.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the amendment of the leader of the opposition meets the difficulty.

Mr. OSLER. I agree with the Finance Minister. I do not think it wise that we should be guided here by the Companies Acts in any province. Is not that covered by the fact that, I think, every company of this sort has to take out a license before it can do business in another province? Now if this company has to take out a license in the province of Quebec, the province of Quebec won't give it a license unless it restricts its powers to make them conform with the laws of Quebec. In Ontario the same way, they won't give you a license except to carry out business subject to their rules. It seems to me that covers the point.

Mr. FOSTER. That might cover the point if they did that. But there are var-

ious reasons why that does not always take place. But the general ground I think is a fair ground. It undoubtedly is the right of a province to create trust companies, and it therefore has power to make legislation. In the province of Ontario you have five or six trust companies which have put their money into that business, and they have been kept down to very rigid conditions, as any person knows who is acquainted with these matters in that province. Under those conditions and with those powers these companies have gone on and done business. Now people come to this parliament and ask for powers as a trust company and they ask for powers greater than are granted by the province, they ask for powers which are to be amalgamated with it and used conjointly, which are not allowed at all by the province, and are not allowed because of prudential considerations. Although we think a lot of our dignity and our superior powers, we ought to be very careful in giving these companies rights which are greater than the rights enjoyed by the Companies under charters and Acts of the provinces.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend will see that the laws of the various provinces might not be uniform. If we were to undertake to adapt ourselves to the laws of each province, we might have difficulty. Let us see that we do not grant powers which in themselves are unreasonable. But I do not think we can afford to be guided by what takes place in the provinces. We must be responsible for our legislation. So far as civil rights are concerned, nothing we can do here can create any civil right, which is exclusively within the jurisdiction of a province and we could not, if we tried to, legislate with regard to civil rights. For instance, to dispose of trust funds is the business of a province, and we do not intend to invade that, and could not if we tried.

Mr. BRODEUR. I may say that trust corporations which exist in the province of Ontario are applying to the legislature of Quebec for charters to do business in that province. One of the most important companies in Toronto came last year to get an Act of incorporation from Quebec, and requested specifically the rights which were denied by the general law. My impression, from reading the law, would be that we might create a corporation here, but we cannot give to that corporation civil powers which are denied to corporations in the different provinces. It would be no use for us to create corporations giving more powers than are permitted by the provincial law. It would be perhaps just as well for them to go to the provincial legislatures to get their powers. I know that has been done in my own province, it was done by the Toronto General Trusts Corporation, and I myself prepared the Bill by which they got their powers in Quebec. I have here the statute that was passed last year with regard to that company; I know that the National Trust Company was incorporated in Quebec, and I think another company.

Mr. HAGGART. I would ask the Finance Minister if there is any arrangement made, or if there has been any correspondence with the local governments, regarding an agreement as to how far we shall exercise powers which interfere with civil rights. I know that Sir Oliver Mowat entered into correspondence with the late government, and we came to some understanding on the subject, and I thought perhaps that understanding might have been continued since. A clear cut understanding was come to as to what subjects the Dominion government should deal with.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not aware that anything of the kind has occurred recently. It may be that there is correspondence in the department such as the hon. gentleman refers to—that is a matter for the Minister of Justice, who is not present. But I will inquire before the matter comes up again.

On section 21,

The Companies Clauses Act, except sections 7, 18 and 39 thereof, shall apply to the company.

Mr. FOSTER. What are these ?

Mr. FIELDING. Section 7 relates to the directors, who are already dealt with in the Bill. Section 18 is a clause which requires that a certain percentage of the capital shall be paid up within a year. We have dealt with that already in the Bill. The next section is in regard to the use of the word 'Limited', which is not insisted upon in the case of these insurance companies. The Bill, in accordance with the suggestion which has been made, will remain in committee. I want to add a clause. This Bill is in part an insurance Bill and in part a trust company Bill. As far as it may be an insurance Bill, it comes under the provisions of the general Act, which provides that the company shall be organized and commence business within two years or the charter fails. But, as respects the trust company part of the Bill, there is no such provision. In order to make it clear that the same provision shall apply in either case, I propose to add the following clause :

The charter of the company shall be forfeited if the company does not go into actual operation within two years after the passing of this Act.

I propose this section so that it will not be held that one part of the company is alive and the other part dead.

Section agreed to.

Progress reported.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose there will be no objection to this Bill standing over for ten days or so ?

Mr. FIELDING. I would not care to say in the absence of the promoter. He must be the judge of that.

Mr. FOSTER. I intend to send some copies of this Bill away.

Mr. FIELDING. I will call the attention of the promoter to the discussion which has taken place, and ask him to consider the matter. I have no right to say how long he wishes it to stand.

RICHMOND AND DRUMMOND FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Tobin.

On the question: Shall the Bill be reported?

Mr. FIELDING. This is one of the Bills for extending the time of insurance companies for organizing. We had a discussion in the House the other day on this subject, and I think the tendency of the House, and I may say the tendency of the committee which investigates these matters, is to discourage these extensions. I think every hon. member who is interested in these Bills should understand that unless an insurance company, or the people promoting it, have capitalists in sight ready to organize the company, they ought not to approach the House for a charter, and if they afterwards find that they cannot raise the money and they come for an extension, they should understand that such an extension should only be granted when special cause is shown. If this is generally understood, perhaps there will be a little more care in the promotion of these Bills. The committee agreed to pass this Bill, but I think I am voicing the general feeling of the committee when I say that there is a very strong disinclination to grant these extensions from year to year. The same policy, I think, should be followed in reference to banks.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 125) to incorporate the Crown Casualty Company of Canada.—Mr. Gervais.

QUESTIONS

MAILS—KILLARNEY AND LITTLE CURRENT.

Mr. LANCASTER—by Mr. Sam. Hughes—asked:

1. Who is the present contractor for mail transportation between Killarney and Little Current, Ontario, during the winter months?
2. What sum is paid for the same per week or per trip?
3. When will the present contract expire?
4. How many different persons handle mail matter at the Killarney, Ontario, post office, and what are their respective names; and have they all been sworn in as such servants?
5. Who is the present postmaster at Killarney, Ontario, and what is his salary?
6. Has the postmaster at Killarney reported irregularities in the winter mail service between Killarney and Little Current? If so, how many such irregularities during the last two years?
7. What action, if any, has been taken by the government in regard to the said irregularities?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Postmaster General).

1. Messrs. C. Noble and J. Lamorandière, sureties for Michael Bernard.
2. $9 a week.
3. On the opening of navigation, 1905.
4. The regulations of the department provide that only the postmaster and his sworn assistants are allowed to handle mail matter. The department at Ottawa does not keep record of assistant postmasters at small places, but inquiry will be made as to whether unauthorized persons have been allowed to transact post office work.
5 (a) J. Lamorandière; (b) salary, $120; forward allowance, $35; rent, $10.
6 and 7. No report of irregularities from the postmaster at Killarney received at the department.

MAILS—ASHCROFT, CARIBOO.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. Who was the mail contractor for the Ashcroft, Cariboo service in 1902?
2. When did the contract expire, and what was paid therefor?
3. To whom has the contract been awarded since that, for what periods, and at what rate?
4. Have tenders been publicly called for in any or all cases of renewal?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Postmaster General):

Ashcroft and Barkerville mail service. In 1897 tenders were invited for the above service or rather group of services.

On the 7th May, 1897, the then superintendent of the mail contract branch submitted a memo. showing the amounts of all tenders received both for a service under one contract and for the several sections of the main and side routes. The following is a list of the tenderers for the service as proposed under one contract, namely: Stephen Tingley, for British Columbia Express Company, $26,250; John G. Collins, Ashcroft, $36,800; John Hamilton, Calgary, $33,450; Stephen Tingley, Ashcroft, $30,000.

The tenders submitted were considered excessive and efforts were made to have the amounts reduced. These efforts were unsuccessful and steps were taken to secure offers from individuals and firms in eastern Canada, with the result that on the 28th of May, 1897, an agreement was entered into with Mr. Joseph Power, of Toronto, at the rate of $23,000 per annum, to date from the 1st July, 1897.

On the same date as the agreement with Power was entered into it was transferred to Messrs. Joseph Kilgour and Charles Miller, of Toronto, and on the 2nd June a further agreement was drawn up and executed by Kilgour and Miller.

The contract stood in the name of Messrs. Kilgour and Miller until 30th September, 1899, when it was assumed by the British Columbia Express Company, of which Joseph Kilgour is president and Charles Miller, solicitor, under a new four year contract), by whom it has been carried on to the present time. This contract was renewed on the 1st October, 1903. Tenders have not been invited since 1897.

The present contract rate is $23,250, whilst the original contract was for $23,000, the difference in payment being on account of increased services being performed by the contractors since they entered into their contract.

COLLECTIONS IN POST OFFICES—ASSESSMENT SYSTEM.

Mr CHISHOLM—by Mr. Sam Hughes—asked :

1. Referring to a statement made on the 27th of February last, by Honourable C. S. Hyman, on behalf of the Postmaster General, that there had been collected by assessment from the postmasters, mail clerks, and those handling the mails for the Dominion, the sum of $63,-349.16, and that the losses so far as ascertained were $19,909.51, leaving a balance of profit of $45,992.68, how much of this loss of $19,909.51 was caused by the postmasters alone ? and what is the amount of loss by said postmasters alone in each of the provinces of the Dominion?

2. Is it the intention of the Post Office Department to continue this system of assessment ? If so, will they reduce the assessments to meet the requirements of the actual losses ?

3. Is the same assessment made on a postmaster whose salary is $500 a year as on a postmaster whose salary is $1,500 a year ? If so, why ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Postmaster General) :

1. Statement of losses by provinces on account of postmasters made good out of post office guarantee fund :

Ontario	$ 315 69
Quebec	343 19
Nova Scotia	113 25
New Brunswick	36 04
Prince Edward Island	15 44
Manitoba	
Northwest Territories	264 33
British Columbia	2,686 44
Yukon	50 00
	$3,824 38

2. Yes. The department's policy is to conduct the system on safe lines, and will increase or reduce the rate of assessment as experience appears to demand.

3. No. The amount of insurance is based upon the revenue of the office, not the salary of the postmaster, in accordance with the following scale :

'Every accounting postmaster, the revenue of whose office is under $2,000 a year, is required to give security to the extent of $800. Where the revenue exceeds $2,000 a year, but is less than $5,000, the insurance required is $1,200. Where it exceeds $5,-000 but is less than $10,000 a year, the insurance required is $1,600. Where it exceeds $10,000 a year, but is less than $15,-000, the insurance required is $2,000. Where it exceeds $15,000 but is less than $25,000, the insurance required is $2,500. Where the revenue exceeds $25,000, except in the cities of Montreal and Toronto, the insurance required is $3,000. In the case of the cities of Montreal and Toronto, the insurance required is $5,000. Each postmaster of a non-accounting post office is required to give $200 security, and if the estimated revenue of his office does not exceed $100 a year, it is optional with him to give bonds or to accept the assessment system.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 69) to estalish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta, and the amendment of Mr. Borden thereto.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Mr. Speaker. After hearing the very full discussion on this Bill by members on both sides of the House ; a discussion from a constitutional standpoint, the standpoint of public policy and from the standpoint of political exigencies by some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, it is not with the idea that I can add anything of a very original character that I propose for a short time to continue the debate. However, being a western man ; a resident of Manitoba for the past 22 years, quite naturally I take a great interest in anything pertaining to the welfare of our great western heritage, and my ideas are not so provincial that I desire to limit that interest to matters mainly connected with the province of my adoption. In looking over the history of our country I think there are few of us but must admit, in the light of past experience, that there are some things that we might very well improve upon had we the drafting of our constitution anew. The great fathers of confederation who in their united wisdom consolidated into one mighty whole the numerous provinces of this splendid Dominion are deserving of every eulogium that can possibly be bestowed on them. They had many intricate and delicate questions to cope with, prejudices to overcome, rights and privileges to safeguard and protect, divers views to harmonize—and all honour

to them for the successful manner in which they accomplished their difficult task. But of what use is experience if you do not profit by it? And in the granting of a new constitution to these baby provinces in the west we should be careful to avoid the pitfalls of the past, to improve where improvement is possible upon existing legislation and to start those new provinces unhampered in their career, by any obnoxious restrictions that can be a source of vexation, turmoil and strife amongst the mixed population inhabiting that part of the Dominion. Some of these people are our fellow Canadians from the older provinces; some are our fellow British subjects from England, Scotland and Ireland, some come from the more advanced European races and many come from the republic to the south. All these classes of settlers at any rate come from countries where they have been in the enjoyment of the greatest amount of constitutional liberty and they will look for and expect the same liberty in their new homes. We are therefore legislating at the present time not merely for existing conditions but for the whole future of that country. We can afford, nay it is our duty, it is an imperative duty that we should deal not only justly, but generously in starting these new provinces housekeeping on their own account. There may have been reasons of a financial character that prevented this Dominion from dealing with some of the other provinces, upon their entering into confederation, with equal generosity, but because of that lack of liberty and generosity repeated demands have been made on the treasury of this country by those provinces and we should guard against anything of that kind in the initial dealings with these new provinces of the west. I am sure there is a desire on the part of the older settled provinces not only to accord the very best possible treatment of a financial character, but to grant the greatest amount of constitutional liberty and legislative freedom in our dealings with these new provinces. The financial arrangements should not be entered into in any niggardly spirit nor should they be carped at because they happen to be more generous than those accorded to the several provinces in which we each reside. Nor should this government deny or withhold from these provinces of the west the management of certain affairs, the control of certain features of their policy, simply because of a reluctance on the part of this government to part with what has undoubtedly been in the past and will be in the future great political party levers, features of administration which have been used for this purpose and can be so used in the future.

There are a few things that I as a Manitoban desire to speak about before entering on a discussion of the provisions of the Bill proper. One of these is incidental to this Bill and was dealt with by the Prime Minister in his introductory remarks; I refer to the reasons he assigned for refusing the reasonable request of the people of Manitoba through their legislators for an extension of the boundaries of that province. The Prime Minister stated that this request had been made not only upon his government, but upon other governments in the past. It was a request most reasonable in its character, a unanimous request joined in by both political parties, but a request which even at this most opportune moment when the delimitation of the western provinces is being made, he and his government could not entertain. And what are the reasons he has given? First because the government of Sir John A. Macdonald had a similar request made to them some 20 years ago, and if it could not be entertained on that occasion it could not be entertained to-day; yet in the earlier portion of his remarks the Prime Minister admitted that the Canada of those days was not the Canada of to-day. That was very true and he might have said further that the Manitoba of those days was not the Manitoba of to-day. At that time Manitoba was supposed to extend as far east as the head of lake navigation. All of that portion of country east of Rat Portage to Port Arthur which was looked upon as disputed territory had been counted in as belonging to Manitoba, and that province was supposed to constitute an area of 154,000 square miles, but to-day we find that owing to the decision given in connection with the boundary award all that portion east of Rat Portage has been handed over to Ontario thus diminishing the area of Manitoba by more than one-half. So I say that the request of 1905 is a much more reasonable one and an entirely different one inasmuch as it is a request on behalf of a province that we know for a certainty contains only some 73,700 square miles, whereas the request of twenty years ago was on behalf of a province which we imagined contained 154,000 square miles. Personally I would have preferred to have seen Manitoba's western boundary extended still further west as far as the 105th Meridian of west longitude, having one province west of that line extending to the eastern boundary of the province of British Columbia. Thus we would have two good sized provinces whose areas would have been more in conformity with those of British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec. By doing this we would have done away with this duplication of governments and the increased cost as a consequence thereof. We have been told frequently in times gone by that Canada is already over-governed, because of this multiplication of provinces whose areas are too small. With such a division of territory as I suggest we would have avoid-

ed the great expense entailed by this duplication of provinces, and we would have had two splendid provinces that would have proved powerful factors in this great confederation. I realize that there is a considerable sentiment opposed to that view in the Northwest Territories. I cannot admit that their objection is a valid one ; I think it is largely sentimental. They look upon the word 'annexed' with objection ; they do not desire to be merged. It is not a universal sentiment, but still a considerable portion of the people there object to merging their fortunes with those of the people of Manitoba, and we cannot entirely ignore sentiment when it is very strongly developed. But I feel sure that if they had decided voluntarily to join their fortunes with those of the people of Manitoba, within the next five or ten years, because of the great advantages they would have derived by reason of increased transportation facilities, by reason of reduced freight rates and other great advantages they would be perfectly satisfied with their position.

Whatever reason the government may have had for not desiring to extend the boundaries of Manitoba westward the question of the northern boundary is entirely different. By the provisions of this Bill the easterly boundary of Saskatchewan is the western boundary of Manitoba, extending from the northwest corner of Manitoba to the 60th parallel of north latitude, and that portion of the provisional district of Saskatchewan lying east of that boundary line is put where ? In the new province of Saskatchewan ? In the province of Manitoba? No, it is thrown into unorganized territory under the jurisdiction of this government. What objection was there to having that portion added to the province of Manitoba ? The right hon. gentleman said he could not, contrary to the wishes of the people of the Territories, take any portion of their land away from them, west of Manitoba's boundary line, and that they had, through their legislators in their assembly, on more than one occasion, put themselves on record as being opposed to having any part of that territory taken away from them. But he has not the same reason for refusing to give Manitoba this district overlapping it on the north. On the contrary, the very same territorial assembly, composed of the very same gentlemen who passed this resolution objecting to any part of the territory west of Manitoba's boundary line being taken from them, passed resolutions in which they gave their consent to having that portion which overlaps Manitoba on the north added to that province. Still in the face of that resolution, the right hon. gentleman refuses to accede to the request of the government of Manitoba. I find, on looking at the Northwest Territories journal of the 14th of December, 1898, the following resolution was passed :

The order of the day being read for the second reading of resolution reported from the Committee of the Whole, which is as follows :

Whereas, it is expedient that the boundary lines between the Northwest Territories and the other provinces and territories should be finally determined at an early date.

And whereas, this legislature denies the right of the parliament of Canada to increase, diminish or otherwise alter the limits of the Northwest Territories, except as hereinafter mentioned, without its consent because it claims for the people it represents equal rights with the people of the provinces in this respect ;

And whereas, certain areas now comprised within the Northwest Territories more properly belong to other provinces or territories, and should therefore be separated from the Northwest Territories ;

Therefore be it resolved, that while consenting to such alteration of the limits of the Northwest Territories as will separate therefrom those areas lying north of the northern boundaries of the provinces of British Columbia and Manitoba respectively, this legislature is firmly of the opinion that the political unity of the Territories should not be disturbed.

So that, we have the very same gentlemen in that territorial assembly, passing that resolution, giving their consent to having this district north of the Manitoba boundary line added to the province, yet the right hon. gentleman refused to accede to the request of the province of Manitoba, endorsed as it was by the Territorial Assembly. What reason did he give for not acceding to that reasonable request ? He said that in this House there are a number of representatives of the people who live in that sparsely settled portion of the country ; and if these people objected to being incorporated in the limits of Manitoba, parliament would not be justified in adding them to that province. But, let me ask the First Minister, did he obtain the consent of those people before he put them into the unorganized territories ? Did he obtain their consent before separating them from the rest of the district of Saskatchewan and putting them outside that district ? Most assuredly not. Why not then have incorporated them within the limits of Manitoba. There is no valid reason why that district should not be added to that province. What was the reply he gave when the request was made to have the northern limit of Manitoba extended to the 60th parallel of north latitude ? Oh, he said, I must first consult the province of Quebec, the province of Ontario and the province of Saskatchewan. Each of these provinces has an equal right for the extension of its territory to Hudson bay ; and some time in the future it is my intention to have a conference between the representatives of those provinces to see how the territory of Keewatin may be divided before we accede to the request of Manitoba. But what possible reason is there for consulting any of those provinces. The province of Ontario intervenes between Keewatin and the province of Quebec. What say could the

province of Quebec have in connection with the division of Keewatin? Or even the province of Ontario, for that matter? Why both of these have had large additions to their territories since Manitoba was made a province and Manitoba was not consulted? There is the less cause for consulting them, when we take into consideration the fact that the district of Keewatin has been under the jurisdiction of Manitoba the past thirty years. The administration of justice in that district has all taken place under the jurisdiction of the lieutenant governor of Manitoba, and the province of Manitoba can be extended to the Hudson bay without encroaching on one foot of territory properly belonging to Ontario or Quebec. In my opinion therefore the refusal of the request of Manitoba was entirely unjust and will meet with the condemnation of every citizen of that province irrespective of party. This has not been a party question. Hon. gentlemen who occupy seats in this House from the province of Manitoba have brought it up in the Manitoba legislature. Hon. gentlemen on the opposite side have brought it up, and it has been treated as a non-party question. It is also being treated in that light by the press of both political parties. It has even received the endorsation of the mouthpiece of the Liberal party in the east, the Toronto 'Globe.' And in view of this general expression of approval, it seems to me that the province of Manitoba has been treated in a most cavalier and unjust manner.

I was somewhat surprised to find that the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) in that lengthy speech which he addressed to this House, representing as he does a Manitoba constituency, did not think this question of sufficient importance to even give it a passing notice. He was a member of the government no doubt, when this and similar requests were made in the past. He was in Ottawa when the delegation from that province came here to press its claim. He was also in the city when the delegation from the board of trade of the city of Winnipeg came down and pressed the claim of that province. Still he has never uttered a protest against the action of this government in turning down the reasonable request of Manitoba for an extension of its territory.

Laying aside the question of the extension of Manitoba's boundaries, there are two features in this Bill which deserve special condemnation by the people of the province of Manitoba. I refer to the educational clauses and the land clauses. Why do I say they should meet with the condemnation of the province of Manitoba? Because we, in that province, have had our bitter experience in connection with each of those questions. Up to the present Manitoba is the only province in confederation which has been denied the ownership if its public lands, and because of that fact, our legislators have had to come down to the central government on numerous occasions, hat in hand, asking an addition to their public revenues in order to be able to cope with the requirements of that developing province. There would have been no need for these begging trips had that province been dealt with justly and fairly as were the other provinces, and we take a sufficient interest in the newly created provinces in the west to desire that they should not have a similar experience and that they should profit by our example. Therefore we urge on the government the claims of our sister provinces.

In my opinion also no financial consideration, which even at present may appear most liberal in its character—eulogized as liberal by hon. gentlemen opposite—will sufficiently compensate for the withholding from those new provinces of their public domain. Without their lands, those provinces will have not one single asset independent of this government, save the power of taxing themselves. To obtain a precedent for this treatment, the right hon. gentleman had to go to the American republic. How frequently have we not heard that right hon. gentleman in eloquent tones declaim against our borrowing examples from American politicians! But, he did not go to the American republic when he desired to get a precedent in connection with the school policy. On the contrary he went out of his way to offer a gratuitous insult to the Americans who are flocking into our Northwest by thousands, when he compared their comparatively inferior moral stamina with ours and attributed it largely to their public school system and to the exclusion from that system of the teaching of certain religious dogma. He always goes, he tells us, for his great examples to the motherland, but in this instance he did not. Had he gone to the motherland for a precedent in the settlement of the land question, he would have had a precedent entirely contradictory to the policy he has followed. He would have found that imperial statesmen in days gone by took the same position as the one he takes now regarding the ownersip of those lands. He would have found that they urged that those lands should be held by the empire for the benefit of the people of the empire. But better counsels prevailed, and it was recognized that these lands could not be administered to the same advantage from Downing street as in Canada itself. What the imperial government has done for this Dominion the Dominion government should have done for the provinces and handed over to them their lands to administer in the interest of their own people. Justice, Sir, is far more essential—very often at any rate—than any mere financial consideration; and I much mistake the character and temper of our western people if they do not condemn the government's policy in reference to these

lands. The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) admits that he has adopted this policy simply as a matter of policy. But the only colour of reason he has assigned for it is that he fears lest, in the future, these new provinces may, through stress of financial stringency, due to incurring debts not wisely but too well, resort to increasing the price of these lands, or may possibly do away with the policy of free homesteads which, up to this time, has done so much to attract immigrants to our shores, and to place settlers on our western prairies. But, Sir, surely the people making their homes in the western part of the Dominion, and those whom they select to administer their affairs, would be at least as anxious to bring people to settle on these lands as would the government here at Ottawa ; and how much more careful are they likely to be of the character of these immigrants than this government has shown itself to be in the past. And, moreover, with how much greater advantage could these lands be administered by the local government through officials under their control than by a government at Ottawa two thousand or two thousand five hundred miles from the scene of operations. Evidently the Prime Minister and his colleagues have not confidence in the ability of the western people to legislate for themselves. When the question of granting autonomy to the Northwest was up for discussion in parliament two or three years ago the Prime Minister and his then colleague, the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), took the ground that the people of the Territories were already in possession of practically complete powers of self-government save the power to incur debt ; and they doubted the wisdom of granting them this power lest it might be utilized for unwise and unnecessary purposes. Apparently, that feeling has never entirely been overcome by these gentlemen, even to this day ; otherwise they would have proposed the granting of a full measure of autonomy to the people of the Territories, including the power to manage their own lands and control their educational system. Two years ago, the Prime Minister expressed his dissent from the policy of granting autonomy for many years to come. But political exigencies forced him to abandon that position. In the midst of the last election campaign, it was suddenly brought to his memory—even in the turmoil and cares and worries of the occasion, he remembered—that he had left letters of the Prime Minister of the Northwest Territories unanswered for months. So he sent a letter giving a pledge—no doubt urged to by his candidates in the west, who had rightly gauged public opinion—that immediately after the election he would take up the question of autonomy and introduce a measure during the first session of parliament. I venture to say that had the people of the Northwest been aware of the

character of the Autonomy Bill, and had they been informed of the restrictions to be placed upon their legislative liberty, the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) would not to-day enjoy the support of such a large number of representatives from the west as he now has. And not only that, but he would not have been in the enjoyment of the support he receives from other provinces of the Dominion in this House. To-day we have a measure which, to use a common expression, grants autonomy with a string to it, one that says in effect : Thus far shalt thou go and no farther. The Prime Minister in effect says : We can trust you with powers of self government, including the power to tax yourselves for all necessary local purposes, we can trust you with the power of administering justice in these provinces ; we can trust you with the working out of your transportation problem—provided, that is, you can do it dispoiled as you are of your chief asset, your public lands—we can trust you with the maintenance of law and order in these provinces ; we can trust you with these things, and feel that you will acquit yourself in a creditable manner ; but hands off the Dominion lands and the separate schools, though no person has threatened either one or the other, for these are preserves of the Dominion government upon which you must not trespass. He declares, in effect : We, the members of the Dominion government have not sufficient confidence in either your ability or your wisdom to control and manage your own lands in the interest of your own people ; through your youth and inexperience as legislators you might adopt some policy that would conflict with the policy of this central government to your detriment.

It is true that the other provinces of the Dominion, save the province of Manitoba, are in the enjoyment of their public domain; it is true that your legislators in the past have given every evidence of capacity and statesmanship ; it is true you have been governed wisely and well ; it is true your country is peopled with a thrifty, intelligent, and industrious people ; nevertheless we cannot entrust to you this great patrimony lest you might dissipate it in a prodigal manner : Therefore, your liberties must be curtailed and your jurisdiction must be limited; likewise your assets. And so a proud and self-reliant people are made to feel the humiliation of a patronizing restraint exercised by those who are in no way their superiors. If this government were fearful lest the new provinces might, at some time in the future do away with this policy of free homesteads that has been such a factor in bringing immigrants to our shores, then, rather than retain the lands in their own possession, why could they not have followed the suggestion of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and have incorporated a provision in the law which would

perpetuate that system so long as we had any homesteads to grant? Such a course would have been much less objectionable than this restraint upon the liberties of the new provinces. They are already restricted in their powers in regard to education, and I say that such a restraint as that, especially as it would have to receive the consent of the people resident there, would have been far less objectionable; and you would have preserved this policy of free homesteads, quite as well as if the lands were administered in the city of Ottawa. And besides it would have done away with a whole host of officials who are on the payroll of this country and whose duties are merely of a nominal character, save during an election campaign.

Now, an argument has been used, that the fact of the other provinces of the Dominion being in the enjoyment of their public domain is not a parallel case; that while the lands of the other provinces were owned by those provinces prior to their entry into confederation, the lands of the Northwest Territories were purchased—'purchased' being the word used—by the Dominion government for the benefit of the Dominion at large. Now, Sir, I, as a westerner, object to that word 'purchased.' These lands were not 'purchased.' It is true that the sum of £300,000 was paid to the Hudson Bay Company, not for these lands, but for certain privileges they enjoyed and for the relinquishment of what was, at best, a doubtful title, on their part. But this money was borrowed on the credit of the Dominion, and interest is being paid upon it to-day just as much by the people of the Northwest, man for man, as by the residents in eastern Canada. But, if the Northwest Territories are to be denied the beneficial ownership of these lands by reason of this argument, how is it that a certain portion of this territory has been handed over to one province? How is it that 150,000 miles of territory in Ungava, a part of this 'purchased' land, paid for with money raised on the credit of the Dominion, was handed over, without a cent of compensation, to the province of Quebec?

Some more powerful logic, some better reasoning will have to be adduced in order to convince the residents of western Canada that they are not equally entitled to the ownership of these lands as are the people who reside in other portions of the Dominion. After the premier had laboured hard to prove the ownership of those lands belong to the Dominion, stating that on the ground of public policy they should be retained in the Dominion, he has practically admitted the justice of the claim of the people of the west to those lands by providing in this Bill for compensation for the same. If they purchased those lands and paid $300-000, why purchase them the second time, paying $1.50 an acre, and especially since he maintains that that is nothing like what they are worth? It is impossible to tell exactly their financial value; but in setting aside some 25,000,000 acres of land at $1.50 an acre, when the ex-Minister of the Interior has stated that the school lands alone, some 50,000,000 acres, would be worth at least $3 an acre, you can easily see that the provinces do not get sufficient compensation for withholding their lands from them.

Now, the Prime Minister appeared to be very solicitous of public sentiment in the west saying that he could not grant the request of the people of Manitoba for an extension of its boundaries westward against the wishes of the people who reside in the territories. But he was not so careful of public opinion when he denied to them the ownership of their lands, nor did he consult their wishes when he decided to impose upon them a school system which may in years to come prove entirely unsatisfactory to them. He does not even allow them the option of saying how those schools shall be maintained; but under the provisions of this Bill he decides that the two systems shall receive an equitable share of public money in such a manner as not to discriminate between them. Now, as a layman, I can see practically no difference between the amended and the original clauses. It is true that the ex-Minister of the Interior, with fine sarcasm at the expense of the Minister of Justice, read into the original clause 16 a much different meaning to that which he attaches to the amended clause. Of course, he was having a drive at his late colleague, the Minister of Justice, through a draughtsman; though, as any person could see, it was not even necessary to read between the lines to know who the ex-Minister of the Interior meant by this particular draughtsman. Here are his words:

> But I am bound to say, Mr. Speaker, that when my hon. friend the Minister of Justice employed a draughtsman to draw this clause, with instructions to maintain only the existing state of affairs in the Northwest Territories, the draughtsman either wholly misunderstood his instructions or he possessed the most remarkable faculty for covering things which were not covered by his instructions.

Well, every member from the Northwest Territories was going to agree with the Minister of Justice prior to the advent of the ex-Minister of the Interior upon the scene. They saw no objection to that original clause 16, every man of them was going to support it until their hands were forced by the return of the ex-Minister of the Interior. According to the ex-Minister of the Interior, the original clause, no matter how inefficiently those separate schools might be carried on, even if religious teaching was made the primary feature of the schools and secular education the secondary feature, no matter how inferior those schools might turn out to be, they were entitled to share and share alike with the public schools

out of the proceeds of the sales of the public lands and all other moneys granted for educational purposes. Is this an evidence of the tolerance that the right hon. gentleman spoke about in his introductory speech? Is this all the confidence he has in the people inhabiting the Northwest Territories? What evidence have they ever given that they will not deal justly, and even generously, with minorities in that country? The right hon. gentleman is quite willing to consult their wishes when he thinks those wishes are in accord with his own; but he is not willing to be guided by their desires when they run counter to his own views. He does follow out their wishes when he refuses Manitoba's request for an extension of her boundaries, but he will not be bound by them when they ask for public lands, and he considers it the essence of statesmanship when he refuses them the right to say what their school system shall be, and denies them what the British North America Act evidently intended they should have, namely, the sole control of their educational affairs. If the right hon. gentleman desired an evidence of public sentiment in the Territories on educational matters, if he was in quest of that pillar of cloud by day and that pillar of fire by night to show him the way and to give him the light, to use his own simile, let him look at the history of separate schools in that country, and he will find that, notwithstanding the fact that the Northwest Territories Act was passed in 1875 permitting the establishment of separate schools in that country, there exists to-day but about ten separate schools to nearly 1,100 public schools. What greater evidence could he desire or require as to the public sentiment of that country regarding the character of the school system they desire? And, Sir, what avail is it to resurrect the mouldy speeches of the Hon. George Brown, of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie and of the Hon. Edward Blake, to prove what those gentlemen had in their minds when they incorporated that provision in the Northwest Territories Act, stating that they wished intending immigrants to know what kind of schools they were going to have in that country, when I venture to say that not one man in 5,000 who have gone into that country to make homes for themselves ever asked the question whether there were separate schools there. The only question agitating them was: What educational facilities are there for giving my children a good common school education? A proof of this is found in the fact that, notwithstanding that the Act permitting separate schools has been in existence thirty years, there is a diminishing number of separate schools and a rapidly increasing number of public schools. In face of this experience and of this overwhelming public sentiment in the Northwest, the Prime Minister has incorporated a clause in this Act forcing upon those new provinces a school system that may or may not prove to their liking in the years to come.

Now, the ex-Minister of the Interior has stated that he is personally aware of the fact that people have taken the trouble to secure copies of the ordinance to see if there were separate schools in that country before going to make their homes there, leaving the impression that they would not have gone in there had they not been sure that there were separate schools in existence. If that is the case, I charge the ex-Minister of the Interior with having—whether deliberately or not, I will not say—misled the immigrants through his immigration literature that he has scattered broadcast in almost every civilized country of the globe, among people whom he wished to attract to this country; for I have hunted in vain for one single expression in that literature where there was any reference to a separate school system. On the contrary, as was shown by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) and the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy), it is distinctly stated in a pamphlet that has been distributed that the schools are non-sectarian, and national in their character—not a word about separate schools. The Minister of Finance stated that on his European tour he was in consultation with a certain representative of a foreign country who was very much agitated about the outcome of this separate school agitation in Canada, and the impresion he conveyed to the members of this House was that if there were no separate schools in the Northwest we would have very few immigrants from that country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in view of the speech made by the Minister of Finance the other evening, I think we would all be delighted to hear the character of the reply he made to that representative of a foreign country. I think if the hon. gentleman sends a copy of his speech over to that representative it will convey to that gentleman a vastly different impression from the impression he gave him in the reply which he gave, because I am sure he did not try to convince that representative that they had no separate schools in that country, where as his whole argument here was to convince us that there were practically no separate schools, that they were national schools, and that any difference there is would soon disappear. This policy, in my opinion, cannot be defended on legal grounds. The constitution of our country does not force us to perpetuate this system of schools contrary to the wishes of the people inhabiting that part of the Dominion. It is true that the right hon. leader of the government, when he introduced this Bill, based his sole argument upon the ground that he stood by and on the rock of the constitution, but by the time my hon. friend the leader of the opposition had got through with his speech in criticism of the speech of the

right hon. leader of the government there was nothing left of that constitutional argument. It was entirely demolished to the extent that his colleague the hon. the Minister of Finance, replying to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, threw up his hands, abandoned the constitutional argument and stated that he would not shield himself behind the constitution thereby giving a rebuke to his own leader; but, while admitting that there were no legal grounds for forcing these schools on the people of that western country, he asserted that we we were morally bound to perpetuate that system. We have had legal authorities quoted in this House. We have heard the opinion of Mr. Christopher Robinson, who backed up the opinion from the legal standpoint which was given by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. We have had other gentlemen eminent in their profession agreeing with the same opinion. It is only right and proper for me to say that there was another hon. gentleman who particularly laid down a different opinion in his most emphatic manner and with the same assurance that usually characterizes all the utterances of that hon. gentleman in the House. I refer to the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). That opinion is deserving of all the respect it is entitled to. In the face of that high legal opinion I imagined that I saw the right hon. leader of the government sitting down and penning a letter like another similar letter written to a political supporter of his within six months after he was called to the premiership. I imagine that I saw the right hon. gentleman writing a letter in these words: My Dear Oliver,—Perhaps the lieutenant governorship of the province of Alberta will be at my disposal by the 1st of July, 1905. If between now and then you are not appointed a judge for giving that constitutional opinion I promise to place the lieutenant governorship at your disposal. (Signed) Wilfrid Laurier. It may not be a judgeship, because I think as a usual thing they require a lawyer for a judgeship, but still there are premierships, lieutenant governorships and several other positions up there at the disposal of the right hon. gentleman and I will venture to say that so long as we have these positions dangling before the eyes of the hon. gentlemen opposite from the west, and especially the vacant portfolio of the Minister of the Interior, the boy who gives this Bill his thorough and emphatic support and swallows every clause that is in it, even at the expense of his convictions, is the one who is the most likely to receive the plum.

This is a Bill which I think cannot be defended on the grounds of public policy. The whole history of such agitations as this is directly contrary to that contention. It is contrary to the spirit of provincial rights and an unwarrantable interference with matters of purely provincial concern. Where are the gentlemen who were so loud with the shibboleth 'Hands off Manitoba' in 1896? Where are the gentlemen who were erstwhile defenders of provincial rights then? Are these gentlemen now the defenders of coercion? Where are these gentlemen who even went to the extent of doing away with the system of separate schools in Manitoba, although that system had been in existence for over twenty years, who thought they were doing their duty, who thought they were within their jurisdiction, who denied the right of this government to dictate to the people of Manitoba what their educational policy should be and who held that the people of Manitoba should work out their own salvation as far as educational affairs are concerned? Where are the gentlemen who journeyed from platform to platform stirring up the prejudices of the people in that country not only against the Dominion government, but also against the principle of separate schools as being antediluvian and contrary to western ideas? Where are those who even journeyed beyond the confines of the province of Manitoba? The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) was premier of the province of Manitoba and it was under his government that these schools were wiped out of existence, though to do him justice I must say that it was a stronger man who dictated this policy to him—the Hon. Joseph Martin, attorney general at that time—but still he followed the hon. Joseph's lead and the schools were abolished. Where is the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior, for he it was who journeyed to the constituency of Haldimand, travelling some 1,500 miles not only to gain the sympathy and support of the people of Haldimand in Manitoba's fight for provincial rights, but also to try and induce the electors of the constituency of Haldimand to cast their votes against the then government and its representative, Dr. Montague, who was seeking re-election at a by-election as Minister of Agriculture ? The hon. ex-Minister of the Interior went into the constituency of Haldimand and put before the people our separate school policy and our National School Act, much to the detriment of the former, and asked their sympathy and support and votes for the then candidate who was opposing the government. Let their followers from Manitoba explain, for several of them occupy seats in this House today who occupied seats in the local legislature at that time and who then sought to maintain the right of the province to control their educational affairs. What evil days must these hon. gentlemen have fallen upon that they are now joining hands in forcing upon the people of the western country a school policy that may not be acceptable in the years that are to come.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are some extracts that I have culled, some choice gems from some of the speeches delivered by the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior on that

Haldimand tour, for recollect that while he journeyed down to the constituency of Haldimand he journeyed back again minus that scalp which he as a western brave sallied forth to secure. He made a speech of a violent character against the schools we had in the province of Manitoba and also appealed to the sympathy of the people of Haldimand on the ground of provincial rights. I desire to read to the House a few of these gems from a speech delivered by that hon. gentleman in the county of Haldimand as reported in the 'Globe.'

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Mr. Speaker. Before you left the chair at six o'clock, I was referring to the speech made by the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) at the town of Caledonia in the constituency of Haldimand in the year 1895. I shall quote from the report in the 'Globe' of April 15, of that year. I do not read these extracts from the speech of the ex-minister (Mr. Sifton) with the idea of lending my endorsation to them, but as one hon. member read extracts from the remarks of clergymen and public men in the United States to show they were not entirely satisfied with the school system of that country, it may be well to hear what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) has to say about the separate schools as they existed in Manitoba. Some of these gentlemen in the United States, although their remarks apply to a condition of things said to exist over twenty years ago, were represented as having said that the public schools in that country were hot beds of immorality. As I have said, I do not lend my endorsation to the remarks which I shall quote from the hon. member (Mr. Sifton), because it so happens that in my constituency there was not a single separate school existing prior to the abolition of separate schools in Manitoba, and personally I cannot speak from experience. We were told by a gentleman on the other side of the House, that the statement as to the clergy of the province of Quebec interfering in elections was a mere myth, a figment of the imagination. However, that may be, I shall quote from the present member for Brandon, the ex-Minister of the Interior and ex-attorney general of his province, as to what his opinion was. I may say that the hon. gentleman made this speech when he occupied the responsible position of attorney general of Manitoba, and as we know he has a great deal of experience in connection with educational affairs, because he told us so himself the other day. Some of these expressions are very harsh, but I must inflict them upon the House in order that hon. gentlemen opposite may form their own opinion on the merits of the separate school system as it existed in Manitoba, from the words of one of their own friends. Mr. Sifton said:

> Catholics made false returns of school population to get large grants from the government.

A pretty serious accusation that.

> They conducted their schools in a manner that would be a disgrace to any civilized country. The priests and the Catholic clergy connected with their orders were their teachers.

I regret the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) is not present, because when he spoke he took great pride in the fact that the clergy were the teachers in so many of these schools in the province of Quebec, stating that a great deal of the good derived from the schools in that province, and the high standard of education there was due to clerical influence. Evidently the ex-minister (Mr. Sifton) had a different impression as to the character of the teaching done by clergymen of the Roman Catholic church in Manitoba, for he said:

> Schools sometimes were kept open only two or three weeks, sometimes two days in the week, while these priests drew their money as teachers. This, he said, was a common thing.

In other words, according to the Minister of the Interior, these priests seemed more anxious to get the educational fund and to pocket it than they were to educate the children by keeping the schools open five days a week. Mr. Sifton goes on to say:

> The system followed was no system at all. As a result people who grew up in districts where separate schools existed were in a state of absolute ignorance and illiteracy.

Pretty hard language in reference to these schools that were so lauded by some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. Mr. Sifton continues:

> It is a notorious fact that in Manitoba, in districts where the people are French and Roman Catholic and where this system of schools has been in existence for twenty years, that it is a rare thing to find a person who can read and write.

And still the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) spoke about the great proportion of the prizes being carried off at St. Boniface by pupils of separate schools of Roman Catholic institutions, in competition with their Protestant brethren there. Evidently, the ex-minister does not look upon separate schools in as favourable a light when he says it is a rare thing to find a person who can either read or write where these schools have been in existence for twenty years. Mr. Sifton further said:

> He could show the audience a petition which came in from the reeve of a Roman Catholic municipality in which six councillors of the municipality made their signatures by putting crosses, and to which only one could sign his name. When it was proposed in the legislature to require by municipal law that the reeve and councillors should be compelled to read and

write, a gentleman who represented a constituency almost exclusively French and Roman Catholic stood up in the legislature and said that if the Bill became law, in his constituency persons could not be found who could qualify for the office of reeve or councillor.

A pretty sweeping assertion, that if a Bill compelling municipal councillors to be able to read and write were to pass the legislature there would not be sufficient men in his district who could qualify for office. Mr. Sifton continued :

Under this system public money went direct to the clergy of the Roman Catholic church. They did practically what they liked with it, conducted their schools or not as they saw fit, with the result that the people grew up in absolute illiteracy. Money was used for the purposes of the church and not for education. He lauded the Public School Act, and supported one system of schools where there should be no distinction between one man and another, when the law should know no man's religion but give each and every one the same privilege.

And still the hon. member (Mr. Sifton) stated the other day in this House, that he would give his approbation to this Bill though it was opposed to his conscientious convictions and his past record. Now he is going to inflict separate schools on the people of the new western provinces which will cause this division between the child of one man and the child of another, and will not give each and every one the same privilege. The report of Mr. Sifton's remarks continues :

He said that if the Roman Catholic people were left alone, if the priests of Quebec would leave them alone, inside of three or four years they would accept the public school system.

Does the ex-Minister of the Interior not think that the same might occur in the new provinces of the west, and that if these people are left alone they would be just as apt to accept the public school system there as in the province of Manitoba ? Apparently, the ex-minister thinks that not only the priests of Manitoba but the priests of Quebec interfere in educational matters outside their own provinces.

He accused the Conservative government, in passing the remedial order, of buying the votes of the province of Quebec.

What a very high estimate the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) had of the people of Quebec. There was a Conservative government doing what they thought they were obliged to do by the order of the highest court in the realm, and this hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) states, that the Conservative government in doing what it believed to be its duty were simply buying up the votes of the people of Quebec. Mr. Sifton further says :

The people of the Red River when they came into confederation never asked for separate schools ; never wanted them, and that the clause in the Bill sent to Ottawa demanding them was fraudulently put there by the clergy of the Roman Catholic church.

Evidently the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) has no great love for the clergy of the Roman Catholic church, nor has he that high opinion of the clerical school system that the hon. member for Labelle has. Dr. Montague was the candidate in Haldimand when this speech was made, and the report states :

Mr. Sifton asked why Dr. Montague took such an interest in this matter ? It is because the Roman Catholic clergy are a well organized body and because they have a political influence in Canada which is not to be sneezed at.

Language more forcible than polite I admit, but still when hon. gentlemen opposite claim that the clergy of Quebec never had any influence, never tried to exercise that influence in political matters, the ex-Minister of the Interior states that they are a well-organized body and that they have a political influence in Canada that is not to be sneezed at. He goes on still further :

During the last hundred years you will find that wherever a constitutional Act was prepared of an organizing character, you will find that something is drawn which indicates the hand of the clergy is there. The language may be the language of the Canadian politician, but in every case the voice is the voice of the church.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have before us today a measure of an organizing character, creating two new provinces out of these vast territories in western Canada. Is it to be believed that this is the sole exception that has taken place in 100 years in which the clergy's hand has not been seen ? I wonder if the Minister of the Interior were he to mentally recall those utterances of his in 1895 when he said that during the last 100 years there has not been a single instance where anything of an organizing character has taken place that the hand of the clergy has not been seen would claim, if he were to speak according to his honest convictions that the same thing is not occurring at the present day. He went on :

If the people of Canada approve of the Act of the government it means that the Roman Catholic church of the province of Quebec can practically get anything they like from the government of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I would commend these utterances to the right hon. gentleman who leads this House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and if he can find in them that spirit of tolerance and Christian charity of which he spoke, if he can find in them that broad-mindedness that soaring to the very pinnacle of statesmanship, that breadth of mind and desire to discuss questions of this character with the object of promoting peace and harmony of which he spoke, then I will attribute to him a great deal more perception than I possess, but I must confess that I believe he himself will be in need of that pillar of cloud by day and pillar of fire by night to show him the way and give him the light. The ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr.

Sifton) is not the only gentleman who took strong ground against interference in provincial matters of this character and in favour of a national as against a separate school system. There is our friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) who is reported in the Halifax 'Chronicle' in March 6, 1896, as speaking at Windsor in the following words——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is that the present Minister of Finance ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The present Minister of Finance, then premier of Nova Scotia.

In Manitoba they have prescribed exercises which contain nothing that ought to be objectionable to any body of Christians, and if there are, means can no doubt be found to remove the cause of complaint without Dominion interference. Why should we not believe that Manitoba will be reasonable in this matter ? The Manitobans are not African savages.

Why cannot we trust the people in the new provinces of the west ? Neither are they African savages. They are dominated by the same spirit of fairness and justice as the people of Manitoba. He goes on :

I will venture the statement that the true interests of the Roman Catholic citizens of Manitoba will be better advanced by the policy of conciliation than by the policy of coercion. This Remedial Bill that the government are trying to enforce upon an unwilling parliament, even if it should pass, cannot settle the question. It would be an attack on——

On what ?

——an attack on provincial rights. . . . . If the Roman Catholics are ever to obtain a solution of this question which is worth having they must obtain it through the good will of the majority of the people of the province to which they belong.

And if the hon. gentleman were to speak his conscientious sentiments he would state equally to-day that the people of the west, the Roman Catholic citizens of the new provinces in the west, will have a better chance to secure their rights and all their privileges through the good will of the majority of those who will people that part of the Dominion. But the hon. gentleman goes on further :

I ask the people of Hants county and the people of Nova Scotia to stand by the principle of free schools in the case of Manitoba, just as they would stand by it in their own province. . . . . We in Nova Scotia know the value of a system of free public schools. We have shown in the past that while we may differ on many questions we are practically a unit in support of that system. . . . . If the Dominion authorities should attempt to interfere with our school system, if they should attempt to impose on this province the system which they are trying to force on Manitoba, we would expect to have the sympathy of the friends of free schools elsewhere, and we would expect the people of the western provinces to give us their sympathy and support in such a condition. Let us to-day give them our hearty support in the struggle until we find that they are not amenable to reason.

Then he goes on to give credit to Sir Charles Tupper for the Nova Scotia school law and he says :

What can we say of the position of that gentleman to-day, who instead of standing up as the champion of a free school system, and resisting those who attack it, scrambled into parliament——

In what manner ? Why here is another gentleman testifying to clerical influence which the hon. gentlemen opposite say is all a myth. According to the present Minister of Finance Sir Charles Tupper was scrambling into parliament

——through the unfair influence of the Roman Catholic pulpits of the county of Cape Breton, and is now devoting the evening of his life to the work of destroying the free school system of Manitoba and forcing upon that province a system which he would not dare to attempt to force upon the province of Nova Scotia.

And yet the hon. gentleman is to-day voting,—I think against his own conscience —to impose upon the people of the western provinces a system of schools that may turn out equally objectionable in those new provinces in the future.

In a letter addressed to the 'Casket' on March the 14th, 1896 the same hon. gentleman states :

Only as a last resort and when every other possible method of settlement has failed can there be any justification for federal interference in the educational affairs of any province in the Dominion.

Again in a letter to the same paper dated April 4th, 1896, he says :

The uproar is upon us ; already the blaze of religious strife has been kindled and is being vigourously fanned every day by the efforts to coerce Manitoba.

And now they are doing the same thing themselves only they are sugar-coating that word 'coercion' which was so bitter to their taste in 1896.

Again on March 6, speaking at Windsor he stated :

I believe that the people of Manitoba if left alone will settle this question for themselves. Why should we not believe this ? We know from our own experience in the maritime provinces that it has been found possible to maintain a free school system and to administer it so as to make it acceptable to the people of every class and creed. We hear no complaint of the Nova Scotia school law. The Manitoba school system is practically the same as the Nova Scotia.

And yet the hon. gentleman told us the other day that to-day if not by law by practice they are practically in the enjoyment of separate schools in Halifax, and in some parts of Nova Scotia, to a greater ex-

tent than under the school system of the Northwest Territories. These schools were secured through the good will of the majority and when the hon. gentleman was asked a pertinent question by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) why we should not expect the same result in the new provinces of the west he states: Possibly so, but when 41 per cent of the population have a suspicion that they may not get that fairness it is only right we should respond to their demands. In other words 59 per cent of the population have to be governed by the wishes of the other 41 per cent.

The ex-Minister of the Interior is not in accord with the Prime Minister on his constitutional argument. He states that he largely agrees with the views of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) but still he is going to support the Bill. In fact he has stated that the whole question should be left to the provinces. On page 3256 of 'Hansard' he is reported as follows:

> But for my part I have no hesitation in saying what my own opinion would be. It would be that the province ought to be left entirely free to deal with its own educational affairs.

This was the opinion expressed by that hon. gentleman, but still he is not going to carry it into effect by voting against this Bill. He went further:

> I am convinced it would be better for the Roman Catholic people of the Northwest Territories if the legislature were left absolutely free.

And again:

> I do not think they would be able to convince me that it would not be better that the legislature of the Northwest Territories should be free.

If the hon. gentleman desires to be consistent and vote according to the convictions he thus expressed, would he not oppose this clause which is not going to leave the people of the Territories free to deal with this matter? Why should he set up one policy to be carried into effect in his own province and a diametrically opposite one to be carried out in the new provinces? If he had changed his opinion, if he had been converted, as the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) has been with regard to the land clause, if he had conscientiously recanted his old time convictions, he might have an excuse, but he has not. What therefore is the reason he gives boldly and unblushingly in the presence of this free parliament why he is going to support the Bill. Did he take any high moral ground? Well, this House can judge for itself. This is the ground he took:

> I came to the conclusion that whatever anybody else might do, my course is perfectly clear. I should, when this question came up, be in a position to speak with the freedom with which a member of the government could not speak, and I should be called on to decide to what extent and how far I would be prepared to compromise opinions which I had publicly expressed, and opinions which I still hold, in order not to destroy——

What?

> ——in order not to destroy the government of which I have been a member.

Here we have the secret—party exigencies. It is on that high moral plane that the hon. gentleman is going to support this Bill. He went on:

> That question which comes to every man in public life sooner or later comes to-day to a good many men in this House of Commons. The question is how far a man is justified in compromising his opinion for the purpose of preventing a political crisis.

How very solicitous the hon. gentleman was about precipitating on this country a political crisis! He followed in the wake of his colleague, the Minister of Finance. That hon. gentleman was aghast at the idea of the leader of the opposition being called upon to form a government, because that government would have to be, according to him, a Protestant government, and then the country would go to the bow-wows entirely. Mr. Speaker, I think that is an insult to our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. It is an insult to them to imagine that the leader of the opposition could not get any one of that faith to come in and form a government with him simply because he desired to leave to the new provinces the entire control of their educational system.

The hon. member for Edmonton told us that all the petitions which have been coming here for the past month, the meetings that have been held, the resolutions that have been passed, were simply for the purpose of creating political party capital. I would ask him if the Toronto 'Globe' is so solicitous for the welfare of the Conservative party that it is opposing this Bill. I will give that newspaper the credit no matter how much it has tried to trim since, it did at one time take the proper ground and stand for the old landmark of provincial rights which Liberals advocated in the years gone by. Surely the hon. gentleman does not mean to say that the Toronto 'Globe' is animated solely with the desire of putting a Conservative government into office. The whole independent press, almost without exception, are condemning the government on account of this Bill. And what about all these strong old time Liberals which the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) called renegade Liberals because they happened not to see eye to eye with the leader of the government and his colleagues in this matter. Is Mr. T. C. Robinette, of Toronto, who was a candidate in Toronto Centre at the last general election, and who would be candidate at the next election in that riding, were the government not afraid to test public opinion there,—is Mr.

Robinette animated by a desire to see his own party defeated and replaced by a Conservative administration ? And what about Mr. Willison, the biographer of the leader of the government, his strong admirer and life long friend ? Is he taking the public platform against this measure simply because he is animated by a sudden zeal in the interests of the Conservative party ? Is Mr. Thomson, King's Counsel, also taking the platform in the interests of the Conservative party ? And Mayor Urquhart and all those other gentlemen who are members of the Libral party—are they animated by a like motive ? Oh, but say some hon. gentlemen opposite, they have been misled. These intelligent gentlemen, equally as intelligent as any to be found in the Liberal ranks, just as intelligent as the hon. member for Edmonton and the hon. member for Ottawa and the hon. member for West Assiniboia—these gentlemen we are told have been misled. But surely they will not accuse the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) with having been misled when he got up and denounced this Bill. It may be, Mr. Speaker, that he spoke too soon but he none the less denounced the measure, and he has always given faithful support to this government ever since 1896, when he first entered the House. Surely he is not to be called a renegade Liberal or even a man who has been misled. Again look at the Laurier Club, composed of some of the brightest minds in the city of Toronto, which passed resolutions condemning this measure. Are we to be told that that club was animated by a desire to benefit the Conservative party ? Then we have the Indian Head Liberal Association passing a resolution which was read here the other evening by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) in which they condemn, not the original clause, but the amended clauses. The resolution reads as follows :

> We, the members of the Indian Head Liberal Association desire to enter a protest against the educational clause in the Autonomy Bill, believing that such is an interference with provincial rights. The clause, as amended by the compromise Bill now before parliament, does not in our opinion contain any modification of what we believe to be an infringement of our rights as a province, and for this reason we emphatically protest against the Bill as remodelled.

Copies of this were sent to the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Hon. Clifford Sifton and R. S. Lake, M.P.. This association is composed of gentlemen who live in the constituency of Mr. Bulyea, a member of the territorial executive. All the ministerial associations in almost every province in the Dominion have been heard and they are all in the same language, and many of these who signed the petitions and signified their protests, never gave a Conservative vote in their lives. Still they are out doing what they believe to be in the best interests of education and of the western people. Was the legislature of British Columbia also animated in the interests of the Conservative party when they passed a resolution the other day unanimously condemning the Bill, and asking that educational affairs be left entirely to the new provinces ? I do not know whether the members from British Columbia in this House are going to be guided by this expression of opinion, but I do know that in the local legislature of British Columbia the parties are almost equally divided, the government having only three or four of a majority. And this resolution passed that House unanimously and without a single adverse criticism :—

> This House regrets that in the Bill submitted to the Dominion parliament granting autonomy to the Northwest Territories there is an interference with provincial rights in regard to the provisions dealing with their school question.

The ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) states that there is a vast difference between the amendment and the original clause. As a layman I fail to see the difference. Those schools are to be maintained, under either clause, in much the same way. The original clause stipulated that all the moneys appropriated by the legislature and distributed as the proceeds of all sales of school lands shall be distributed in an equitable manner between the separate and the public schools.

The amended clause reads that all the funds arising for school purposes—which includes the proceeds of the Dominion lands and all appropriated by the legislature—shall be distributed without discrimination, that is, shall be distributed in an equitable manner. It is simply a change of the wording without any change of the meaning, so far as I can see, and so far as many other hon. gentlemen, much more conversant with the meaning of legal phraseology than I am, can see. But if the ex-Minister of the Interior takes that view, what view have they in the province of Quebec, as shown by some of their leading party journals ? I will read from 'Le Canada' of a couple of weeks ago an article in which great credit is taken for the Prime Minister for standing to his guns and not compromising, but insisting upon obtaining for their people exactly what he sought to get in the first place :

> In virtue of the Laurier law, the minority will conserve :
> 1. The separate schools.
> 2. Religious instruction.
> 3. Its share of the taxes.
> In addition the minority will have the benefit of section 93 of the British North America Act. The organic law of 1875 contained no such protection, and in truth, a guarantee of a system of separate schools without the insertion of section 93 is illusory. If in the future the legislature should pass a spoilatory law, abolishing the rights of the minority, the minority will have these powers :
> 1. An appeal to the courts.

2. An appeal to the Governor General in Council for remedial legislation.
3. The process of disallowance.

Then it goes on :

Some people supposed Sir Wilfrid Laurier would recede as a result of the clamour raised on this question by the fanatics; but he remains firm to the original proposal and is giving the legislation which he at first announced.

So, Mr. Speaker, you can exactly see the game. It is the old game of 1896—in the province of Quebec the cry will be that Sir Wilfrid, one of their co-religionists and compatriots, has protected their rights ; he has not given way at all ; the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) successfully concealed the intended meaning of the law even from the expert eyes of the Minister of the Interior. On the other hand, Mr. Sifton and his colleagues from the west will go to the people there and point out that the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), brave man that he was, clapped a pistol to the head of his leader and compelled him to yield on clause 16, though the Minister of Justice had successfully deluded all the western members, yet, when the ex-Minister of the Interior appeared on the scene, his shrewd eyes detected what the Minister of Justice desired to incorporate in the clause, and made them remedy it, making amendments in accordance with his views. I say it is the old game of 1896 played over again—one cry in one province and an entirely different cry in another province.

Now, I was somewhat surprised to hear the hon. gentlemen on the other side from the province of Quebec praising this measure, considering that they were the great sticklers for provincial rights in days gone by. Only a few years ago a Bill was introduced in this House to create a Dominion medical council. The object was to allow our medical practitioners to appear before the council and boards of examiners that would allow them the privilege of practising in any province of the Dominion without being compelled to submit to an examination in the respective provinces. One result of this would have been that we should have had the privilege of practising without registration in the motherland, a privilege that is now denied us, because we have no degree for the Dominion of Canada. It was provided in this Bill that whenever five or more provinces passed legislation concurring with this Bill the measure should become law. And whence arose the opposition that prevented the passing of the Bill in that form ? Why, from these hon. gentlemen from the province of Quebec, who took strong grounds against the measure, because, as they contended, it was an invasion of provincial rights. They were so jealous of their provincial rights, they were so desirous that no one should practise in their province without passing their provincial examination, that they stood in the breach and compelled the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to recede from the position he originally took and to cause the Bill to be amended so as to provide that it should not become law until every province in the Dominion had passed concurrent legislation. And since then, it is this province of Quebec that has stood in the breach and prevented this concurrent legislation being passed. Every other province in the Dominion has either passed the legislation approving this Bill or has expressed its willingness to do so—Quebec is the only one that refuses. And its ground for refusal is simply that the Bill would interfere with their provincial rights. And yet this is the province whose representatives are refusing provincial rights to the new provinces in the west.

The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott), in the course of his speech on Friday evening last, took occasion to congratulate—and properly so—the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) upon his excellent speech. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle certainly distinguished himself, both in matter and in manner, and made a speech which was a credit to himself and to those who were wise to select him as their representative. Therefore, the hon. member for West Assiniboia was wholly justified in the compliment he paid. But before he had finished his compliment—though not wishing to be at all uncharitable to the hon. gentleman—it appeared that he desired to pay himself a compliment, and took this method of preparing that compliment for my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle and then politely handing it to himself. I do not know whether I have formed a wrong impression, but I will read the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) and leave the House to judge :

If it would not be presumptuous on my part to say so, I would congratulate the House, I would congratulate the Northwest and particularly I would congratulate our hon. friends opposite upon their acquisition of that hon. gentleman, who was elected last November to represent the district of Qu'Appelle. Of course, I do not quite agree with every one of the sentiments expressed by that hon. gentleman ; but I will say this for him, that he made the class of speech that friends of the Northwest Territories desired to be made before this question of provincial autonomy was determined, and before the details and terms were determined ; it was the class of speech which the true friend of the Northwest felt it proper to make and——

And here are the words to which I have referred :

——just the class of speech I have made myself the first session I came into this parliament.

If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) made that class of speech when he first came into this parliament, I am sorry to say that he has greatly deteriorated in his latter-day utterances. For, if any one has taken the

trouble to look up 'Hansard' during the last parliamentary term, or any one who has listened to the hon. gentleman when he has, time and again, made the most unwarranted personal attacks, especially upon the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler), who is to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) the proverbial red rag to the bull, he cannot but feel that the hon. gentleman has fallen far below the high standard which he tells us he assumed when he came into this House.

Mr. SPROULE. He was throwing bouquets at himself.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. And they were not petrified bouquets either. We have not to go further than the hon. gentleman's speech of last Friday to prove the accuracy of my statement that the hon. gentleman has fallen away from the high standard which he says at one time was his. We who had the privilege of listening to the hon. gentleman on Friday will realize the very severe and uncalled for, not to say unkind and utterly unwarranted, attack which he made upon the Prime Minister of the Northwest Territories. He could scarcely say anything too bad of that hon. gentleman. He called him a rank partisan, and said he was guilty of the grossest misrepresentation ever indulged in in the whole Dominion of Canada. This hyperbole—let us call it, though rather a mild term to express our feelings—gives one an idea of how the hon. gentleman has fallen away from the standard which, he says, was his early in his parliamentary career.

But the leader of the opposition also came in for criticism of a most unfair kind in connection with his speech of last Friday. Not only was the hon. gentleman unfair to the premier of the Territories, but he was most unfair in garbling the utterances of the leader of the opposition. The leader of the opposition had taken a certain stand on the land clause, he took the position that these lands should be handed over to the new provinces, that they should be administered by the new provinces in the interest of the people residing there, and he took up the argument used by the leader of the government and some other hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, contending that they should not hand these lands over, as it might interfere with the immigration policy of the Dominion government. Touching upon that question, the leader of the opposition spoke as follows:

> Are they not the people chiefly interested? May we not rightly conclude that if these lands are handed over to them they will so deal with them as to best conserve their own interests by forwarding and assisting a vigorous policy of immigration?

Now, the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) left out that portion of the sentence completely. He started in the middle of a sentence, and he finished before the end of the sentence, finished at a comma and tried to create a wrong impression, entirely contrary to that which the hon. leader of the opposition intended to convey to the members of this House. This is where the member for West Assiniboia began the quotation:

> May I not further suggest that even if there were any danger—and I do not think there is—it would be the task of good statesmanship to have inserted, if necessary, a provision in this Bill with regard to free homesteads and the prices of these lands,——

Now, there is a comma, that is where the member for West Assiniboia stopped, and he did not quote the following words which I will now read:

> ——and obtain to it the consent of the people of the Northwest Territories.

Had he quoted that last portion of the sentence it would have done away with the force of his argument. He tried to make out that this expression on the part of the leader of the opposition was an infringement and a gross violation of provincial rights. But had he included the latter expression, 'and obtain the consent of the people of the Northwest Territories,' of course it would have taken away entirely the ground for his contention. And mark you, Mr. Speaker, this is the gentleman who is aspiring to the vacant portfolio of the Minister of the Interior. The member for West Assiniboia has stated in this House and in public meetings that he was opposed to the autonomy before the Canadian Pacific Railway tax-exemption was finally settled; and I am credibly informed that, either at Moosejaw or Medicine Hat, during the last campaign, he stated that he would vote against an Autonomy Bill unless, before that measure was produced, the question of the tax exemption of the Canadian Pacific Railway was entirely settled, that it would be dangerous on the part of the Dominion to grant autonomy to the Territories before that question had been finally adjudicated by the Privy Council. Now, has that question been finally passed upon? It is true that it has passed through the courts of Manitoba, it is true that there has been an appeal to the Supreme Court, and the decision of the Manitoba courts has been reversed; but it still has to run the gauntlet of the Privy Council, and we know how frequently Supreme Court decisions are overthrown by the Privy Council. Still this question is not settled, it is still open for decision, and the member for West Assiniboia is giving his hearty endorsation and support to this Bill in face of the pledges he made to his electors on this question.

Now, I have here some quotations from the hon. gentleman's own paper, and I will read from the Regina 'Leader' of October 22, 1903. This paper is edited by the hon. gentleman himself. I find that the hon. gentleman writing from Ottawa, no doubt

with his own pen, sent the following communication to his paper:

He explained the effect of the Manitoba Supreme Court judgment given in March last upon the Canadian Pacific Railway tax exemption cases, which left all Canadian Pacific Railway lands and property in the Northwest Territories liable to school taxation as long as the area was not a province—a right of taxation which would not exist to-day had a province or provinces been created. Until this judgment was confirmed or upset by the Privy Council, Mr. Scott failed to see how the Northwest could afford to accept autonomy.

Then again on November 12 in an editorial of the Regina 'Leader' I find the following extract:

If the cases were finally settled there would no longer be a reason for delay. Until the cases are finally determined, final settlement of the autonomy question will remain a matter of practical impossibility. But the people of the Northwest contend that the new provinces must not be handicapped with any such tax exemption provisions. We contend that when erecting the province parliament must negotiate with the company for abrogation of the rights to exemption guaranteed to it by its contract. Now does any sane person think that parliament is in as good a position to enter into negotiations now with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the abrogation of the exemption rights, as parliament will occupy after the test cases are finally settled if the Manitoba Supreme Court's judgment be upheld by the Privy Council.

The hon. gentleman was very staunch in the month of November, 1903, in his opposition to autonomy being granted to the provinces at all until this Canadian Pacific Railway tax exemption case was entirely out of the way and settled by a decision of the Privy Council. To-day he is supporting this Bill, and that question still remains unsettled. The hon. gentleman also took strong grounds in days gone by in favour of one province. He spoke strongly in favour of one province, he has written strongly in favour of one province, and to-day he is voting in favour of two provinces. For he states on page 3751:

I may be permitted to say that I was myself quite strongly in favour of the proposition that only one province should be created ; and even yet, looking at the question purely from the local and territorial point of view, I can see no reason why one government, one legislature, one set of machinery, should not have been sufficient for that territory.

Still he is voting for a Bill that provides for two provinces. He also took exception to the boundaries; he claimed that the present eastern boundary of the district of Alberta should have been the dividing line. That is not the dividing line under this Bill, but he is supporting the Bill with all the enthusiasm at his disposal. And, Mr. Speaker, while he is doing this he is calling the premier of the Territories, Mr. Haultain, a rabid partisan because he advocates the very same things, and because he has been consistent enough to maintain his position. The hon. member for West Assiniboia also took strong ground in the past in favour of having the land retained by the provinces or handed over to the provinces; he took that ground in the year 1901, as quoted in 'Hansard' in the following words:

If the proper principle is adhered to, if the principle of absolute equality is observed, if parliament places the new provinces upon an equitable basis of local government, giving a proper grant for the government, also a per capita subsidy, and what may be shown to be due as a debt allowance, they will be put in possession of the public resources, lands, timber and minerals in the same way as the other provinces were put in possession of these resources.

Here was a strong expression of that hon. gentleman in favour of having all the lands handed over to the provinces. And what does he give as a reason for changing his opinion in this regard ? He says that owing to his youth and inexperience he gave voice to opinion which was looked at in 1905 as an inaccuracy, that, as a matter of fact these other provinces were not put in possession, but they merely retained possession of their own lands. Then, he says :

These other provinces are not put in possession, but left in possession of these resources. Very young members sometimes fall into inaccuracies.

The hon. gentleman evidently has not got over his youth or he would not play the part of a weathercock politician being wafted hither and thither by every speech that is made in this House. We want a strong man at the head of the Department of the Interior. We do not want a man who is changing his opinions every day. The hon. gentleman states that he has changed his opinion on this question and he gives as his reason that he was influenced by the speeches made by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). Now, he has been speaking on public platforms in the past, he has been associated with his fellow westerners and he knew what their opinions were on this question. He has conversed with them in private and in public, but it only remains after these Bills are introduced and after he has listened to a couple of speeches in this House that were probably repeated to him in private on many occasions for the hon. gentleman to change his opinion. Under these auspices he gave utterance to the following statement in this parliament :

But I may say, that in 1901, when I made that statement, and even later, the principle found no general acceptance in this House or amongst any of the people east of the great lakes ; and my main purpose in uttering these words here was to try and impress upon the people of

eastern Canada the necessity of recognizing the right of possession or, at least, of a beneficial interest in the lands of the Northwest Territories by the people of these Territories.

In other words the hon. gentleman went forth as a missionary to instruct and to convert the people in the eastern provinces to his view-point as to this land question with the result that the hon. gentleman was converted himself. He is drawing rather a long bow when he says that these opinions found no general acceptance in this House because my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has given voice to these same opinions for years past. In his speeches in the west and in this House during all the years that this autonomy question has been discussed in parliament he has expressed his opinion in favour of handing these lands over to the provinces. If the hon. member for West Assiniboia has not stated, some other hon. gentlemen have stated that one reason why these lands should not be handed over to the new provinces is that they might be at the mercy of land speculators. Fancy under provincial management these lands being more likely to be exploited than if they were under the management of the ex-Minister of the Interior and his officials of recent years! Under provincial management would there have been 250,000 acres of wheat lands handed over to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company at $1 an acre?

When this matter was up in the House for debate that hon. gentleman was forced to admit that 150,000 of these 250,000 acres had been handed over practically illegally, because he did not know whether the conditions of settlement had been complied with or not. He admitted that there had been no inspection to see whether the settlers were on the land or not, and when he was pressed further he admitted that they had been handed over without his knowledge, without the knowledge of his deputy and without their consent and that when they found that out they gave orders that no more lands were to be handed over until an inspection had been made. After the horse was stolen they ordered the stable door to be locked. When pressed still further to state who had done this, what was his reply?—an official of the government; and when pressed still further to state what was that official's name, the ex-Minister of the Interior stated that he did not know. Fancy the responsible head of the department, responsible for all the transactions taking place under his administration finding out that 150,000 acres of land had been illegally handed over to a company without complying with the conditions—having beside him his deputy who was an official of the government—and never taking the trouble to inquire that official's name! Well, we are very gullible sometimes on this side of the House, but we are scarcely so gullible as to give credence to such a statement as that except in the parliamentary sense. I fancy that the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) who was at that time the Dominion Lands Commissioner might be able to explain who this official was who illegally handed over that 150,000 acres to this company. The hon. member for West Assiniboia, in his paper, the Regina 'Leader' of Thursday, May 29, 1902, after the election had taken place, used the following language in the form of a heading:

HAULTAIN ENDORSED

By the overwhelming majority of the electorate and given a most emphatic mandate. The people are in favour of one province—General administrative policy approved.

And so on.

Because the leader of the territorial government still maintains that there should be only one province and because he has seen fit to maintain his position in an open letter published in the country the hon. member for West Assiniboia says that he is a rank partisan. Speaking of the lands of the Northwest, the hon. member for West Assiniboia writes in the same issue of his paper:

The lesson of the election is very simple. The administration of the Northwest Territories is approved, and the policy of the executive is endorsed. The command of the electorate is 'as you were.' . . . As to the policy of the executive it is at present virtually confined to one question, that of the provincial status. Premier Haultain is returned to carry out the plan he submitted to the Dominion government and to the people of the Northwest. The plan is nothing new. Premier Haultain has been trying to carry it out for years. He has educated the people into the understanding of it and belief in it. All he has to do is to continue along the road he has been travelling for some time past. That is the road along which his followers have faithfully accompanied him and it is the direction to which he is pointed by the elections that have just taken place.

That hon. gentleman was evidently an ardent admirer of the premier of the Territories no longer ago that May 29, 1902, and later. One reason why that vicious personal attack was made upon Mr. Haultain the other night by the hon. member for Wet Assiniboia was that that hon. gentleman has not even to this day got over the castigation that he received on several platforms in the west at the hands of the premier of the Northwest Territories, and he desired in a measure to get even with that gentleman in parliament when that gentleman was not privileged to say a word to defend himself. In the same paper, of Mr. Haultain, whom he then lauded and whom he now calls a rank partisan, he writes as follows:

The country, therefore is to be congratulated that once again the Haultain administration

will be returned to power. We do not suppose the history of any country can show as much good achieved with such inadequate means, and so few mistakes made in the face of great difficulties as have characterized the Northwest government ever since Mr. Haultain has held the helm. The premier once said that if persons wanted to know his policy they would find it in the ordinances. That is true : but it also manifests itself elsewhere. Mr. Haultain may well tell any one seeking his policy to look around. The schools that dot our prairies are the pride of our towns ; the public works that are everywhere visible for the use, convenience and profit of the settlers ; an up-to-date agricultural department ; and the vigilant watch over the Northwest at Ottawa, all speak of a policy which the people of this country ought to be proud of and to this policy has to be added the statesmanlike proposals by which Mr. Haultain has continually urged we should reach the provincial status. Eye has not seen nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of any other man to conceive the good things Mr. Haultain claims as our right in regard to the matter of becoming a province.

Mr. Scott was so strongly in favour of Mr. Haultain then, that he wrote and spoke strongly in his support. To-day, Mr. Haultain maintains exactly the position he took in this Bill of rights of his and for which he received the endorsation of the electors of the west, but Mr. Scott is no longer supporting him. Which do you consider the rank partisan ; the man who sticks to his old-time policy, or the man who, because of party feelings has sunk his personal convictions and his past record, and who to-day supports a Bill that gives two provinces instead of one ; that does not fix the boundaries as the people of the Territories wished them to be fixed ; that refuses the new provinces the ownership of their public domain, and that takes away from these new provinces the control of education. As a usual thing, I do not read copious extracts, but I have on this occasion to borrow the habit from the member for West Assiniboia, because it is only right that the members of this House should have their memory refreshed as to the views held by the hon. gentleman on these questions a short time ago, and which are diametrically opposed to the views which he says he holds to-day. Mr. Scott continues :

No man in Canada has so thorough a grasp of the problem under consideration as Mr. Haultain. Step by step he has brought the Northwest to its present position. Territorial history since 1888—and fourteen years is no short period as political life goes—is his history. For the pressing of the negotiations with and possibly against the federal authorities, we want our strongest and best equipped man. Without doubt Haultain is such a man. He has the facts and the arguments at his finger ends, the subject is now almost part of himself. The people of the west have reason to be proud of their present premier.

Mark you, this is the language of the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) but a short time ago, and yet the other day we heard him use strong language against Mr. Haultain, simply because Mr. Haultain has seen fit to be consistent.

The people of the Northwest have reason to be proud of their present premier. Under him they have had good and economical and careful government. Largely under his direction a body of laws admirably suitable to new and therefore difficult conditions, have been framed bit by bit and without any violent or disturbing changes. He is fit to stand side by side with any of Canada's public men and ask no odds, as those who heard him in the debate with Premier Roblin at Indian Head last December well know. He is without question the man for the job, which is no light one.

This again is Mr. Scott's language. The other day the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) told us that he based his present action very largely on the fact that when the Northwest Territories Act was put through the House in 1875, the Hon. George Brown took a certain position which he proposed to follow. For instance, the hon. member for West Assiniboia said :

And George Brown who did not support the legislation ; what did he say ?

The moment this Act passed and the Northwest became part of the union, they came under the Union Act, and under the provisions with regard to separate schools.

In the face of that language, if the late Mr. Brown were still alive and had a seat in this House and were confronting the legislation which we have before us, what would he do ? Support the protection to minority rights ? Certainly. That therefore should I do even if I might be as violent an opponent of separate schools as Mr. Brown was.

It will be noticed that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) speaks out for the rights of the minority. What rights ? The rights they secured under the Act of 1875. But these are not the rights the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) is contending for, because he says the rights given the minority under the Act of 1875 have been whittled away by the Territorial government so that with one breath he contradicts what he say with another. The hon. gentleman takes the position that George Brown was in favour of these rights that were to be maintained for all time once they were crystallized into law, and he says that he takes the same ground as George Brown, but as a matter of fact the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) is only contending to-day for minority rights which he says are far less than were given to the minority under the Act of 1875. The hon. gentleman for West Assiniboia further says :

I believe—and the large majority of the people in the Northwest Territories that I have heard from since these proposals were brought down also believe—that provincial rights are being granted to them in the fullest sense in which they are enjoyed by any other province of Canada.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) has fallen into another youthful inaccuracy. Can he

point to any other province in the Dominion —save Ontario and Quebec and they only by reason of compact—can he point to any province in the Dominion that has not absolute control over its educational system. If he cannot point to any other such province, and I challenge him to do so, then what becomes of his contention that the new provinces are going to be placed in the same full enjoyment of provincial rights as any other province is in the Dominion of Canada. The hon. gentleman was also inaccurate when he said that the draft Bill of Mr. Haultain contained provisions that would have perpetuated ecclesiastical schools. Well, the framer of that draft Bill does not agree with the hon. member for West Assiniboia. The framer of that draft Bill meant that the British North America Act should apply which gives sole control to the provinces over educational affairs. When the hon. member (Mr. Scott), in order to suit his own party purposes, desires to read into that draft Bill a meaning that the framers of the Bill never intended it should have, he is taking a stand which he cannot maintain for one moment. Of course he is privileged to read into the draft Bill any ignorant meaning he may desire, but his doing so will not change the true intent of those who framed that clause. That clause was drafted, as I understand, under the guidance and direction of the premier of the Territories, and of the present Chief Justice Sifton and his then deputy, the present Judge Harvey. These gentlemen decided that the clause should be drafted so that the provinces should have absolute control over their educational affairs, and Mr. Haultain so interprets the clause to-day, and indeed it is the only sane interpretation it will bear. I do not wish to discuss this from a legal point of view, although my lay opinion might be equally as good as that of the member for West Assiniboia ; I simply give you the opinion of the leader of the Territorial Executive on the matter, who says that this draft Bill was framed in accordance with the desire of the people of the Territories to control their own educational affairs, and that it was sent down to the Ottawa government with that object in view. And, Sir, if that draft Bill had the meaning which the member for West Assiniboia attaches to it, how is it that the right hon. the Prime Minister, astute as he is, and now is it that the lynx-eyed Postmaster General did not discover such a meaning ? They are both legal gentlemen learned in the law, and yet it remained for the layman from West Assiniboia to read into the Territorial draft Bill a meaning that the Prime Minister of Canada and the Postmaster General failed to see. The member for West Assiniboia has stated that if he were one of the minority he would never consent to taking out of this Bill the guarantee of separate schools. In one breath the hon. gentleman states : We have practically no separate schools up there, it is a national school system. They have the same text books, the same qualifications for their teachers, the same inspection, nothing different at all except a separate school-house. And still he says :

I say, looking at the history of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, that if I were a member of the minority I would not consent to have the guarantee cut out,——

What guarantee ? For the rights of the legislation of 1875 which he stated George Brown contended would exist for all time to come once they were incorporated in the Act of 1875, or is it just the vestige that is left which according to his own language would disappear in a very short time if the guarantee were cut out.

——because I believe the time would come, and that not in the very far future, when the final vestige of the separate school would disappear.

He takes exactly the opposite ground from that taken by the hon. Minister of Finance because the Minister of Finance states that if this Bill becomes law the separate schools, the few there are, will disappear. That in effect is his argument and that is the impression made on this House. But the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) says that if this guarantee is cut out then the only vestige of separate schools which they have will disappear and that in the not distant future. The hon. gentleman has quoted very extensively from some comments made in the press in the Northwest Territories in order to prove to the members of this House that the people there are quite satisfied with the present Bill as it is presented to this House. There are other papers up there besides those from which the hon. gentleman quoted, and I shall inflict a few of these comments upon the House. For instance the Medicine Hat 'Times' says :

The west has had a rude awakening. Until a few days ago everybody believed the Act creating two provinces here would not interfere with the school question, but Sir Wilfrid Laurier's government has added a clause to the Bill which, if not promptly withdrawn, will raise such a storm in the Territories that may take years to subside. The best the west will get out of it will not compensate for the fearful disturbance it will occasion. . . . New settlers coming in should be greeted by a united people having but one object, namely, the development of the country, not hideous dissension over educational matters. Words are too weak to express the indignation and regret which must be felt by all true lovers of the western country.

Evidently the writer of this article knew who was precipitating this question into the political arena and did not blame it on this side of the House. He took issue with that view.

The Moosomin 'Spectator' says :

Sir Wilfrid, we think, made a grave mistake when he argued for separate schools on the

ground of their greater efficiency from a moral standpoint, as any such defence is bound to rouse spirited controversy.

The large majority of the people in the Territories express satisfaction with the present school system and are content to have the system continued. But many, believing that the matter of education belongs wholly to the province object to the Dominion parliament's fastening any system, however satisfactory, on any province, as that means an interference with provincial rights. The objection is not therefore so much against the system as against the manner of imposing the system, at least if nothing more is intended than the adoption of the present school system.

The Alameda 'Dispatch' says :

In the interest of the whole community it would be better to withdraw the Autonomy Bill rather than pass it with the present school clause, and thereby impose coercion on the two new provinces.

The Regina 'West' is a paper published in the hon. gentleman's own town. I believe there are three papers in that town and that two of them are opposed to the government on the major portions of this Bill, at least so far as the school clauses are concerned. The one paper that is advocating the Bill in its entirety is the paper edited by the hon. gentleman himself (Mr. Scott). The Regina 'West' says :

However, we may warn the government and the western members that no modification of the education clause or no compromise in its wording will be satisfactory to the people of the new provinces. The people want full and complete control over education and schools, and consequently the clauses now causing trouble should be struck out altogether. It is the right of the province, according to the British North America Act, to have control of educational matters, and nothing short of this full right should be given to the new provinces. If western members consent to and vote for anything less than this they are traitors to the new provinces and traitors to the cause of full provincial autonomy. Anything less than complete control over education and schools is not autonomy. . . . We want none of our people enslaved, but everybody free even unto the whole people. Sir Wilfrid proposes to put every citizen of the new provinces into slavery by not giving full provincial rights. An agitation for full control of education by the new provinces is, as we take it, an agitation for the freedom of Catholic and Protestant alike. We are not discussing the merits of separate or public schools, but the just right of the provinces to deal with the question without federal influence.

The Moosomin 'World' says :

In less than a week, the change that has come over public opinion regarding the Autonomy Bill is most marked and emphatic. This effect, of course, can be and is, no greater than the cause that has produced it. . . . For this state of public sentiment the onus is on Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who no doubt depended on the honeyed sweetness of his smooth language to overcome any opposition to his cunningly conceived religious device.

His coercive scheme, however, cannot obtain, for while the great majority respect religious convictions, of whatever sect they may be, they do now demand the free exercise of legislative power to deal with the education of the youth of our country as the needs of the community require, and as the interests of those immediately concerned most desire.

The Qu'Appelle 'Progress' says :

It is evident that the western members are willing to arrange a compromise whereby provincial rights will be sacrificed. The command of the west should be 'hands off, we can, and have a right to handle our own education,

The Yorkton 'Enterprise' says :

If the new provinces are satisfied with the present separate school system, Sir Wilfrid Laurier's proposed coercive law is wholly unnecessary, and, on the other hand, if the system is not satisfactory, what right has a federal government to dictate to them ? In any case, and from every point of view, what Sir Wilfrid Laurier proposes is an unwarrantable withholding of provincial rights. Sir Wilfrid has been a successful leader, but it by no means follows that he will be a successful driver.

Now Mr. Speaker, I have quoted these somewhat lengthy extracts to combat the contention of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) that the people are largely satisfied with the Autonomy Bill now engaging the attention of parliament. The hon. gentleman quoted from an interview with the Rev. Dr. Chown, in which it was stated that the doctor at a public meeting at Toronto had stated that he was present in Regina at the time word was received of the provisions of the Autonomy Bill and that there was not a word of discussion raised about the educational clauses. I shall read what Dr. Chown says in a letter to the editor of the 'Globe' in to-night's paper :

To the editor of the 'Globe' : I notice in the 'Globe's' report of the address of Mr. Walter Scott, M.P., of Regina, made in the House of Commons yesterday, a statement is attributed to me, to the effect that the people of the Northwest were satisfied with the Laurier government's solution of the school difficulty. He may have been misled by a newspaper report, but I certainly did not make such a statement, as I have no means of knowing the present facts.

The only public utterance I have made about the school question was at a meeting of the Provincial Rights Committee in Toronto, at which time, speaking to a motion made by Dr. Bruce, to petition the House of Commons, the Senate and the Governor General, praying that no further steps be taken until the people interested have an opportunity of expressing themselves upon the issue, I said that I had been in the Northwest for some time during the election contest, and I could bear testimony to the fact that the school question was not discussed at all, and that the vote of November last could not be taken as expressing any opinion upon the matter.

I quite agree with Mr. Scott, as reported in the 'Globe' of Saturday, that the school question was 'not an issue at all in the last elec-

tion,' but from that fact I argued that, inasmuch as it was kept in the background, the people interesed in such a matter should be heard before the parliament of Canada finally pass upon the question. Mr. Scott argues that because the issue was not discussed the people must be satisfied with the provisions of a Bill of which they then had no knowledge.

From this conclusion I must dissent, and I may say that, in the interests of a common, enlightened and progressive citizenship, I regret exceedingly that any school system which will segregate different sections of the population during the early years of their education, and give a different colouring to their civic and national ideals, is about to be fastened upon the people yet to inhabit our magnificent heritable in the Northwest.

I believe a solution of sectarian difficulties should be and will yet be possible, in the form of a system of Christian morality upon which all varieties of opinion may agree, to be taught in all the schools of the country.

S. D. CHOWN.

Toronto, April 1.

The hon. gentleman saw fit to refer to Mr. Bulyea. He wondered if Mr. Bulyea had been present with Mr. Haultain in his interviews with the leader of the opposition. Well, I know whereof I speak when I say that from the time the premier of the Territories came to Ottawa at the request of the leader of the government to discuss this question, until this Bill was introduced into this House, he absolutely refused to discuss it with any one, either Liberal or Conservative, because, as he said, he did not think it would be proper to enter into a discussion with anybody upon this question while he was negotiating with the government. But when this Bill was brought before parliament and its provisions made public, he considered he was no longer under any restraint, and has since discussed it with both Liberals and Conservatives, and as freely, frankly and thoroughly with the one as with the other.

I do not wish to trespass at any further length on the patience of the House. I simply desired more particularly to criticise the three leading features, the question of the boundary of Manitoba, the land question and the educational clauses. As to the first, I think I have convinced the House that the reasonable request of the province of Manitoba has been contemptuously treated. I see that the premier of Ontario, taking his cue from the right hon. gentleman's speech, has filed a claim for a certain portion of Keewatin, and also that the new Quebec premier has expressed his intention to make a similar requisition on behalf of that province. It is evident that the object of the right hon. gentleman is being accomplished, but in the meantime the people of Manitoba are in a state of unrest and excitement. As to the land policy, in my judgment the government have no reasonable ground, either from a constitutional point of view or from the point of view of public policy, in withholding those lands from the province. In my opinion also, the open letter of the premier of the Northwest Territories, protesting against the manner in which the provisions of his draft Bill were disregarded, cavalierly treated and passed over, does not contain one expression which any reasonable man can attribute to partisanship, unless it be partisan to be consistent. But if abandoning the very things which Mr. Haultain had provided for in his draft Bill, and which had received the support of the territorial assembly, and even that of the hon. member for West Assiniboia; if abandoning every claim put forward on behalf of the Territories, be consistency, then I am willing to give the palm to the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). As to the educational clauses, in my opinion they are an interference in matters of purely provincial concern. I believe them to be unconstitutional and impolitic. High legal authorities, such as Sir Louis Davies, judge of the Supreme Court, has declared that this parliament had not the right to interfere in the school policy of the Territories; and should this question ever come up before him for adjudication, he would, if he desired to be consistent, feel bound to give an opinion in accord with the views he expressed in parliament. I have here the opinion he expressed. It has been quoted in this House before, but you cannot emphasize a good opinion too frequently. This is what Sir Louis Davies said in 1891, when the territorial charter was under consideration:

> My opinion is now, and has been for years, that when that time comes (the time to erect the Territories into provinces) you cannot withhold from the provinces so erected the right to determine for themselves the question of education in one way or the other. I would be the last to favour this parliament imposing upon the people there any system of education, either free or separate. I only claim that when a Bill is introduced to erect these Territories into provinces that Bill should contain a provision enabling the people of the different provinces so created to decide what system of education they will have.

Surely that opinion is not biased or coloured by Sir Louis Davies' political proclivities. Surely it was not given in order to advance the cause of the Conservative party. He takes the ground that parliament is not at liberty to interfere with the educational policy of those new provinces. The late Judge Mills, the former philosopher of the Liberal party, a man of high legal attainments, frequently quoted as a constitutional authority, both in this House and the Upper Chamber, and who was transferred to the Supreme Court before his death, also gave an opinion which is in accord with that of Sir Louis Davies. He said:

> When the people of the Territories or any portion of the Territories are sufficiently numerous to constitute a province—when, in fact, they attain their majority in regard to local matters, and when they propose to set up for themselves—this parliament has no right to

exercise control over them. It can give good advice, but it has no right to give commands.

When the Territories have a sufficient population to entitle them to become a province, they must decide for themselves whether they will have separate schools or not.

I have my view as to what will be the best decision for them to arrive at, but I must not impose on them my views as to how they should be governed after they have attained their majority.

I think I have quoted sufficient legal authority to show that the act of the government is unconstitutional, that the question of education should be left entirely to the provinces, that the provinces should be given their legislative freedom in this matter, and that the action of the government cannot be defended on grounds of public policy, but is an unwarranted interference with provincial jurisdiction, and is likely to be a source of trouble among the mixed population who will make in that country their homes in the future.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton and Victoria). I must congratulate the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat on the free and exhaustive manner in which he has discussed this question, and I am afraid that, as a new member, with very little experience in this House, I shall be hardly able to follow the pace he has set for me in dealing with the subject under discussion. My hon. friend started out by finding fault with the land policy of this government. But that policy, Mr. Speaker, is not a new one. It is not a policy of to-day or yesterday, but one which was laid down by a gentleman who had about as able a mastery of public affairs in this country as any man who ever lived in it. I refer to the Rt. Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, the greatest leader of which the party to which my hon. friend belongs could ever boast. It was he who laid down the land policy we have since followed, and in criticising that policy my hon. friend is setting himself at issue with that great leader.

The right hon. Sir John Macdonald, in 1870, laid down the land policy of this country. In 1872 he went to the country and was sustained. In 1878 he was returned to power; and he was sustained after that in the general elections of 1882, 1887 and 1891. I should say that was a sufficient test of the policy of Sir John Macdonald so far as the land question is concerned, and that it is rather too late in the day now to declare that it is a policy that should not be followed in this country. A few days ago the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) laid down a doctrine, which, if it is a wise one in regard to the matter to which he referred, would be equally wise here. Speaking of the school question, he said that the people of this country had recognized the wisdom of the policy of the Liberal party in 1896, and again in 1900, and again in 1904, and, so far as he was concerned, he would not bother with the subject any longer, but would let well enough alone. I say if that was a wise policy with respect to the school question it is equally wise with respect to the land policy of Sir John Macdonald which has been so often approved by the people of this country. I submit that not only did the country generally commend that policy, but the province of Manitoba, in which the policy was first put in operation, has, if I am correctly informed, always given a handsome majority to the Conservative party of which Sir John Macdonald was the head. When the land policy of Sir John Macdonald has been approved by the province of Manitoba for thirty-five years, I think it comes —I will not say with ill grace but— with little force from the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. J. Roche) to find fault with the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), because he continues that policy.

Now, the hon. member for Marquette makes an onslaught on this government, and especially on the Prime Minister, because he does not change the boundaries of the province. I understood my hon. friend (Mr. Roche) to be strongly in favour of provincial rights and as strongly against anything that would interfere with those rights without the provinces being consulted. I happen to have in my hand the statute on this particular question showing that it is not open to any Prime Minister or government to deal with the question exactly as he may think proper. I gather from what the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. J. Roche) says that if there were a provision in this Bill extending the boundaries of Manitoba and making half a dozen other changes in the boundaries of Ontario, Quebec and other provinces, he would support it. But the hon. gentleman must not forget that we have no powers to deal indiscriminately with the dividing lines between provinces. There is an Act of the imperial parliament regulating matters of this kind; and, before we do anything about changing our neighbours' land mark, we must consider that statute that we may comply with it. It reads as follows:

> The parliament of Canada may from time to time, with the consent of the legislature of any province of the said Dominion, increase, diminish or otherwise alter the limits of such province, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature, and may, with the like consent, make provision respecting the effect and operation of any such increase or diminution or alteration of territory in relation to any province affected thereby.

When the Prime Minister speaks of consulting Ontario, Quebec, Manitoba and the other provinces whose territory is likely to be affected by any changes in boundaries made in that part of the country he is talking of doing what it is his bounden duty

to do and is showing himself the true guardian of provincial rights.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do I understand my hon. friend (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) to be under the impression that, in order to incorporate into the province of Manitoba some portion of the territory which is now comprised in the Northwest Territories, it would be necessary to have the consent of the legislatures of Ontario or Quebec?

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. I said of Manitoba.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But not of Ontario or Quebec?

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. The Act says that, if they are likely to be affected by it they must be consulted. Of course, we must leave something for the Prime Minister to judge for himself. If, in his judgment, Quebec and Ontario are likely to be affected, he is bound to consult those provinces. I think it is perfectly clear that it is not a matter that can be jumped at without full consideration. Though a man from Manitoba might say that this matter does not affect Quebec and Ontario, it is perfectly clear that the Prime Ministers of Ontario and Quebec do not think so, for the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. J. Roche) tells us that they have filed claims with this government to be considered in the division of this territory. Therefore, this important statute clearly comes into operation here and its terms must be complied with.

Now, my hon. friend (Mr. W. J. Roche) has gone further, to deal with land policy. He finds fault with the government—and, consequently with all Conservative governments that have existed in this country up to the present time—because they borrowed their land policy from the United States. I do not think it makes much difference whence we get a policy, so long as it is a good policy. If any rule of life that we follow is a good one, it is not wise for us to cast aside or neglect it because it happens to be in use in the United States. I do not think that any hon. gentleman in this House will say that the land policy of the United States has not been a success so far as immigration is concerned, or so far as development is concerned so far as attracting the people is concerned and their success after they have gone to the United States. I think we would be only too glad if we could get as many people into our country and as good a class as they are getting through the land policy they have. Now, it has been pointed out that the provinces would do better in the handling of these lands than the central government. That may be so, but one thing is certain—that in the United States, if we can copy them, they have not followed that policy.

The States have had nothing to do with the public domain except possibly in their early history they were formed into states, exactly as Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and the other provinces when they came into the union. I think they held what lands they had then, except that some were passed over to the central government under certain arrangements; but any lands they had acquired after the United States had been formed under one government, were held by the central government and one policy prevailed in respect to the whole of them. I submit that it is in the interests of this country to have one policy and one management of the public domain, one system in respect to immigration, and one price for the lands, in order to avoid as much as possible a conflict of management between half a dozen different governments.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. With regard to the constitutional point with respect to which I took the liberty of interrupting my hon. friend a moment ago, I do not find in the statute these words to which he referred: 'Likely to be affected thereby.' I did not contradict my hon. friend, because I thought he would be exact in his quotation. It says:

> The parliament of Canada may from time to time, with the consent of the legislature of any province of the said Dominion, increase, diminish or otherwise alter the limits of such province, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature, and may with the like consent, make provision respecting the effect and operation of any such increase or diminution or alteration of territory in relation of any province affected thereby.

Not 'likely to be affected thereby.'

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. That was close to it, but when we are dealing with the great west we do not pay attention to trifling things. The difference is certainly very slight, and it was hardly worth my hon. friend's while to bother with it. It is certainly clear that the intention of that statute was that any province to be affected by the change should be consulted, that there should be legislation upon the subject, and it is only by concurrent legislation on the part of each government that they can deal with it effectively. The question would not be settled if we were first to start out to deal with it effectively. The question would not be settled if we were first to start out to deal with it without the consent of the others, and without that consent being obtained according to the statute. Although I may not be correct according to the very letter of the law, I am certainly not so far wrong as to justify the member from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) in saying that we are violating the constitution and doing a whole lot of wrong things because we did not deal with this question the right way. Now I think those two points as to whether it is the duty of the government to deal with this question as a public policy for the whole country, or whether it is better to

cut it up into sections, have been answered.

Now I will deal briefly with another point mentioned by the hon. gentleman with regard to the literature that was sent out broadcast and what it said about the character of the schools. If a pamphlet that has been sent out lately is such as the hon. gentleman has stated, and I have no doubt it is, I can only tell my hon. friend that it is very different from some literature of that character that was sent out in 1881 when the hon. gentleman's friends were leading the government of this country. The Department of Agriculture sent out a pamphlet making the following reference to the subject of education :

> The school system was based upon that of Quebec, that is to say, that Catholics have an absolute control and complete direction of the education of their children, and that Protestants possess exactly the same rights.

That pamphlet was sent out in 1881 when Sir John A. Macdonald and his friends had control of the government, and when the Act of 1875 was fresh in their minds. They sent this pamphlet broadcast over Europe, wherever immigrants could be induced to come to this country and settle in our Northwest ; they were told that the same system of schools prevailed there that prevailed in Quebec and that people of the faith of our Ontario friends would find there exactly the kind of education that is given in Ontario.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will proceed to deal with the constitutional question that is involved in this discussion though I will not presume that I can deal with it satisfactorily to everybody. I propose to deal with this subject under three different phases. First, I would ask what power have we in respect to this question ? What should we do with that power or how should we exercise it if we have any power in this matter ? Now the first thing I find in this constitution of ours states that the Dominion of Canada shall be united with a constitution similar to that and based upon the constitution of Great Britain and Ireland. We start out with that declaration in our constitution, it is not a hard and fast constitution that is unbending, that we cannot change one way or the other ; it is a constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. Those of us who know anything about the constitution of Great Britain know how elastic it is, how it is made to suit various conditions, how it can be capable of taking under its folds all conditons of men. When we remember that we are attracting into our Northwest the very classes of people that go to make up the British empire we will realize at once that we need just such a constitution as that of the United Kingdom to enable us to deal with all these people as successfully as Great Britain deals with them. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a constitution in our hands that is not a hard and fast instrument, we have to deal with certain conditions in this country to-day and I think it would be well for us to keep constantly before our minds that our constitution is based upon the British constitution that is able to govern millions of people in the Indies, millions of people in the other parts of the world, and hundreds of thousands if not millions of people in South Africa. In adjusting that constitution to our own conditions will it be said that we cannot without a wrench and a violation of our institutions in this country and the foundations of the state, make that constitution that is equal in principle to the British constitution apply to the provinces of the west-? Now, very shortly after confederation steps were taken to bring in the Northwest Territories. In order to understand this question aright we should follow as nearly as possible the steps that were taken in this connection. First we find the parliament of Canada presenting an address asking Her Gracious Majesty to admit Rupert's Land and the Northwest Territories into the union. Let us see what they say :

> That the 146th section of the British North America Act, 1867, provides for the admission of Rupert's Land and the Northwest Territories, or either of them, into the union with Canada, upon the terms and conditions to be expressed in addresses from the House of parliament of this Dominion to your Majesty, and which shall be approved of by your Majesty in Council.
>
> That we do therefore most humbly pray that your Majesty will be graciously pleased, by and with the advice of your Most Honourable Privy Council, to unite Rupert's Land and the Northwestern Territory with this Dominion, and to grant to the Parliament of Canada authority to legislate for their future welfare and good government and we most humbly beg to express to your Majesty that we are willing to assume the duties and obligations of government and legislation as regards these territories.
>
> That in the event of your Majesty's government agreeing to transfer to Canada the jurisdiction and control over the said region, the government and parliament of Canada will be ready to provide that the legal rights of any corporation, company or individual within the same shall be respected, and placed under the protection of courts of competent jurisdiction.

Now, what I wish to point out is that in the second part of this petition the parliament of Canada, not recognizing up to this time that they had the power to deal with this territory, pray that Her Majesty shall be graciously pleased to give them the power that is necessary to make laws for the government of the country.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the date of that?

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. 1868. After this petition was presented to Her Majesty for power to deal with this land an Order in Council was passed on the 23rd day of June, 1870. It is headed as follows:

Rupert's Land and the Northwestern Territory.

At the Court at Windsor, the 23rd day of June, 1870.

Present:—The Queen's Most Excellent Majesty, Lord President, Lord Privy Seal, Lord Chamberlain, Mr. Gladstone.

Whereas by the British North America Act, 1867, it was (amongst other things) enacted that it should be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, on Address from the Houses of Parliament of Canada, to admit Rupert's Land and the Northwestern Territory, or either of them, into the Union on such terms and conditions in each case as should be in the addresses expressed, and as the Queen should think fit to approve, subject to the provisions of the said Act. And it was further enacted that the provisions of any Order in Council in that behalf should have effect as if they had been enacted by the parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland:

And whereas by an address from the Houses of the parliament of Canada, of which address a copy is contained in the schedule to this order annexed, marked A, Her Majesty was prayed, by and with the advice of Her Most Honourable Privy Council, to unite Rupert's Land and the Northwestern Territory with the Dominion of Canada, and to grant to the parliament of Canada authority to legislate for their future welfare and good government upon the terms and conditions therein stated:

And whereas by the Rupert's Land Act, 1868, it was (amongst other things) enacted that it should be competent for the Governor and company of adventurers of England trading into Hudson Bay (hereinafter called the company) to surrender to Her Majesty, and for Her Majesty, by an instrument under Her sign manual and signet to accept a surrender of all or any of the lands, territories, rights, privileges, liberties, franchises, powers, and authorities whatsoever, granted or purported to be granted by certain letters patent therein recited to the said company within Rupert's Land, upon such terms and conditions as should be agreed upon by and between Her Majesty and the said company; provided however, that such surrender should not be accepted by Her Majesty until the terms and conditions upon which Rupert's Land should be admitted into the said Dominion:

And whereas such surrender has been duly accepted by Her Majesty, by an instrument under Her sign manual and signet, bearing date at Windsor the twenty-second day of June, one thousand eight hundred and seventy:

It is hereby ordered and declared by Her Majesty, by and with the advice of the Privy Council, in pursuance and exercise of the powers vested in Her Majesty by the said Acts of parliament, that from and after the fifteenth day of July, one thousand eight hundred and seventy, the said Northwestern Territory shall be admitted into and become part of the Dominion of Canada upon the terms and conditions set forth in the first hereinbefore recited address, and that the parliament of Canada shall from the day aforesaid have full power and authority to legislate for the future welfare and good government of the said Territory. And it is further ordered that, without prejudice to any obligations arising from the aforesaid approved report, Rupert's Land shall from and after the said date be admitted into and become part of the Dominion of Canada upon the following terms and conditions, being the terms and conditions still remaining to be performed of those embodied in the said second address of the parliament of Canada and approved of by Her Majesty as aforesaid:—

1. Canada is to pay to the company £300,000 when Rupert's Land is transferred to the Dominion of Canada.

These are simply the steps that have been taken in regard to this land—in the first instance the conveyance of the title to the land to Her Majesty, taking it back from the company; in the next place granting to the parliament of Canada the powers they ask for to deal with this country, to make laws in respect to it and to exercise full control over it. Now, there is another matter of importance in view of the discussion which is now taking place in this House. What seems to be worrying us now is whether or not we have jurisdiction to deal with this question, whether or not we have jurisdiction to give a constitution to these new provinces. That is where some of our friends seem to find a difficulty. They say that the difficulty is not that they are not willing to extend these powers, but they question whether under the constitution they have the authority to do so. They would make us believe that they would be willing and pleased to extend these powers, but they say they cannot get away from the principles of the constitution.

That seems to be the position they take. Very shortly after confederation it became apparent to those governing Canada, that they would have to create new provinces in the Territories, and Sir John Macdonald was clear enough in his judgment and sound enough in his constitutional law to see that it would be necessary for him to get certain additional powers for this purpose. We need not speculate as to what Sir John Macdonald wanted, because he set forth his wish in a letter to Lord Kimberley, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, in which he wrote that he wanted an Act confirming the Act of the Canadian parliament 33 Victoria, chapter 3, as if it had been passed as an imperial statute. He further wrote that he wanted authority:

> To empower the Dominion parliament from time to time to establish other provinces in the Northwest Territories with such local government, legislature and constitution, as it may think proper, provided that no such local government or legislature should have greater power conferred upon it than the power conferred upon the local government and legislatures by the British North America Act, 1867; and also empowering it to grant such provinces representation in the parliament of the Dominion.

The only limitation Sir John wanted was that the new provinces should be given no greater power than was granted to the older provinces at the time of confederation. If Sir John Macdonald wanted power simply to apply the British North America Act to the new provinces, he was clear-headed enough

to have said so, but he wanted more. It may be said that the Act of 1870 was modified in its passage through the imperial parliament, and that Sir John Macdonald's idea was not crystallized into legislation, but I have taken the trouble to follow the career of this Act in its different stages through the imperial parliament, and I find that it was introduced one day, read a second time another day, a third time another day, and not a single syllable was said about it in the House or in Committee of the Whole. This clearly shows that the imperial parliament simply took the Bill as it was sent to them from the Canadian government, and put it through without any change. We are quite familiar with the Act itself, and I think that any ordinary man can have no difficulty in coming to the conclusion that it gives us new powers which up to that time we had not. It says :

> The parliament of Canada may from time to time establish new provinces in any territories forming for the time being part of the Dominion of Canada, but not included in any province thereof, and may at the time of such admission make provisions for the construction and administration of any such province and for the passing of laws for the peace, order and good government of the province.

Reading that, with the explanation contained in Sir John's letter to Lord Kimberley, I do not think there is very much difficulty in concluding what power we have. It may be said : if the power of the Dominion parliament to form the new provinces of Manitoba was good and absolute, and if there was no question about its constitutionality, why did the Canadian government go to England for confirmation of the Manitoba Act. Without setting oneself up as any great constitutional authority, I think it is perfectly plain why that happened. The parliament of Canada believed that it had no power to deal with the Northwest except as to the power which was delegated by the Orders in Council which I have read, and by acts which were passed subsequent to the British North America Act of 1867. The Order in Council giving them power to deal with this question was passed on the 21st day of June, but it will be seen that the Manitoba Act received the assent of the Governor General here in Canada on the 12th of May previously. The Act being passed in this House before the passage of the Order in Council, it might well have suggested itself to the law officers in Canada that they had no authority, and that as it was an important constitutional matter, it was better to remove any doubt by a confirming Act. If the dates were revised ; if the Order in Council giving the parliament of Canada power to deal with this question had been passed on the 12th of May and the Manitoba Act passed on the 21st of June following, you would have heard nothing about the constitutionality of the law, but the fact that the Act was passed before the Order in Council was signed by Her Majesty created the doubt. The ex-Minister of the Interior, excellent lawyer that he is, gave it as his opinion (and it has not been contradicted), that the law officers of the Crown in England did not consider that a confirmatory Act was necessary and that they held there was ample power in this parliament to pass the Act of 1870. I submit that if we had power to pass the Manitoba Act of 1870, there is nothing in the Bill now before the House which takes it out of the category of the provisions contained in the Manitoba Act, and which would oust us from our power to legislate.

It may be said that there is an amendment in the Manitoba Act. So there is, and there is only an amendment in this Act. The power of amendment was recognized in the Manitoba Act, and section 2 of that Act simply says that the British North America Act will be changed in such a way as to suit the circumstances and conditions existing in Manitoba. Those changes are contained in that Act to-day. The second section of the Act to-day is precisely, as nearly as I can read it, the same as the second section of the Manitoba Act of 1870. The Act of 1870 reads that such changes shall be made as are necessary to make the British North America Act applicable to the conditions existing in Manitoba. That is not the exact wording, but that is the meaning of it ; it is changed to suit the circumstances. Now, what do we find to-day ? All that we find in the second section of the Bill which is now before the House is that changes will be made to suit the circumstances existing at the time at which we create another province. A great deal of fear seems to be expressed by some parties in this House that we are destroying the constitution, that it is an awful thing to make any amendment in this Act, and the slightest change would destroy the whole fabric of the constitution. Sir John Macdonald was, I presume, as loyal to the constitution as any man in this country. Our hon. friends, at any rate, were willing to follow him and to endorse his views on constitutional matters. He proposed this amendment to the constitution in 1870, he put it through this House, he went several times to the country, and the electors endorsed himself, his constitution and his amendments, and nobody ever suggested that there was the slightest danger in the world in anything he did in connection with this bringing into effect of the provisions for the admission of other provinces. If it was all right to make these slight changes in 1870, to legislate for separate schools in 1875, why is it not all right to-day to make slight changes in order to bring the Act fully and properly into effect in the western provinces ? The leader of the opposition, since this debate commenced, suggested an amendment in clause 109 of the British North America Act. The British North Am-

erica Act, so far as it deals with land, deals with it in section 109. Section 109 gives the land to the provinces unconditionally. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) excellent lawyer as he is, before this question got to such a red heat as it is to-day, when the Bill was first introduced, suggested in this House, in connection with this land question, that it would be well to introduce an amendment by which, although the lands were given to the western provinces, they would not have absolute control of them ; he would have some stipulations and conditions placed upon the manner in which they would hold the land, and would not give them an entirely and absolutely free hand. If it is proper for the hon. leader of the opposition to suggest that there should be such an amendment, if it would be proper to say that we should put such a proviso in section 109 of the British North America Act, what is the objection to making slight changes in other parts of the Act ? If we have no power to touch it at all, if we cannot touch it in reference to schools, we cannot touch it in reference to lands ; and if we can touch it in reference to lands, we can touch it in reference to schools.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Section 109 does not deal with the distribution of legislative power. Section 109 deals with the ownership of lands. It is only when the land is vested in the provinces that the question of legislative power arises, so they are two entirely distinct things.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. It is certainly an amendment of the Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not wish my hon. friend to misunderstand me. I said we could not alter the distribution of legislative power. That is the point I made.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. I understand that the position of my hon. friend is that we cannot amend the British North America Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, we cannot ; I do not take the position, however, that the 'terms and conditions' must always be the same.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. Does my hon. friend admit that we can ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As far as amending the Act is concerned, of course my hon. friend knows that section 146 of the British North America Act speaks of the terms and conditions on which provinces or territories may be brought in. That is one thing. But the distribution of legislative power is another and an entirely different thing.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. If we have no power to amend the Act, then we cannot touch it ; and still it was quite competent, within the purview and terms of section 146 of which my hon. friend speaks, to make terms and conditions, because that section of the Act contemplates two purposes. It contemplates the admission of Manitoba, British Columbia, Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island and other provinces, which are entities, provincial entities, at the time and capable of contracting. They were capable of going into this compact, of preparing a scheme in the shape of an address which is confirmed by Order in Council. It is quite true that they can put into it and take out of it, and slice it and form it, as it suits them, but the moment it receives the sanction of the Sovereign by Order in Council, then that is an end to it. In this case, instead of a compact, we have an Act of parliament. But my hon. friend takes the position that you cannot make any change in that Act, that you must simply make the conditions which suited New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Quebec and Ontario, apply to the new provinces, because you have no sea room at all, you can do nothing. It is quite true that there was no limitation on the conditions which could be placed in the Order in Council, there was nothing to limit your sway in making the bargain ; but will my hon. friend or his supporters submit that we have the same scope to-day ? If they will admit that we have the same scope to-day, that we can put in the constitution which they are making for the new provinces every line and every word that we could put in an Order in Council bringing in British Columbia, Prince Edward Island or Newfoundland ; if we have those powers under the constitution, then we have ample powers to put all these conditions into the new constitution. Will my hon. friend tell me, or tell this House or the country, that the provisions of section 92 or section 93 of the British North America Act were binding on Prince Edward Island when it was coming in, or on British Columbia when it came in ? Nothing of the kind. They could make such provisions as they thought proper, and is it not right, when it is only this parliament that has the responsibility to-day—for there is no provision by which an address can come from the Territories, so that this is a one-sided negotiation, so to speak, and we take the full responsibility in this House for what this constitution will be—that we should be told that the constitution that would not stand in the way of the admission of New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island, or any other province, into confederation, must prevent us from making such terms and stipulations as we think are proper and right in bringing in new provinces from the west. I do not think that, as the leader of the opposition himself would say, it is either law or logic or sound argument to say that we have not as free a hand in making a province under the terms of the Act as we would have under the conditions which we could place in an Order in Council and in an address from an existing provincial entity. I submit, Mr.

Speaker, that I do not think my learned friend has any too well answered the point that we have equal rights in dealing with the conditions under the Act as we would have in making an Order in Council and stipulating how a particular province is to come in. I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, that if we wished to ascertain what powers the fathers of confederation thought they possessed, under the conditions of the confederation, the best time for us to search for information on that point would be in 1870, when the conditions of the compact were fresh in their minds.

We hear a great deal about this section 93 giving exclusive power to the province. Would it not be well to look at this Act in the light cast upon it by some of the decisions of the Privy Council, and those are decisions which we should not lightly cast aside even if they do run contrary to our own opinion. A great many contend that this section 93 gives the province unlimited powers to deal with matters of education. It seems to me that our hon. friends who read the Act in such a light simply stop at the end of the first two lines :

> In and for each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education.

But there are four other sections which these hon. gentlemen do not read at all. There is also a decision of the Privy Council right in point upon that section ; and it seems to me that in order not to be misled any longer as to its full force, effect and meaning, it would be well to quote that decision. This is what the Privy Council said in dealing exactly with that proviso :

> Before leaving this part of the case it may be well to notice the argument urged by the respondent that the construction which their lordships have put upon the second and third subsections of the section of the Manitoba Act is inconsistent with the powers conferred upon the legislatures of the provinces to exclusively make laws in respect to education. The argument is fallacious. The power conferred is not absolute but limited. It is exercisable only subject and according to the following provision. The subsections which follow, whatever be their true construction defining the conditions under which alone provincial legislatures may legislate with reference to education and indicate the limitations imposed on and the exceptions from their power to legislate exclusively, their right to legislate is not enjoyed properly speaking exclusively, for in the case specified in subsection 3 the parliament of Canada is authorized to legislate on the same subject. There is, therefore, no such inconsistency as is suggested.

That is the decision of the Privy Council. It shows that in the British North America Act, from cover to cover, there is no such thing as giving to any province the exclusive powers to deal with education. I take the responsibility of saying that there is not to-day such a thing in this country as any province dealing exclusively with education. I heard the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) asking the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) the other day whether or not there was a province in the Dominion which had a free hand to deal with education. I say there is not. There are provinces in the Dominion to-day which are free to pass one Act. Nova Scotia to-day is perfectly free to pass an Act that will contain some terms in respect to the separate schools ; but once the Nova Scotia legislature passes such an Act it cannot change it. Or if it should, it would be subject to an appeal to the government of the Dominion for remedial legislation. Therefore it can well be said that there is no province in the Dominion to-day which has this wonderful, absolute right to deal with the question of education as it sees fit.

There is another point to which I would direct attention, as showing the intention of this part of the Confederation Act. It would be well for us to try and understand, without any haste or passion or feeling in this matter, how these questions were understood from the beginning. Some day in February, 1867, these clauses 92 and 93 were under consideration in the House of Lords. Now, whatever feeling there may be in this House and country over the question, I think we will all admit that the House of Lords would approach it with a great deal of calmness and give it due consideration, and that not one of the venerable gentlemen who occupy seats in that House would be in the slightest degree nervous about explaining what these clauses really meant. We find Lord Carnarvon dealing with this question calmly and judicially. As to clause 93, he said :

> Lastly, in the 93rd clause which contains the exceptional provisions to which I refer, your lordship will observe some rather complicated arrangements in reference to education. I need hardly say that that great question gives rise to nearly as much earnestness and division of opinion on that as on this side of the Atlantic. This clause has been framed after long and anxious controversy in which all parties have been represented and on conditions to which all had given their consent. . . . The object of the clause is to secure to the religious minority in one province the same rights, privileges and protection which the religious minority in another province may enjoy. The Roman Catholic minority of Upper Canada, the Protestant minority of Lower Canada and the Roman Catholic minority of the maritime provinces will thus stand on a footing of entire equality.

That is the explanation which Lord Carnarvon gave in 1867, and I submit to you that that was the way in which the late Sir John Macdonald and the framers of the Manitoba Act understood it in 1870.

I would ask you to note the strong resemblance between clause 93 in the British North America Act and the Manitoba Act.

> In and for the province the said legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject to the following provisions.

I submit that the provisions are exactly the same except where an amendment is made to make them applicable to what existed in those days in Manitoba. The second section of the Act is :

On, from and after the said day on which the order of the Queen in Council shall take effect as aforesaid, the provisions of the British North America Act of 1867 shall, except those parts thereof which are in terms made or by reasonable intendment may be held to be specially applicable to or only to affect one or more but not the whole of the provinces now composing the Dominion, and except so far as the same may be varied by this Act, be applicable to the province of Manitoba in the same way and to the like extent as they apply to the several provinces of Canada and as if the province of Manitoba had been one of the provinces originally united by the said Act.

That is the same language which is to be found in the Act creating the province of Alberta, and there has been some talk as to what the effect of that Act might be on the educational question. I think there was some exception taken to the construction put upon the clause by my hon. friend from West Assiniboia, which we find in the Act which has been submitted as a constitution for the new provinces by the premier, Mr. Haultain.

Now, I have read to you, Mr. Speaker, the clause in the Manitoba Act. This is the corresponding clause that we find in Mr. Haultain's Bill. The name of the province is blank, but I supply the name of Alberta:

On and after the said first day of January, 1903, the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, except those parts thereof which are in terms made or by reasonable intendment may be held to be, specially applicable to or to affect only one or more but not the whole of the provinces under that Act composing the Dominion, and except so far as the same may be varied by this Act, shall be applicable to the province of Alberta in the same way and to the same extent as they apply to the several provinces of Canada and as if the province of Alberta had been one of the provinces originally united by the said Act.

At this point I wish to look a little closely at the meaning of this language so far as education is concerned. Hon. members who are opposing the Bill and who profess to be particular friends of the Northwest, have nothing to say against this draft Act, so far as I can understand. They say there are terms in the proposed Act of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) which bring the separate schools into effect in the Northwest, and they declare they are not in favour of such a policy. At the same time, I do not think they have anything to say against this draft Act of Mr. Haultain's. If you examine this clause closely you will find what Mr. Haultain means is that whatever is in existence in the Territories to-day will be gathered together, the whole business shoved back to 1867 and then brought in as if this was a new province. Whatever law you have in force in the Territories to-day must be dealt with as if it had been a law in force in 1867, the time of confederation. What is the law in force in the Territories? Is not the Act of 1875 as much in force to-day as it was when it was passed? It has not been repealed. The fact that ordinances have been based upon it which are inconsistent with it in some respects or which are not as strong in the direction it intended as the Act itself, does not take away the validity of the Act. That Act created separate schools, and that is the Act which Mr. Haultain says is to be continued in force as if had been passed in 1867. That is the effect of what Mr. Haultain proposes, as I understand it. And while hon. gentlemen opposed to the government are unwilling to take separate schools from us, they are ready to swallow them holus bolus when offered by Mr. Haultain. I am not finding fault with Mr. Haultain for putting this in the Act. I think he was doing the right thing in recognizing the conditions that existed at the time. But we must not claim credit for doing what we are not doing. Mr. Haultain and his friends claim credit for not recognizing the conditions in the west. They were going to wipe the whole thing off the slate, and so they claimed to be the friends of the Territories and say that we are the enemies of the Territories. But they cannot sustain that argument in the face of this draft Act, which has in it ever word, if not more, than we have in the legislation before the House.

I have pointed out the different conditions which are in this Manitoba Act. It contains section 2, exactly like the one which is going through to-day. Section 26 of it deals with the land question; and section 20 deals with the school question. So it is precisely the same as the Act now before us. I was pointing out—and I think it is necessary to point out—the ideas which prevail in connection with this constitution which was given to the Territories in 1875. It has been observed here by the hon. member for Marquette that nothing that Alex. Mackenzie and Edward Blake, and old men of that kind said should not receive very much attention. I do not regard Hon. Edward Blake's views on constitutional questions in that way. I think that Mr. Blake was a big man on constitutional questions in 1875; I think he has been a big man on constitutional questions every year since, and I believe he is a big man on constitutional questions to-day; and for that reason we ought to be very much pleased when we find in the books things that he said on questions of this kind, and we ought to be satisfied that what he has said on these questions is sound and good. This is what he said when this Bill of 1875 was before the House, when this question of forming the constitution of the Northwest Territories was being dealt with. It will be seen that the words of Mr. Blake are not the words of a man who thought that we were creat-

ing a constitutional fabric which was to last for only a few days, something that was to be wiped off the slate when we chose to do so. He speaks of the constitution then being formed as the basis and the foundation for the laws under which thousands and millions of people will come into that country. He said:

To found primary institutions under which we hope to see hundreds of thousands, and the more sanguine among us think millions of men and families settled and flourishing, was one of the noblest undertakings that could be entered upon by any legislative body, and it was no small indication of the power and true position of this Dominion that parliament should be engaged to-day in that important task. He agreed with the hon. member for Kingston——

That, I presume, was Sir John Macdonald.

——that the task was one that required time, consideration and deliberation and they must take care that no false steps were made in such a work. He did not agree with that right hon. gentleman that the government ought to repeat his errors. The right hon. gentleman had tried the institutions for the Northwest Territories which he now asked the House to frame and for the same reason as he had given to-day—that it would be better for the Dominion government to keep matters in their own hands and decide what was best for the future. He (Mr. Blake) believed that it was essential to our obtaining a large immigration to the Northwest that we should tell the people beforehand what those rights were to be in the country in which we invited them to settle. It was interesting to the people to know that at the very earliest moment there was a sufficient aggregate of population within a reasonable distance, that aggregation would have a voice in the self-government of the Territories, and he believed the Dominion government was wise (although the measure might be brought down very late this session and it might be found impossible to give it due consideration) in determining in advance of settlement what the character of the institutions of the country should be in which we invite people. He did not agree with the policy of asking people to settle in that western country, and tell them that a paternal government would look after them, and would give them such institutions as the government thought suitable. We had better let the people know their fate politically and otherwise before they settle there.

And he said further:

He regarded it as essential under the circumstances of the country and in view of the deliberation during the last few days that a general principle should be laid down in the Bill with respect to public instruction.

He did believe that we ought not to introduce into that territory the heart-burnings and difficulties with which certain other portions of this Dominion and other countries had been afflicted. It seemed to him, having regard to the fact that, as far as we could expect at present, the general character of that population would be somewhat analogous to the population of Ontario, that there should be some provision in the constitution by which they should have conferred upon them the same rights and privileges in regard to religious instruction as those possessed by the people of the province of Ontario. The principles of local self-government and the settling the question of public instruction seemed to him ought to be the cardinal principles of the measure.

In reply to him Mr. Mackenzie makes a short speech, showing what his views are, and setting forth the terms of that section 11 of the Northwest Territories Act, 1875, with which we are familiar. Now, Mr. Speaker, in exercising this power I think it is safe for us to follow the precedents that have been laid down. I should think that the different steps that have been taken by the imperial government in giving us control over this territory, enabling us to make a constitution, and giving us every other power that they could give us in order to form these new countries into provinces and to give them constitutions, that being the case, it seems to me there is no question but that we have the power. The next question is, how are we to exercise it. I was pointing out that I think it is wise to exercise that power along the same lines as it was exercised by Sir John A. Macdonald in 1870, by Mr. Mackenzie in 1875, and by Mr. Haultain when he had the drafting of the Bill a few years ago, and as it is exercised to-day, by the premier of this country who guides us in the way in which we should exercise this power.

It is contended that we do not grant constitutional freedom. This is constitutional freedom as it is understood by the Supreme Court of the United States :

'Constitutional freedom' certainly does not consist in exemption from governmental interference in the citizen's private affairs, in his being unmolested in his family, in being suffered to buy, sell and enjoy property, and generally to seek happiness in his own way. All these might be permitted by the most arbitrary ruler, even though he allowed his subjects no degree of political liberty. Mr. Justice Storey has well shown that constitutional freedom means something more than liberty permitted ; it consists in the civil and political rights which are absolutely guaranteed assured, and guarded; in one's liberties as a man and a citizen—his rights to vote, his rights to hold office, his right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, his equality with all others who are his fellow-citizens, all these, guarded and protected, and not held at the mercy and discretion of any one man or any popular majority. People vs. Hurlbut, 24 Mich. 44, 106, 108, 9 Am. Dec. 103.

Now the great difficulty seems to be why we must have separate schools. There are some people among us, and their ideas are deserving of every respect, who think that separate schools are not necessary and that we should not make provision for them. But a great many people in this country think they are necessary, and that being the case, we have to deal with circumstances as we find them. I heard a quotation from a paper to-night giving the language of some

reverend gentleman, I think belonging to my own church, saying that he hoped the day would arrive when one common ground of education could be reached, and when some form of religion could be taught in the schools upon which all could agree. Well, Sir, if there was any hope of reaching that state of affairs, I would be very glad. But we have been nearly a hundred years in trying to agree upon that point, and we do not seem to be any nearer to it to-day than we were then. I find that in 1854 there was a separate school law in the province of Ontario ; I find that they repealed it and in 1863 they put it again on the statute-book, and they now have separate schools in the province of Ontario. Seeing that neither in Quebec nor in Ontario can the present system be changed, it seems to me there is not much hope of being able to do away entirely with the principle of separate schools. Now, this very point was considered by the Privy Council, as will appear on page 485, volume 5, of Cartwright's Reports. They ask the question why it is that Catholics cannot agree to this common school education ? And they answer it in this wise :

> It is owing to religious convictions which everybody must respect, and to the teaching of the church that Roman Catholics and members of the Church of England find themselves unable to partake of advantages which the law offers to all alike.

Dealing with the same subject the Privy Council, at page 187 of the same volume, says :

> As a matter of fact the objections of Roman Catholics to schools such as alone receive state aid under the Act of 1890 (Manitoba Act), is conscientious and deeply rooted. If this had not been so, if there had been a system of public education acceptable to Protestant and Catholic alike, the elaborate enactments which have been the subject of so much controversy and consideration would have been unnecessary. It is notorious that there were acute differences of opinion between Catholics and Protestants on the education question prior to 1870. This is recognized and emphasized on almost every line of these enactments. There is no doubt either what the points of difference were, and it is in the light of these that the twenty-second section of the Manitoba Act of 1870, which was throughout a parliamentary compact, must be read.

Dealing with the same question further on their Lordships say that the argument urged by some people in favour of common schools is that they suit both alike. To this we cannot agree, as our Roman Catholic friends cannot accept them as doing justice to their views in respect to religious education.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no strong reason, from a presonal standpoint, why I should not be just as well satisfied with separate schools or with public schools as any other gentleman in this House. But I have this to say, that the experience of many years in close touch with the public schools of the province from which I come, has taught me that there is no use in trying to force upon any people a system of education with which they are not satisfied. Now my own position on the question is this : I am in favour of the most absolute and thorough government supervision and control of all schools receiving government grants or municipal aid. I am strongly in favour of the teaching of the principles of the Christian religion in schools. I am firmly convinced, after many years of active experience, that the teaching of religion cannot be successfully and harmoniously conducted in a mixed school attended by Roman Catholics and Protestant children together. I am a firm believer in the divine injunction : 'Train up a child in the way he should go and when he is old he will not depart from it.' I believe it is the duty of the state to see that as much as possible the cardinal principles of the Christian religion are thoroughly instilled into the youthful minds of the nation. I believe that this all-important purpose can only be accomplished by Protestants of all classes agreeing upon a certain line of religious instruction in all Protestant schools.

I believe that the Roman Catholics of Canada are doing the right thing when they insist upon the teaching of their children in the religious principles of their church. Our Protestant friends say that there is no religious teaching in our national schools and it is as good for your children as it is for ours ; that is quite true, and that view is worthy of some respect. But, our Roman Catholic friends say: We know that what you say is true and we know that our children will not be in any way interfered with in the common schools. But that is not enough ; we want our children to receive religious instructions every day in the school and we want those instructions to be guided and inspired by the teachings of our church and we want the instructions imparted by a person who understands and believes in them. This, as I understand it, is the position of our Catholic people in Canada and it is one, particularly from their standpoint, that commends itself to me, and one which I most cheerfully commend to the Protestants of Canada. As one who has been for the last twenty years in close touch with the public schools of the province of Nova Scotia, I take the responsibility of telling my Protestant countrymen that they cannot be too soon in following the example of their Roman Catholic brethren in insisting upon religious teaching in every school of the land.

That is the position which I take in respect to religion in the schools. I believe it is the proper thing to have it and if we must have separate schools in order to have religion in the schools let us have separate schools. If we can have them together, all

right, but if we cannot let us have them any way. What is the use of Protestants starving religion out of the schools and depriving their children of religious instruction for the sake of a few dollars ? Why should we hold out for a thing that Roman Catholics cannot and will not accept ? Is is not a proper thing for us as Protestants who have children to educate them in our own way? There is nothing in so far as the different Protestant bodies are concerned that will prevent them from having their children educated together in the same classes, taught by the same teachers or from receiving religious instructions upon grounds common to all Protestant bodies.

I was talking about this amendment. A great deal of fault is found because we have this amendment. I submit that this amendment is not legislation of this House. It is legislation that was passed by the legislature of the Northwest Territories. They are just as fully represented in their local House as the province of Manitoba. According to their size and population they have just as many representatives in the local legislature of the Northwest Territories as any local parliament of Canada. They have a government, they have a premier, they have all the powers that a local legislature has except that they cannot borrow money and the longer that power is kept from them, I think, the better. This is an Act they have passed themselves. The Northwest Territories have passed this legislation and they appear to be perfectly satisfied with it and we have some evidence in its favour. We heard the speech the other evening by the hon. memeber for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake), an opponent of this government. He put himself on record in connection with these schools, and what he says is this :

> I intend to claim the privilege of briefly putting on record the views which I hold with regard to this question. After nearly twenty-two years residence in the Northwest Territories, I believe firmly that the public school system as at present administered is the one best suited to the needs of the country.

That is the view of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle about the legislation that we are dealing with. He says that he has had twenty-two years experience in the Northwest, that he has seen many changes and that this law which is now on the statute-book has given satisfaction to that country. Mr. Haultain himself says about this Act that he has had some experience of it as premier, and he says :

> If I were dictator I would not change one line of it.

It is perfectly satisfactory to the premier, it is perfectly satisfactory to the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, and as far as we can find out it is perfectly satisfactory to every man who knows anything about education in the west. Now, if it is so satisfactory and if we are keeping it in the constitution of the provinces, what is the matter with it ? Is it not the right thing to do? Is it not right that we should have permanent institutions and not be subject to every change of doctrine that may come about from one day to another ? It may be necessary for me, on account of some statements that were made about this Act, to deal to some extent with some of its provisions. I am sorry that in the part of the country that I come from some of the clergy have been a little bit carried away by the agitation that has been going on in connection with this Act. I find this letter in some newspaper published in the part of the country I come from and when I read to this House certain provisions of the Education Act, I think it will be observed that there is no very great justification for this letter which was written by a reverend gentleman for whom the whole country, myself amongst others, has the greatest respect. I am only sorry that he did not take the trouble to learn for himself what the provisions of this Act are before he made such a pronouncement. He says :

> But to be perfectly frank, what is asked in this Autonomy Bill is not separate denominational schools ; there is no mention of Russian or Jew or Anglican or Presbyterian, what is asked is the recognition and public maintenance of Roman Catholic schools which the ratepayer is to support whatever his religious views may be. That is not equal educational privileges for all, this is not even the principle of separate schools, this is discrimination, it is the selection of one class of denominational schools for public support for all time and this without any reference to the public supervision of the teaching staff either in the matter of its appointment or its qualifications. Surely one is not to be called unjust and bigoted because he hesitates at fastening on posterity an unequal school system so pregnant with discord and strife as this is sure to be. Rather it would seem does the injustice lie in making any discrimination at all.

When we see what the provisions of this Act are, I think it is a pity that this reverend gentlemen who has put a little time on this question, at all events, enough time to enable him to write this letter, did not give it a little more attention, before he came to the conclusion that this Act was such an awful thing as he seems to think it is.

In the province of Nova Scotia we have a public free school system, the law governing which has been on the statute-books since 1864, but since then it has been several times amended. I have had something to do with the school legislation of Nova Scotia, and I know its provisions very well. I must say that so far as I know the Nova Scotia School Act, and comparing it with the Northwest Territories Education Act, I am inclined to believe that the latter is more full in its provisions, and, taking it all round, a better law. I would like our Nova Scotia friends to understand what

kind of an Education Act for the Territories we are giving our sanction to in this House, and I shall briefly contrast some of its provisions with those of the Nova Scotia School Law. In Nova Scotia we have what is known as a superintendent of education who is an officer of the government holding office for life or good conduct, but in the Northwest Territories they have a commissioner of education, who is a member of the government, responsible to the people, and who must go back for re-election. The Commissioner of Education in the Northwest Territories has full control of everything pertaining to education; he makes regulations as to the competency of the teachers for receiving a license; he controls their conduct after they are licensed; he supervises the manner in which they are engaged by the trustees; he drafts a form of contract which they must sign and they cannot teach school for one day without having complied with every regulation of the Act. Some hon. gentlemen have tried to make out that the separate school is absolutely apart from the public school, but I wish the message to be carried to our friends in Nova Scotia that this is an absolute mis-statement of the fact. The separate schools are national in every sense; they have the same text books, the same inspection and are under the same supervision as the common schools. From nine o'clock in the morning until half past three in the afternoon nothing can be taught in these schools except the ordinary prescribed lessons, but by arrangement between the trustees and the parents of the children in separate schools, there may be a half hour's religious instruction each day after half past three in the afternoon. I cannot see anything wrong about giving religious instruction in that manner; for my part I would like to see it the rule in every school in the country. Again, we are told by some hon. gentlemen, that once we pass this Act the school system in the Territories can never be changed, but section 52 of the School Act provides that if in any section there is a so-called separate school and a common school and the people wish to change they can unite and have the one common school. Therefore, the people can follow any school system they please, so long as they do not take away from the Roman Catholic or the Protestant minority the rights they have acquired. If the trustees of a Catholic and Protestant school in one section are willing to have a common school without any religious teaching in it, there is nothing in the Act to prevent it. I was pointing out, Mr. Speaker, that the rights in the matter of education which the minority of the new Territories will have under this legislation, are not as extensive as the rights given to the Protestant minority in Quebec or to the Roman Catholic minority in Ontario. And, in the province of Nova Scotia, although we have no separate schools by law, I can assure hon. gentlemen that the privileges which are allowed to separate schools and which are enjoyed by our Catholic friends in Nova Scotia are far and above anything which this law gives in the new provinces. If to-day, instead of forty years ago, we were framing a constitution for the admission of Nova Scotia into the confederation, I take the responsibility of saying that we could not form a compact without recognizing the claims of our Catholic friends in respect to this matter. Although there is no law dealing with it, I can assure the House that the Catholics of Nova Scotia are not suffering any grievance in respect to the educational laws of that province. If it is the right of the minority in Quebec to have a guarantee in the constitution, if it is the right of the minority in Ontario to have a similar guarantee, if it was the right of the minority in the Northwest Territories to have a guarantee in the Act of 1875, surely it is the right of that minority to have a like guarantee in the constitution to-day.

In 1867, when the province of Ontario came into confederation, the Catholics of Ontario came to the fathers of confederation with this section of the law in their hands:

> Every separate school shall be entitled to a share in the funds annually granted by the legislature of this province for the support of common schools and shall be entitled also to a share in all other public grants, investments and allotments for public common school purposes now made or hereafter to be made by the province or the municipal authorities according to the average number of pupils attending such schools.

That is the law with which the Catholics of Ontario came to the fathers of confederation and said: Our rights must be recognized under that Act. And their rights were recognized under that Act. To-day, when we are making a new constitution, the Catholics—I suppose it is the Catholics who are asking for this now—come to us with a statute of this parliament and say: This is an Act which you put upon the statute-books by which our rights to separate schools were granted in 1875, thirty years ago; this has been revised and reviewed twenty times since and it has always been looked upon as a proper thing to put in that law, and now we ask you to recognize it as fully and as completely as a similar right was recognized in 1867, when the minorities of Quebec and of Ontario came to the fathers of confederation looking for the protection of their rights. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if it would be fair or just to say to people who have lived for thirty years under a statute which we have given them affording them protection, an Act passed in 1875, to now remove the protection which they have enjoyed constitutionally for thirty years. Some one was asked

what right we have to suppose that the people of the Northwest will not grant the same privileges as we would grant in the east. While I am not saying that they would not, I will say that if I were a Catholic living in the Northwest what has happened in the past would, I think, be notice to me that I had not a great deal to expect in matters of this kind. I do not want to jar upon the feelings of any western man, or any other man, but I think that to be honest we should place the facts just as we find them. In the seventies, or perhaps in the eighties, a school law was passed in Manitoba which, as far as I can learn, was perfectly satisfactory to the Catholics and was a carrying out of the compact of 1870. Why it was so, I do not know ; but the fact is that it was later wiped off the statute-books, and there is no such thing in the statute-book of Manitoba to-day. It has been stated in this House to-day that a resolution has been twice passed in the legislature of the Northwest asking the government to take away the provisions of the Northwest Territories Act in respect to separate schools. These provisions have not been taken away, but does anybody venture to tell me that if the legislature of the Northwest had the power to take these provisions away, it would not do so ? They have twice passed resolutions wiping off the slate. They had not the power to fully and effectively carry that out, but as far as the intention is concerned, it was clearly there. All doubt with respect to the legislature of the Territories is removed in that way, and doubt with respect to the legislature of Manitoba is removed by the fact that three times in succession efforts have been made to wipe off the statute-book anything which authorized separate schools ; and I, therefore, think the minority are justified in asking us, when granting a new constitution, to see that these rights which were reserved to them in 1875 will again be reserved to them under the constitution of 1905.

I have spoken longer than I intended, but the points I wish to make are these, and I shall summarize them in concluding. In the first place, I wish to point out that I think that we have ample power under the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, and the Orders in Council which were passed to give us control over the Northwest and over British Columbia in 1871, to grant a constitution to any new provinces that we might carve out of the new country. I think, Sir, that we are perfectly safe in taking it for granted that when the parliament of Great Britain told us that we could give a province a constitution, that that means a constitution and it means nothing less. To give a province a constitution is to give it all the machinery necessary to carry its affairs on as a province ; and when, in the old days, we took in provinces by Order in Council, we took them in on such conditions as were stipulated and agreed upon. and perhaps one hundred changes would be made between the commencement of negotiations and the final admission of the province. If we were bound down to hard and fast rules, we could never get a province to enter the confederation, and the early legislators of Canada were not long in discovering that some discretionary power was needed, and Sir John A. Macdonald asked the parliament of England to give the Dominion parliament such power as would enable them to give the provinces entering confederation such constitution as from time to time they might find necessary. These constitutional powers were granted and exercised, and in the exercise of that discretion the parliament of Canada had full power to mould and shape the conditions of Canada and to give to these new provinces a constitution as much as possible on the lines of the old provinces, making such changes as were necessary to suit the circumstances in each case.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we have this power, and that we are exercising it in the right direction in recognizing the circumstances that to-day exist in that country. While we should give every privilege to the local legislature, we should carry out, in dealing with these new provinces, the principles that governed us in forming constitutions of the other provinces. It was recognized, as I said before, at confederation ; it was recognized in 1870, when the people who had formed confederation had every term and every condition of that contract fresh in their minds, when they had just returned from the conferences in England, when they were fresh from the conferences at Quebec and elsewhere, and when they had the whole business moulded and shaped in their minds, then the very first time they had to put it into effect they recognized the principle for which I am contending, and which is found in the British North America Act of a few years before. As I said before, it is recognized in the Act of 1875, it is recognized in that admirable speech of Mr. Blake, in that speech of Alexander Mackenzie, and in the concurrence with that idea of Sir John Macdonald and every member who spoke in the House of Commons in 1875. Finding these conditions and finding that it is our duty to follow them out, and finding that we have those powers, are we doing anything but what is right and fair when, in this slight way, we recognize that constitutional principle ? What are we doing ? We are simply adopting and making the law of the Dominion a law which the premier of the country with which we are dealing has stated is first-class legislation, is legislation which was passed by the parliament over which he presides, and of which he has said that if he were a dictator to-morrow he would not change one line of it. We are putting an Act into force in this country which an hon. gentleman who sits in this House as an opponent of the gov-

ernment, would venture to say that after twenty-two years' experience in the west this school law which we find to-day upon the statute-books is best suited for the needs of that country. That is the law we are asked to pass. I think the position I take in supporting the government is perfectly clear. I believe we have the power to do what we are doing, that in recognizing the constitutional rights of the people in the Northwest we are acting wisely, and that we could not recognize those rights at all and do less than we are doing.

Mr. GEORGE H. PERLEY (Argenteuil). This matter has been so thoroughly threshed out, Mr. Speaker, and the hour is now so late that I do not propose to keep the House very long. After listening to the many and varied arguments we have heard since this debate began it seems to me quite evident that no one is absolutely certain whether or not this House has the power to pass this Bill in its present shape. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. McKenzie) claims that our constitution is as pliable and elastic as the British constitution, but I can hardly see how for a moment it can be maintained that a constitution, which is a written one, and hence bound within the four corners of the document, can be at all compared to one which has its only basis in practice and precedent. Our constitution is the British North America Act, and that Act I do not think we have the power to alter or change in any particular without the consent of the imperial parliament. After listening to the very able arguments which we have had pro and con concerning the question of jurisdiction from the many able lawyers who have taken part in this debate it seems to me that those who deny our power to legislate as we please regarding the new provinces have the best of the argument, and I shall be surprised if the question of our jurisdiction is not carried to the Privy Council in England before it is finally decided. Should this happen, as I am afraid it will, the effect in the meantime will be most unfortunate, for the new provinces will be kept in a condition of trouble and uncertainty until the matter is finally decided. In my opinion it would have been far better had a series of questions been submitted to the Supreme Court and the Privy Council, and thus have removed by the highest court in the empire any doubts that might arise as to our powers, and as the creation of these new provinces was a matter which has been anticipated by everybody for some years, it seems to me that it would have been only ordinary foresight and prudence on the part of this government to have found out in advance exactly what jurisdiction this parliament has regarding these matters and thus be in a position to act without any uncertainty or hesitation. That, to my mind, would be the business way of acting, and naturally that is the way which most commends itself to my approval. Even now I think it would be better for the government to adopt that course, and I would consequently urge them strongly to withdraw the Bill and postpone it until next session, by which time we could ascertain exactly what our position is and thus avoid the danger of putting in our statutes a very important law which may turn out to be in many respects outside our jurisdiction and consequently waste paper. In the meantime the government could take advantage of the delay by taking up with the Canadian Pacific Railway the question of doing away with the exemption of that company from taxation, the continuance of which is provided for in section 23 of the Bill; and for my part I know of no reason why they could not arrive at some equitable arrangement which would be satisfactory to every one and fair to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and which would leave the new provinces absolutely untrammelled as regards taxation.

The chief discussion in this House and in the press throughout the country has been regarding clause 16 which deals with education. As I understand it, and as the hon. the Minister of Justice has explained it, this clause, as amended by the government, gives minorities in the Northwest the same rights they now enjoy. Neither more nor less. These rights are very simple and easy to understand. The important sections providing for these schools in the Northwest Ordinance are:

41. The minority of the ratepayers in any district, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish a separate school therein; and in such case the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate school shall be liable only to assessments of such rates as they impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

137. No religious instruction except as hereinafter provided shall be permitted in the school of any district from the opening of such school until one-half hour previous to its closing in the afternoon, after which time any such instruction permitted or desired by the board may be given.

(2) It shall, however, be permissible for the board of any district to direct that the school be opened by the recitation of the Lord's Prayer.

138. Any child shall have the privilege of leaving the school-room at the time at which religious instruction is commenced, as provided for in the next preceding section, or of remaining without taking part in any religious instruction that may be given if the parents or guardians so desire.

139. No teacher, school trustee or inspector shall in any way attempt to deprive such child of any advantage that it might derive from the ordinary education given in such school, and any such action on the part of any school trustee, inspector or teacher shall be held to be a disqualification for and voidance of the office held by him.

149. No person shall be engaged, appointed, employed or retained as teacher in any school unless he holds a valid certificate of qualification issued under the regulations of the department.

In other words, all schools must be conducted in the same way. All the teachers must be equally competent, all the text books and teaching must be the same in all the schools, and all the schools must be subject to government supervision. Religious instruction is, however, allowed for one-half hour of whatever kind the board of each school may decide. Now, Mr. Speaker, these rights for minorities have been in force, in much the same form, for many years, and thousands of people have settled in the Northwest relying on them. I understand they have been perfectly satisfactory to the people of the Northwest, and no doubt would be continued in the new provinces, were the matter left entirely to them. Personally, I believe it would be better to have all our children educated together, as they would learn to know each other better and perhaps make better citizens. But I have always lived in a mixed community such as we have in Ottawa, and I consider that the rights and feelings of every class of people should be respected, and that it would be impossible to carry on our government on any other basis in a country of varied races and religions such as Canada possesses. I might add, Sir, that although the county I have the honour to represent is composed of every class, creed and nationality, I have not received a single letter or petition urging on me to take any particular course regarding this question, and I think I may, without laying myself open to a charge of undue conceit, consider this a cause of pardonable pride on my part as showing that the people of Argenteuil are willing to trust me in this matter. If we have any right to legislate at all on the subject, I am sure that none of my Protestant friends would object to our continuing in the Northwest the very moderate rights of education which the Roman Catholic minority now has there and has had for so many years.

By their speeches, hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to convince the people that the Conservatives are against the separate school system as it at present exists in the Northwest. But, Sir, no member of the opposition has taken any such position.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PERLEY. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition showed in a masterly argument, from a constitutional and legal point of view, that this parliament should not deal with the question, but nothing that he said could in any way be construed into an objection to separate schools. We have had from the hon. Minister of Justice and many other lawyers a different view on the constitutional question from that taken by my hon. leader. According to some legal authorities, the power to legislate regarding education lies with us only, and according to others we are bound by the constitution to provide for a system of education. I myself believe in provincial rights, but in this case the question is not one of provincial rights, as there are yet no province in the Northwest, but of the legal interpretation of the British North America Act, and on that point no one can tell which lawyer is right and what view the Privy Council may take.

While I think that the educational clause as now drafted is fair and equitable, I repeat that, in my opinion, it would be better not to go on with the Bill now but let the government find out first where we stand and what our powers really are before we attempt to legislate.

It seems to me that the government is very much to blame for the hasty and ill considered way in which this measure was brought before the House and the country. The right hon. Prime Minister brought in this Bill on the 21st of February, and the greater part of his speech was an elaborate argument in favour of separate schools, and was of such a nature as to arouse a storm throughout the country on this question, and to make men of strong Protestant views believe there must be something very objectionable in the Bill. You must remember, Mr. Speaker, that none of us had seen the Bill when the right hon. Prime Minister presented it for its first reading, and still his speech produced in my mind the impression that he expected the measure to be strongly objected to by the Protestants of this country. That is exactly what happened. Petitions began to pour in at once, and a few days afterwards the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) resigned his office. After that, a whole month elapsed before the modified education clause was brought in by the government, and this agitation throughout the country kept on growing. I believe the storm of disapproval would never have arisen if the right hon. Prime Minister had consulted with his colleagues and his followers beforehand and had provided, in the first instance, simply for schools as they exist at present in the Northwest. I have no doubt that the people will place on the shoulders of the government, where it properly belongs, the blame for the unfortunate agitation on this question that has swept over the country.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, April 4, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

VANCOUVER, VICTORIA AND EASTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS (Yale-Cariboo) moved:

That the petition of John Hendry, presented this day, praying to be permitted to lay before the House the petition of the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway Company, praying for an Act to extend the time for the commencement and completion of their railway, notwithstanding the expiration of the time for receiving petitions for private Bills, be now read and received and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Before that motion is adopted, I wish merely to draw attention to the fact that this petition comes in at an extremely late date, and after the time for the presentation of petitions and introduction of private Bills has been twice extended. When an application of that nature is made, some exceptional reason should be given why the House should depart from its well-understood rule. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Duncan Ross) has given no reason whatever.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Mr. Speaker, in 1897 an Act was passed by the provincial legislature of the province of British Columbia incorporating the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company. In 1898 an Act was passed by this parliament declaring the works of this company to be works for the general advantage of Canada. In 1902 and 1904 extensions of time for the commencement and completion of the work were granted by this parliament. Since then some fifty miles of the railway has been constructed and arrangements are now being made to complete the road. In the course of making the necessary financial arrangements, the question was raised whether the charter rights of the company had not expired because of a certain omission in the legislation secured in this parliament. In order to remove this doubt—and the question was never raised until two or three days ago—the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway Company come to this parliament and ask for the legislation necessary to that end. It is purely a technical matter. But the working of the company and the financial arrangements now about to be completed will be affected unless this legislation goes through.

Motion agreed to.

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 4) to amend the Railway Act, 1903.—Mr. W. F. Maclean.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE.

KASLO AND LARDO-DUNCAN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. W. A. GALLIHER (Kootenay) moved:

That the petition of Robert Irving, presented this day, praying to be permitted to lay before the House the petition of the Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Railway Company, for the passing of an Act to extend the time for the completion of their railway, notwithstanding the expiration of the time for presenting petitions for private Bills, be now read and received and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Explain, please.

Mr. GALLIHER. I must admit, with reference to this matter, that probably the default was due to the solicitor of the company. Mr. Irving is the manager of the company. They obtained an Act of incorporation, and have already expended on construction something like $200,000, and they now ask to have the time for completion extended. If the petition was not presented within the time limit that is due to an oversight on the part of the solicitor, and it seems to me that the shareholders should not on that account be precluded from deriving any benefit from the moneys they have expended, as will be the case if this petition be not granted.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the time for completion expire before next session?

Mr. GALLIHER. Yes.

Motion agreed to.

KASLO AND LARDO-DUNCAN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. ROBERT MACPHERSON moved:

That the petition of Robert Irving, presented this day, praying to be permitted to lay before the House the petition of the Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Railway Company for the passing of an Act to extend the time for the completion of their railway, notwithstanding the expiration of the time for presenting petitions for private Bills, be read and received forthwith and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to.

MANITOBA BOUNDARY EXTENSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I observe that a return brought down giving copies of petitions and memorials from the legislative assembly of Manitoba and the executive of that province regarding the extension of the boundary of Manitoba contains an order of the Governor General in Council of the 21st March, 1905. I would like to ask my right hon. friend whether there has been any reply to that Order in Council from the executive government of the province of Manitoba.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. A reply from the government of Manitoba has been received this day and will be brought down to-morrow.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the right hon. gentleman have any objection to a motion passing for the printing of these documents as well as other documents in that connection which may be brought down?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To-morrow, when I bring down the other paper, we can make a motion.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 69) to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta and the amendment of Mr. Borden thereto.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE (Montmagny). At this stage of the debate, Mr. Speaker, I shall not pretend to review the whole of the discussion which has taken place in this House on the Bill now before us, nor shall I attempt to deal with all the clauses in that Bill. I propose to confine my remarks to that part of the measure which has created so much sensation, not only in this House, but in the country as well. I refer to the clause dealing with education. Having listened very faithfully to the debate which is taking place, I am of the opinion that the views which have been expressed on both sides, even those most opposite to my own, have been given in good faith and with but one object in view, the betterment of this country of ours.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Hear, hear.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. The view that I take of this matter may be a very weak one, but it is held in all sincerity and frankness; and in giving expression to it I trust that I shall not say anything likely to hurt the feelings of any one. You will understand, Mr. Speaker, that it would be much easier for me to address yourself and the House in my native tongue, but as I want my words to be understood, especially by those of my hon. friends who do not enjoy the advantage of understanding the beautiful French language, I shall endeavour to use the language of the majority. And if my English is not of the first quality, I ask you, Sir, and this House, for your kind indulgence.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Your English is very good.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I must ask you further not to forget that I have been educated in one of those very inferior schools of the province of Quebec.

If ever, Sir, there was a right well established, if ever there was a right based on justice and equity, it is the right of the Catholics of the Northwest to their separate schools. That is a right which comes to them naturally, constitutionally and politically. By virtue of natural law, it is the right of the parent to bring up his children in the way he thinks best calculated to make them good Christians and good citizens, and it is the parent who is finally responsible for the education of his children. That is so true that a simple comparsion will make itself evident to hon. members opposite. Suppose, for instance, that my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) or my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) should have no children and I should have six.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I have children.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I am simply putting an hypothetical case for the sake of argument, but as I apparently was not very well posted regarding the capacity of my hon. friend, I shall take instead the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes). Suppose these hon. gentlemen had no children and I had six, does it not belong to me and not to them to decide how my children shall be educated?

Mr. SPROULE. How many have you got?

An hon. MEMBER. He is only beginning.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I am a French Canadian and it will be all right. Is it because my hon. friends are in the majority that they can impose on me, against my conscience, their views, and dictate to me how I shall have my children educated? The child is not the property of the state, but of his parents, and it is they who have the right to decide how he shall be brought up and to have him brought up according to the dictates of their conscience. Hence we have seen outside the organization of the state, private societies or associations such as schools. The family constitutes a private society, at the head of which is the parents, and for the protection of which public society has been established. The civil society has been instituted for the protection of natural law, not to annihilate it; and for the public society to deny the right to existence of these private societies would be to destroy its own foundation, because both derive their source in the same principle, the sociableness of mankind.

It is on that instinct of sociableness, always mainfesting itself, that confederation has been established. The British North America Act defines the principles on which the different provinces have rested that principle and their agreement to it.

The British North America Act defines the principles upon which the different provinces have entered into that compact and their

agreement to it. This compact is eminently synallagmatic, providing for mutual and reciprocal obligations and common duties. In the British North America Act lies the common ground on which the different provinces formed the confederation which is now the Dominion of Canada. But, Mr. Speaker, that confederation was not looked upon at first favourably by some of the provinces, fears were expressed on behalf of the minorities in the various provinces, especially by the Protestant University of Quebec, and inducements had to be held out to the minorities in order to gain their consent. Let me quote to you some of the promises that were made to the provinces, from which you can judge what was the idea of the fathers of confederation. Hon. D'Arcy McGee, who I understand was one of the fathers of confederation, speaking, I believe, in 1864, said :

The minorities east and west have really nothing to fear, beyond what always existed, local irritations produced by ill-disposed individuals. The strong arm, the long arm of the confederate power will be extended over them all and woe to the wretch on whom that arm shall have to descend in anger for any violation of federal compact.

Well, Sir, inducements and promises of that kind were relied upon, and the various provinces agreed to form a confederation. They passed some resolutions and then went to the imperial parliament and obtained what is now termed the British North America Act, which is the constitution of Canada. That Act defines the powers of the central government, and the exclusive powers of the provinces. Among the latter is jurisdiction in the matter of education, but a jurisdiction which is not exclusive, but is limited by the terms of the British North America Act itself. My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) the other night said that section 91 defined the powers of the central government and section 92 defined the exclusive powers of the provinces ; and when he was asked by my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. L. P. Demers) if jurisdiction over education was contained in section 92, he was obliged to admit that it was not. There is a special section of the British North America Act, section 93, which gives to the provinces jurisdiction in the matter of education, but one which is limited by the terms of the section itself, subsections 1, 2, 3 and 4. Now we are told that in order to ascertain the meaning of any statute we must go back and inquire what was the intention of the legislators. Well, when this Act was passed in the British parliament, the mover, Lord Carnarvon, then Secretary of State to the colonies, made a statement which was quoted last night by my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) ; but I may be permitted to read it again, because I consider it very pertinent. Coming to section 93 the mover said :

Your lordships will observe some rather complicated arrangements in reference to education. I need hardly say that that great question gives rise to nearly as much earnestness and division of opinion on that as on this side of the Atlantic. This clause has been framed after long and anxious controversy in which all parties have been represented and on conditions to which all had given their consent.

There is not a word here of Quebec or Ontario.

The Roman Catholic minority of Upper Canada, the Protestant minority of Lower Canada, and the Roman Catholic minority of the maritime provinces will thus stand on a footing of entire equality.

Well, Sir, on the 22nd of February of the same year the Earl of Shaftesbury presented a petition to the House of Lords on behalf of the Protestants of the province of Quebec, asking that their rights be protected under the British North America Act that was then passing through parliament. What was the answer of Lord Carnarvon ? Here I will call upon my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) to make good his promise when he said that if we could show him some words in which we are in honour bound to give separate schools to the Northwest, then he would be in favour of them. I call the attention of that hon. gentleman to these words I am about to quote, and then ask him to keep his pledge. Lord Carnarvon, on the 22nd of February, in answering the Earl of Shaftesbury, said :

Hence the House would perceive that it was almost impossible for any injury to be done to the Protestant minority. The real question at issue between the Protestant and Roman Catholic communities was the question of education, and the 93rd clause, after long controversy, in which the views of all parties had been represented, had been framed. The object of that clause was to guard against the possibility of the members of the minority suffering from undue pressure by the majority. It had been to place all these minorities, whatever religion, on precisely the same footing, and that, whether the minorities were in esse or in posse.

Now is not that the case of the Northwest which was then a minority in posse and did not then form part of the confederation ? Thus the Roman Catholic minority in Upper Canada and the Protestant minority in Lower Canada and the Roman Catholic minority in the maritime provinces would all be placed on a footing of precise equality. Now, Sir, the time has come when the pledge made by Lord Carnarvon in the House of Lords, when he was speaking of minorities, must be kept, and when we ought to do them the justice that was promised in the House of Lords. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) made a very eloquent speech a portion of which I will quote :

Now, Sir, I never was a separate school adherent, I never believed in separate schools as against national schools. In 1896 I stated my

belief, as I state it now ; I knew it was not politically to my advantage, I knew it was not politically to the advantage of the Liberal-Conservative party; but, Sir, without thinking of ulterior things, I said to myself:

There is the constitution, there is the pronouncement of the highest judicial tribunal in this empire, there is the minority coming with a grievance and having the right to appeal to the Dominion government and the Dominion parliament, the only power that has jurisdiction to right their wrongs ; I said to myself : I believe it is right, I believe in the policy of attempting to carry out the constitution.

Well, Sir, why does not the hon. member for North Toronto still believe in the constitution ? I have always understood that a man who had principles and who believed in his principles stuck to them and tried to convince the people that they were wrong and not be convinced by the people that he was wrong. I think the hon. member for North Toronto has been long enough in politics and has been long enough in this parliament not to allow himself, when he believed that he had the right view of the question, and when he believed in the right of the minority, to be convinced that he was wrong even by a thrice expressed opinion on the part of the people, especially so, when during the elections of 1900 and 1904, that question was not in the least talked of. My hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) was quite right the other day when he said that the hon. member for North Toronto changed his mind because he found that his former view was not to his political advantage and it did not pay. These are the principles of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. They have principles but they cannot stick to them. They do not believe in any thing that does not pay and is not to their political advantage. It is not the statesmen who try to enlighten the mob, but it is the mob that tries to enlighten the political statesmen of the Conservative party. We have an expression of opinion by the highest tribunal in the British empire ; we have on this question the opinion of the judicial committee of the Privy Council which was given in the Manitoba case. We have the opinion of Lord Herschell, and I hope that the hon. member for North Toronto who has been much longer in politics than I have and who ought to know better than I do will pay some attention to that opinion and that he will be convinced that the correct view of this case is not to be found in the expression of public opinion on such a question as this. Lord Herschell, speaking in regard to the question of the jurisdiction of the provinces in the matter of education, said :

> Before leaving this part of the case it may be well to notice the arguments urged by the respondent, that the construction which their lordships have put upon the 2nd and 3rd subsections of section 22 of the Manitoba Act is inconsistent with the power conferred upon the legislature of the province to exclusively make laws in relation to education. The argument is fallacious. The power conferred is not absolute, but limited. It is exercisable only 'subject and according to the following provisions.' The subsections which follow, therefore, whatever be their true construction, define the conditions under which alone provincial legislatures may legislate in relation to education, and indicate the limitations imposed on, and the exceptions from, their power of exclusive legislation. Their right to legislate is not indeed, properly speaking, exclusive, for in the case specified in subsection 3, the parliament of Canada is authorized to legislate on the same subject. There is, therefore, no such inconsistency as was suggested.

Mr. Speaker, when the Northwest Territories entered the union they came under the principle of the British North America Act which is the basis of confederation and which is the principle upon which all the sovereign states have met to form this confederation. This was the principle and it was so well understood that when a law was passed relating to separate schools in the Northwest Territories it met, in the House of Commons, with little if any opposition. The men of that time, the Blakes, the Mackenzies, and Sir John Macdonald understood perhaps better than our hon. friends to-day what was the spirit of the constitution because they were closer to it. Were there any doubt left in the minds of hon. gentlemen about the right of the Catholics of the Northwest Territories to their separate schools the law of 1875 should remove it immediately. That law, which I need not read to the House, as has been said by my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), is the law of to-day. That law was passed under the provisions of section 93 of the British North America Act, it is the law of to-day and the meaning of the British North America Act is that when separate schools have been established they have been established for good. Why was it that the law of 1875 was passed ? Was it not passed at the request of the Protestant minority in Manitoba, under section 93 of the British North America Act, to make clearer and to relieve any doubt there may have been relating to the rights of the Protestant minority of the west ? When that law was passed by parliament, the Protestant minority as it then existed believed that the Northwest Territories would be a second province of Quebec and that the French Catholics would have a majority there. That is so clear that you cannot find any speech against it, not even a speech by George Brown himself, and I defy hon. gentlemen opposite to show me one single article in the Protestant papers of that time against the law of 1875. What was the attitude of the 'Globe' then ? Can we find a single word in the 'Globe' of 1875 against the law which gave separate schools to the minority of the Northwest Territories? Nor, can we find a single word of protest in the 'Mail,' which, I believe, is the organ of the Conservative party to-day. Well Sir,

when this law was passed in 1875 to protect the rights of the Protestant minority of the Northwest Territories it was passed without any obstruction from the Catholic majority of the west, and if it was passed with the complete acquiescence of the Catholic majority of the west why should our Protestant friends of the west to-day be any more narrow-minded than the Catholics were in 1875 ? Why should they not stand to-day as we stood in 1875 ready to give to our Protestant fellow-citizens what was their right and what we claim to be our right to-day, because we are now in the minority ? I suppose, that our hon. friends on the other side of the House will want to know when the Northwest Territories enter confederation, and I suppose that the old war cry that we have heard very often in this discussion, without, it seems to me any reason, will be again heard that we are making an attack upon provincial rights. Well, Sir, my view is that the Northwest Territories are not yet members of the confederation of Canada. We know that they have not the rights of a province in the matter of education, that we have absolute and unlimited jurisdiction as far as the Northwest Territories go, and I think I can fairly say, Mr. Speaker, that the Northwest Territories in the matter of education or in any other matter have not even the colour of a right. The question has arisen : When do they enter the union, or when do they become a party to the compact formed in 1867 between Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick ? Was it in 1870, or is it to-day or will it be to-morrow ? Mr. Haultain, the premier of the Northwest Territories says that the Northwest Territories entered the union on the 15th July, 1870. One might ask by virtue of what law did the Northwest Territories become a party to the contract which implies the possession of all the powers which were conceded to the other provinces by the imperial parliament in 1867, only by a fiction of international law. But, let us for the moment accept the argument of Mr. Haultain, let us suppose that the Territories entered the union in 1870 ; by the terms of the British North America Act, separate schools having been established in the west since by the federal government which was the competent authority, and that law having been ratified by the legislature of the Northwest Territories, separate schools were established for ever and we cannot now abolish them. That, is not my opinion only. I would not give my own legal opinion on such an important question, but in stating this, I give the opinion which was expressed by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper in 1896. Speaking on the Manitoba school question in 1896, he quoted and endorsed what Hon. Mr. Mills said in the House of Commons on March 8, 1875 :

> The British North America Act favours the Catholic population. It provides that any province having separate schools before confederation should have them for all time, and also that any province not having them at the time of the union, but receiving them at any future time, shall receive them as a right which can never be taken back.

Well, Sir, is not that the case in the Northwest Territories to-day ? In 1896, Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper was quoting the Hon. D. Mills, on the Northwest Territories Act of 1875, and we know the Hon. David Mills was a high authority. If we take Mr. Haultain's opinion, not even this federal parliament, bound by its constitution and the Act of Confederation, can abolish the schools which were established after the so-called, entrance into the union by the Act of 1870. My hon. friends on the other side may say that the British North America Act refers only to the provinces and that the word 'legislature' in section 93 does not mean the legislature of the Northwest Territories, but if they take the trouble to read the Canadian Interpretation Act, they will see that 'province' means the Territories of the Northwest and the district of Keewatin, and, they will see that the 'legislature' means not only the legislature of the provinces, but the legislature of the Northwest Territories and the Orders in Council passed relating to Keewatin.

It is true the British North America Act is an imperial statute, but is one worded by Canadians, passed on Canadian resolutions.

In the province of Quebec we were at first greatly impressed by the leader of the opposition as being a broad-minded man and a man above prejudices. He came to our province and his first words were addressed to the people in the French language, and that incident endeared him to the heart of the French Canadian, but, Sir, when the leader of the opposition had to show that he was really the leader of his party, never was more applicable the saying about a French statesman : 'Je suis le chef, il faut bien que je les suive.' When the hon. gentleman had to show himself as the leader of his party, we thought, judging by his short record of the past, we would see him occupy his position in public life with the mantle of Sir John A. Macdonald covering his shoulders. But we were disappointed. Was it too broad for his shoulders ? I cannot say, but I know that the hon. gentleman has changed the mantle which Sir John Macdonald wore as the leader of the Conservative party ; he has changed that broad mantle for a narrower one ; one which may not be dignified by the name of mantle, but which perhaps might be better described as the short pea jacket of the old Tories that was worn by Sir Allan Macnab. However that may be, we have the consolation of seeing that the old Tory jacket is perhaps a little too short for the hon. member for Carleton,

judging by his seeming uncomfortableness during this whole discussion. The hon. gentleman has told us that he has not been pressed by his followers into assuming his present position, and we must accept his word for it. It would appear then that the hon. gentleman has acted a little bit of the role of a Czar, which we have heard so much about from the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean), the leader of the opposition has acted like the dictator which those who read the Toronto 'World' saw described in its columns the other day.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I hope you read it.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Certainly, but I take an antidote afterwards. The Canadian House of Commons bears the same relation to the legislature of the Northwest, as the imperial parliament bore towards the Canadian colonies in 1867. These Territories were acquired by the right of conquest, and with them this parliament acquired the power to legislate for their future welfare, but, did the Northwest Territories really enter the union in 1870, as is claimed by Mr. Haultain ? Canada was not then treating with independent sovereign provinces, as in the case of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia. There was no compact with these Territories, there was no synallagmatic contract, but merely the taking possession of a portion of territory. That western country had no power to treat with us ; the claims of the half-breeds that they had that power were not listened to, It would be fairer to say that since 1870 the Northwest belonged to the union, but was not a party to the compact entered into in 1867. The Territories in 1870 were given a provisional constitution it is true, but it was a transitory constitution without provincial rights and there was an acknowledgment of our sovereignty. It was even argued, here, that the Northwest Territories had not the right to send members and senators to the Dominion parliament, and I need not quote the speech of the Hon. Mr. Mills in 1875 to that effect. But, Sir, the surest proof that these Territories are not a part of the union is that they have not autonomy, and that to-day, without their consent, their domain is being divided into two new provinces. Even take the Bill as presented to this House and you will see that the date of the union is at the time of the passing of this Act.

We have heard a good deal about provincial rights in this House. May I ask, where are the provincial rights that are wronged in this matter ? Where are the provinces that have provincial rights ? They do not yet exist, and even were there any provinces existing to-day their rights in the matter of education would be limited in matters of education as are the rights of any other province in the confederation by the British North America Act. Canada has now to deal with her own property, and so we are going to create new provinces and to give them a constitution. I say, Sir, that it is most important that we should give them a constitution which shall be in accordance with the spirit of confederation, and in doing so we must not forget that these lands of the Northwest have been acquired, not by Protestant Canada, but by the Canadian confederation, French and English, Protestant and Catholic. And, Sir, in view of the condition of certain minds in the country and in view of the agitation, fomented by certain narrow spirits it is most expedient that in giving these Territories autonomy there should be a clear and precise declaration as to what is confederation and what is the spirit of the British North America Act—not a milk and water declaration, but a declaration, clear and precise as the principle on which union has been established, so that the question may be settled for ever, so that the government of these provinces shall be protected, not only against agitators from the outside, but against itself.

We have been told, Sir, many a time that we should trust the majority. This might be true in Quebec, but considering what has been done in the Territories since 1875 how can we trust the majority there ? I need not quote the ordinances passed in 1892, or the ordinances passed in 1901, for we have the speech of the Minister of Finance and we have the speech of the ex-Minister of the Interior—a man who ought to know—in testimony that separate schools in the Northwest exist only in name and not in fact. The Minister of Finance has told us that from the hour of the opening of the school in the morning until half past three in the afternoon the separate schools and the public schools in the Northwest Territories are exactly the same. Let me quote the opinion of Archbishop Taché on this point :

> More astute than the Manitoba government, the one of the Territories has left the Catholics their existence, but he has robbed them of what constitutes their special character, and assures their liberty of action.

Now, as to what separate schools ought to be, I shall cite the opinion of Lord Watson. He is a highly educated man, a man learned in the law, a man tolerant and broad minded and his opinion ought to be worth something to us at this juncture. En passant, I may say that I wish our hon. friends opposite would read a little more as to what is going on in Great Britain and a little less as to what is going on in the United States, if they want to form a correct view on Canadian political or social issues. Is it not strange to see the loyalists on the other side of the House being taught the British spirit

and the British constitution by what are called the rebel and disloyal members from the province of Quebec, yes Sir, taught British principles by the very men who have been arraigned in the Toronto 'World' as being disloyal to British institutions. I wish that the hon. members on the other side of the House had a little more of the British spirit and the British training that we French Canadians have in the province of Quebec. If they had, Sir, you would perhaps hear a little less of their cries about loyalty and see in them a little more of the true spirit of loyalty. Lord Watson, speaking of the idea of denominational schools in the minds of Roman Catholics said :

I rather think that the original idea of denominational schools is a school of a sect of people who are desirous that their own religion should be taught in it, and taught in their own way—a doctrinal religion ; and not only taught because religion is taught in a non-sectarian school, but, in the view of those who founded denominational schools originally, the theory was that their views of religion and teaching of their religion should permeate and run through all the education given in the school—that, whether it were rudimentary science or anything else, there should be an innoculation of the youthful mind with particular religious views.

We have seen that from the hour of opening in the morning until half-past three in the afternoon the schools in the Northwest are practically non-sectarian or neutral schools. Well, Sir, with regard to neutral schools, I will give you, not the opinion of any narrow and illiterate French Canadian, but the opinion of men on the other side of the Atlantic whose reputation has extended over the world, and men who belong to the Protestant sects. Mr. Guizot, a Protestant, and a historian of some note, a Frenchman, but not a French Canadian, says :

Popular education must be given and received in a religious atmosphere so that religious impressions and habits penetrate the child from every where. Religion is not an exercise or study to which one assigns a given hour or place. It is a law, a law which must make itself felt constantly and everywhere and which only at that price has a salutary action upon soul and life. That is to say that in primary schools religious influence must be habitually present. If the priest is defiant or isolates himself from the teacher, if the teacher considers himself as the independent rival, and not the auxiliary of the priest, the moral effect of school is lost.

Lord Derby writes :

The secularized school is the realization of a mad and dangerous idea.

Sir Robert Peel said that such a system violated the right of conscience. Mr. Gladstone, whose opinion I hope will be received with respect on the other side of the House, said :

Any system which places religious education in the background is a pernicious one.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE.

Is not that the system that we have had in the Northwest since 1892, when the attempt was made to abolish the system of separate schools ?

Now, Sir, what do we Catholics ask for ? We have not the intention of robbing our fellow-citizens belonging to different creeds of the smallest piece of their school rights ; but we claim ours loudly, as must do free citizens, and with the calm and confident conscience of Christians. And, Sir, if the Catholics have a right to their schools, why should we not give those schools effectively to them ? The question is not as to the merits or the demerits of separate schools ; yet in passing I may give in a few words some idea of the character of the separate schools of Quebec. I shall not speak at length of the results of the neutral schools of the United States. I may say this, however, that we have seen in that country divorces increasing, the race difficulty increasing, the fight between capital and labour increasing, murders increasing, and religion diminishing. I do not want to insult gratuitously the United States as hon. members on the other side of the House put it ; but, Sir, have we not a right to be proud of our Canadian institutions when we compare them with the institutions of any other country, especially those of the country that is closest to us, and in the light of the facts which have been put before the public in the United States themselves ? I said that religion was decreasing in the United States, and I can prove that, not on any Canadian authority, but on the authority of the New York 'Telegram,' which in 1896 said that the number of adherents of all the churches in the United States does not exceed twenty-three millions, that is, one-third of the population. Well, Sir, if that is the way the United States have succeeded with the system of Godless schools, do you not think that we have a right in this country to guard our fellow-citizens against the same system being imposed upon them?

The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said it was his own business whether he thought religious teaching in the schools was right or wrong. I am proud to say that I am in favour of religious instruction in schools. Very different from the attitude of the hon. member for East Grey was the opinion of a Methodist, Dr. Ryerson, which was quoted at Cornwall on August 31, 1878, by no other than Sir John A. Macdonald, whom I hope the hon. member for East Grey will not go back upon. This is what he said of Dr. Ryerson :

He has stated that the Separate School Bill did not injure common schools, but had widened the basis of education.

Well, Sir, if Sir John A. Macdonald could state that the Separate School Bill of 1875, had widened the basis of education, I do not think the public school has widened the minds of our friends on the other side of the

House. With regard to the system of schools in the province of Quebec, I must say that when we look at the facts and results of those schools, we have nothing to be ashamed of. I think our system of schools can compare with any other system in the Dominion of Canada. If I remember rightly, the system of schools in the province of Quebec took the first prize at the World's Fair of 1893 at Chicago, and I think it was awarded some medals at the World's Fair in Paris in 1900 ; and I may say this, in answer to a reverend gentleman—I think it was Dr. Salton—who, speaking in Ottawa, said that the morality of Quebec was lower than that of any other province of the Dominion.

Let me give you a few statistics, showing the proportion of convictions in each province. In British Columbia we had one conviction to every 56 inhabitants; in the Northwest Territories one in every 77 ; in Ontario one in 114 ; in Manitoba one in 115 ; in New Brunswick one in 144 ; in Nova Scotia one in 154. And in that fearfully backward province of Quebec, we have only one conviction in every 176 inhabitants. May I then be permitted to say that our province can not be so very far behind in the race, judging by the statistics under this head. Then if we take the expenditure since 1900, we find that the province of Quebec is, in the matter of expenditure on public education, far ahead of any province in the Dominion. If my hon. friend denied that, I have the figures right here. But I shall not weary the House by going into them. I may say too that the number of illiterates has decreased in the province of Quebec in a proportion far greater than in any other province of the Dominion ; and I am sorry to say that in that province, where we have abolished separate schools, the province of New Brunswick, the number of illiterates has increased. If my hon. friends from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) or South York (Mr. Maclean) will go to the province of Quebec, as we are not afraid to go to the province of Ontario ; if they would go before the public of that province as my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) has gone before the public of Toronto and Kingston and other places in Ontario—if they would come to my poor riding—they would see there schools where the pupils are not all stupid. They would see a few presbyteries where the priests are not totally illiterate but men of culture and learning, who take an interest in the education of their province. If the hon. member for South York would only come to the province of Quebec, he would see that we have there 5,000 primary schools, 600 superior primary schools, 3 normal schools, one engineering school, 3 schools of agriculture, also institutions for the blind, the deaf and the dumb—I hope my hon. friends opposite would go to one of these institutions and be treated for the first of these diseases. These are facts which any province would be proud to put before the parliament of Canada. But those hon. gentlemen would sooner shut their eyes and appeal in their newspapers to public passion than take the opportunity to obtain a little enlightment.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if I ever made any reflection on the public schools of the province of Quebec.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I am not charging my hon. friend with having made any such reflections in this House, but I say that he ought to go to the province of Quebec and learn something about educational matters in this country of ours.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Will the hon. gentleman let me say that I spend nearly every summer in the province of Quebec and have often been in those presbyteries to which he has referred. I have met the reverend gentlemen in charge of them, and have found them to be such as my hon. friend says they are, so that he is giving me no enlightenment on that subject. He is instead putting me in the position of having said things which I did not say.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I do not know whether my hon. friend wishes here to escape responsibility for the brutal cartoons published in his newspaper the Toronto 'World' —cartoons in which the province of Quebec is represented as an illiterate Indian and the people of the Northwest as most intelligent, civilized, and claiming they are white men. What does that mean if it does not mean that the inhabitants of the province of Quebec are of mixed origin ? Sir, I would be prouder to have in my veins the blood of the noble red man than the blood of some hon. gentlemen opposite who write in the Toronto 'World.' I would wish that every British colony and every province of this Dominion were peopled by inhabitants of as pure an origin and with as pure blood in their veins as the French inhabitants of the province of Quebec. I would wish that they could trace as good a genealogy as any inhabitant of that province is able to trace, not only in this country but in the country of his forefathers. The cartoons published in the Toronto 'Globe' are bold, brutal, stupid and as untrue as they are stupid. It appears now that my hon. friend from South York would lead us to infer that he does not approve of those cartoons, but I do not know that he has ever gone back on them.

But supposing the schools of the province of Quebec were as bad as they are described by hon. members opposite and by some people who write in the Ontario papers, I say that if we have a system of schools in the province of Quebec at all we have a right to-day to be proud, because after the treaty of Paris in 1763, when the last ship for France took away from our shores the nobility and the rich people and left be-

hind the poor peasants, ruined by war, left with a debt from France of 20 million francs, a whole cloud of adventurers came to this country and continued on the ruin of the poor settlers who were left behind. Then contrary to the Act of capitulation and the treaty of Paris, the Catholic institutions were taken away from the French people. The system of schools we had then were taken from us. I should like to give my hon. friend a history of the school system in the province of Quebec if it were possible to enlighten him, because although he tells us he has spent much time in that province, it is quite evident that he has not learnt much. From 1760 to 1800 the French Canadian refused to participate in the schools then existing, because it was against their conscience to do so, and I consider that their ignorance was a glorious one. In 1800 there was a school system established for which the French Canadians were taxed; the Royal Institution, in which the money was given to the Protestant schools and to them only. Again the French Canadians refused to attend those schools, because it was against their conscience to do so, and they remained in their glorious ignorance. In 1824 we had the first schools worthy of the name, but as there was no public money given them, they could not work very well. In 1837 our rights were still not recognized and the Protestant minority had still control of the public funds. In 1841 the first move was made towards giving our people a schools system which they could support, and in 1846 we had our separate school system established, and our French Canadian people could go to schools where their rights were recognized and which they could attend without a blush of shame. Considering that we started our school only in 1846, we have made marvellous progress and to-day our system is at the head of the whole confederation.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that so? I understand the hon. gentleman to say that their school system is at the head of the confederation to-day, and I assume that refers to the intelligence of the people.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. If my hon. friend would take the trouble to look into the reports of public instruction of Quebec he would learn many things which he will never see in the Orange 'Sentinel.'

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask the hon. member, if I am not improperly interrupting him—and I do not wish to do that—to explain one point? He speaks of what he calls the superior educational system of Quebec. And, if I followed him closely, this system has been in operation since 1846—that is, for two generations at least. How is it, then, that in spite of the excellence of the system, statistics show that while the number of those who can read and write is, in the province of Manitoba, 72 per cent; in Prince Edward Island, 75 per cent; in New Brunswick, 70 per cent; in Nova Scotia, 72 per cent; and in Ontario, 80 per cent, Quebec has only 67 per cent—only 67 out of every 100 people who can read or write? These figures do not indicate that this system has succeeded very well in doing away with illiteracy in the province of Quebec.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I am very glad that my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) has asked me that question. I will try to enlighten him a little further. I said that our system of schools in Quebec was started in 1846. But it was not in full operation until 1855. And then, as my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) has rightly put it, the people were for a long time very cautious about the schools. They had long been tyrannized over, and they saw in the schools, as they thought, an instrument to rob them of what they held dear—their language and their institutions. Therefore, it was only slowly and with great caution that they accepted the work of the schools. But in 1855 the system was at work almost as completely as it is to-day. As to overcoming illiteracy, we have made greater progress in Quebec than in any other province. Let me give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) the figures. In 1871, in Quebec, there were of illiterates—people who could neither read nor write—35·93 per cent of the population. In 1891 only 29·05 per cent of the population were illiterate. Thus in the twenty years we have made progress to the extent of 6·89 per cent. In Ontario, in 1871, there were 7·90 per cent of the people who could neither read nor write. In 1891 this had been reduced to 7·05 per cent, showing progress to the extent of only 0·85 per cent. In New Brunswick, where there are no separate schools, they had, in 1871, 14·45 per cent of illiterates, and in 1891 the proportion was 14·99 per cent, or an absolute retrogression to the extent of ·54 per cent. I do not say that we lead confederation in the proportion of our people who can read or write; but I do say that we lead in the progress that we have made in extending the blessings of education.

Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that we should have in the Northwest a national system of schools. Sir, do you call it a national system of schools which is opposed to the conscience of 40 per cent of the nation? Do you call those national schools against which 40 per cent of the nation have fought for more than a century? I say that what these hon. gentlemen call national schools are anti-national schools, because they are forced upon 40 per cent of the people against their will; I say that what you call free schools are the exact reverse of free, because they deny the liberty of the individual and make him a slave in the hands of the state. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) told us that in the province of Quebec a Protestant boy was obliged to go to a Catholic school. But

is it not a fact that where our Protestant brothers are in the majority in any part of the province of Quebec they can have a separate school of their own ? Is it not a fact that, even though in any district they may be in the minority, they can establish a separate school if they have the certain small number required by the law ? And is it not a fact that even where the Protestants have not the legally required number, the French Canadians are broad enough to allow their Protestant brethren to have schools of their own ? But is it not a fact —and I wish the hon. member for North Toronto were here to answer—that whereever the Catholics are in a majority in any district in the Northwest, they have not the right to establish a separate school, but are obliged to go to the public schools ? The treatment meted out to the minority in Quebec and in the Northwest Territories cannot be compared. Sir, it is as bad to force the Catholic to send his child to a school where no religion is taught as to force him to send that child to a school where a religion opposed to his own is taught. That is the Catholic doctrine ; I wish that my hon. friend would understand it once for all. We object, not only to being obliged to send Catholic children to Protestant schools, but to being obliged to send them to schools where no religion is taught.

Sir, as a French Canadian who has studied and learned something of British institutions, and who is loyal to the institutions given this Dominion by the mother country, because he has studied them and believes in them, I may ask my hon. friend from North Toronto what is British liberty if the Catholics are not allowed to have their own schools ? Is not that political liberty the pride of Englishmen, inclusive and widely tolerant ? Is it a selfish and narrow liberty, in some sort Protestant and privileged, and which is only a means to better shackle some of the people with the heavy chains of an intolerable despotism? Where is the British liberty, I ask these hon. gentlemen, if the minority, because it is a minority, cannot enjoy the liberties which were promised them in the name of the Sovereign, and which have been formally declared in the mandates of that Sovereign ? Sir, if this House were to follow racial appeals, the appeals made to prejudice by the hon. member for East Grey, it would only serve to remind us that we were the vanquished in 1759.

Mr. SPROULE. I desire at once and flatly to contradict the hon. member (Mr. A. Lavergne), and to repeat, what I have said before, that I never made an appeal to either race or religion. I call upon the hon. member to withdraw his statement.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I expected that denial, and now I am going to prove what I have said. There is a newspaper called the 'Sentinel' published in Toronto. It claims to be the organ of the Orange Order, with which, I understand, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) has something to do. Of course, I do not wish to say anything against the character of my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule). In the province of Quebec, it is true, that he has a bad reputation, I must say ; but we who know him know that he is a good man, and know that he would not hurt a fly. But in my province we are often asked : 'You know the member for East Grey better than we do ; is it not true that the Yellow Pope has certain Peter's pence and is obliged to earn his money, and that is why he is so violent against the Catholics and the Romish Church. In this organ of the Orange Order —the 'Yellow Hierarchy,' as my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) calls it—in its issue of March 16th, 1905, I find Brother D. Pritchard, grand treasurer, quoted as follows :

> I have always been an advocate for public schools, believing that by the national schools more than by any other means we may hope to build up a united people. One school and one language taught in the same should be the motto of every loyal Canadian.

And he adds, the English language is to be the one to be taught. Well, Sir, what does that mean ? Does it mean that the French language, which is an official language in Canada as well as the English, is to be abolished by the Orange order when they get into power ? I can make nothing else out of it. On February 23, 1905, the Reverend Brother Hughes—no, not Reverned Brother Hughes, M.P., at a banquet in Brantford, gave the history of the Orange movement and its fight against the Romish church, and asked all the members to maintain their principles, even if the occasion demanded that they fought for them. Well, Sir, I do not say that a man has not a right to fight for his principles, but I am not quite sure that the hon. gentleman means a constitutional fight. I am afraid that he is appealing to the Orange lodges to fight another battle of the Boyne. Well, here is something more. If there is one right of a British subject which has been claimed by the hon. member for East Grey on many occasions during this session, it is the right of petition. After the province of Quebec began to petition like British subjects for the maintenance of separate schools in the Northwest, the 'Orange Sentinel' of March 23, 1905, contained the following, under the title, 'The glove is thrown down':

> After saying that 'it was Quebec assuming to dictate to the Dominion, or rather is the arbitrary and intolerant ecclesiastical oligarchy dominating Quebec, making a supreme effort to tyranize the democracy and the Protestants in Canada,' it says :
>
> The gauntlet will be taken up, the fight will be accepted. For our own part we are right glad that it has been precipitated just now. Sooner or later it had to come, and the sooner the better for all concerned. Sooner or later

there was bound to be a struggle—a fight to a finish——

It goes on to ask the Protestants to unite and destroy Rome and Quebec. Now, Sir, is not that language an appeal to racial prejudices? Is it not an appeal to religious prejudices? Is it not designed to set race against race, creeed against creed? Sir, we saw in the paper which is the organ of the organization of which the hon. member for East Grey is the Grand Master, language such as I have quoted, and am I not right therefore in saying that the hon. gentleman, if not in this House, at least in his paper, has made appeals to racial and religious prejudices.

Mr. SPROULE. I never had any interest in the 'Orange Sentinel' to the value of one cent, and I have no more relationship to it except as a member of the Orange order, than the hon. gentleman hmself. Does the hon. gentleman think it proper and fair to hold the member for East Grey responsible for the sentiments of every one who writes in the 'Orange Sentinel'? The hon. gentleman made a personal charge against me.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. He first made a charge against me, now he has transferred it to some one else. May I ask the hon. member for East Grey if he, as Grand Master of all the Orange lodges of Canada, has repudiated their organ, the 'Orange Sentinel'? Is not the 'Orange Sentinel' the written expression of the deliberations of the Orange lodges of the Dominion of Canada? Is not the 'Orange Sentinel' the organ of the Grand Master of the Orange organization as well as the organ of private members? I did not know that it had been repudiated by the Grand Master, and I want to know if the grand master repudiates it to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask the hon. gentle man if he and his friends have repudiated the course of the Toronto 'Globe' lately in regard to the Autonomy Bill?

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I repudiate it entirely. My hon. friend has no right to answer one question by asking another. I have answered the hon. gentleman frankly and clearly, and I ask him to answer me in the same manner. I said I repudiated the course of the 'Globe,' and I want the hon. member for East Grey to say with equal frankness if he repudiates the 'Orange Sentinel.'

Mr. SPROULE. The member for East Grey is not attacking the 'Sentinel' for what it said.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I cannot know whether the yellow pope speaks ex cathedra or not. Well, Sir, not only are we the subjects of racial appeals, but we are called upon to remember that we were vanquished in 1759. When I was reading the history of Canada not long ago I came across the story of a French Canadian, Du Calvet, who was arrested in Quebec in 1781, and was imprisoned without a trial. When I was reading his words I was reminded of the course of the 'Orange Sentinel' in taunting the French Canadians with having been vanquished in 1759. Here are the words of Du Calvet, written in London in 1781:

> How sad it was to be vanquished! If it only cost the blood which is shed on the battle field, the wound would be very deep, very sore, it would bleed many years, but time could cure it. But to be condemned to feel perpetually the hand of the conqueror pounding on your shoulder, but to be perpetually a slave, under the power of the most constitutional sovereign, of the freest people on earth, it is too much.

Sir, that is the position in which hon. gentleman on the other side wish to place us to-day. That is the position in which their yellow papers wish to place us to-day. But I want to remind hon. members opposite that in this compact of confederation we are not slaves but partners. In the compact of confederation we took our part, and in that compact the French Canadians are treated as partners. We have been loyal to British institutions and we have been loyal to the Canadian constitution. We claim the right to be treated as fellow-citizens, as compatriots.

Mr. SPROULE. We have no desire to treat you otherwise.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. The hon. member for North Toronto said that when this law was passed war would begin in the Northwest. These hon. gentlemen are always ready to accept the opinion of the majority when that opinion is against separate schools, but when that opinion is in favour of separate schools then they talk of war and rebellion against the sovereign authority of this parliament. I say that if separate schools were withheld from the people of the Northwest it would be an injustice done against the Catholics of the Dominion, an injustice which is not deserved by the Catholics and French Canadians of this Dominion.

But, Sir, what can we do then? We can make a constitutional fight. You never heard the members from Quebec of the hierarchy, or the priests of Quebec talking of war and rebellion. You have never heard from the pulpits of our churches the speeches which have been made in other churches or in lodges. We submit to the law. We may oppose the law, we may conduct a constitutional agitation against it, but you never heard on our side talk of war or rebellion because the majority was against us. We respect the majority, but it is strange to observe the attitude of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. When they have the majority with them they claim that the majority has every right, but when the majority is against them they say that they will make war against the

majority. There is only one right that I do not recognize in the majority and that is the right to bring compulsion to bear upon me in a matter of conscience. If there are three or four men against me I say they have no right to endeavour to force me to do something which I feel that I cannot conscientiously do. Therefore, I say in conclusion that in view of all the facts we should give to the minority in the Northwest Territories their rights generously, not the shadow of justice, not the mere form of liberty. We are told that there are only ten or twelve separate schools in the Northwest Territories. Well, Sir, I claim that if there was only one separate school in the Northwest Territories we should just the same render justice to the minority in respect to that one school. Is it that the principle of liberty and of right is to be decided on the ground of the strength of those claiming it to obtain and maintain it? I say that we should give right to those to whom it is due and not only to those who have the strength to maintain their rights. If there were only one separate school in the Northwest Territories we would be obliged to do the minority justice the same as if there were a hundred separate schools. But, there is more than one and there would be even more than there are to-day if by the ordinances of the Northwest Territories the Catholics were not forced to send their children to the public schools. If the ordinances which have been adopted in the Northwest Territories prevent Catholics from constituting separate schools, I think it is unfair and unjust to use that as an argument against them and to say that there are not enough separate schools and that therefore we should not render them the justice to which they are entitled. Give generously to the minority in the Northwest the right which are due them. Give them these rights first, because by so doing we are carrying out the principles of liberty. Give them these rights because we owe some gratitude to the province of Quebec. And here, I will call the attention of the House to a statement which I am sure my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) will not deny. On the 12th July, 1902, which is a great day, Mr. Robinson who was then the member for West Elgin, speaking to the Orangemen in St. Thomas, Ontario, said:

> We know that the French of Lower Canada have kept this vast Dominion to the British empire; for if these Frenchmen had not been faithful to this country you Orangemen listening to me would not have room enough to stand here together.

If this opinion could be expressed to the Orangemen standing togeher, I say this country should do justice to the minority of the Northwest Territories and should in this way signify its great gratitude to the hierarchy which is not the awful spectre it has been painted in the Toronto 'World,' but which is the hierarchy which has kept its people faithful to the British Crown on many an occasion as my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) has said. I wish to take the part of my hon. friend from Labelle who has been attacked in the Ontario papers lately and to say that he belongs to a family which has always been loyal to the British Crown. When the English Protestant minority of Quebec in 1776 did not know which way to turn, when as we say in French, they did not know whether to cry 'Vive la Ligue' or 'Vive Le Roi,' the great grandfather of my hon. friend was on the side of the British Crown and against the American rebels and with another French Canadian, Lamothe, he carried despatches from Montreal through the American lines to the English general in Quebec. Another of my fellow-countrymen, Bouchette, brought the English governor into the besieged city of Quebec. Ever since those days in 1760 when Canada was ceded to the British Crown we have kept our compact faithfully, and I maintain that we have a right to claim that justice should be done to us as we have deserved. In finishing my speech, which I cannot help but feel has been too lengthy, I desire to make a comparison. Not far from here is the great river St. Lawrence which separates us from the Anglo-Saxon Republic to the south. Sweeping past the foot of the hill upon which this building stands is the Ottawa river which separates the French province of Quebec from the English province of Ontario. These two rivers converge near the city of Montreal and for a long time their waters run together without mixing. On the one side we have the dark coloured waters of the Ottawa river and on the other the silvery, bright waters of the St. Lawrence. They float together to a common destiny. Is not that the image of this Dominion of ours? We have two nations floating together, not mixing the one with the other; on the one side the French race, on the other side the English nation, on the one side the Protestant creed, on the other side the Catholic creed. Well, Sir, could we not model this country after these beautiful rivers of ours? Could we not together float away to a common destiny without mixing, without amalgamating the one with the other, and if we do I predict for this country, which is my country and to which I am as loyal as any man, a glorious destiny and in the name of nations a glorious immortality.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). Mr. Speaker, I must compliment the young member for Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne) on the very able address which he has given to the House. I must bear testimony to the fact, Sir, that not only do our French Canadian people speak their own language

with purity, but once they become masters of the English language they place at a disadvantage those of us who can speak but one language.

Mr. BOURASSA. You will have to go to a separate school.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Not at all.

Mr. BOURASSA. Yes, if you want to be on an equal footing there.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am sure that our young friend was educated in a national school. If the same harmony could be maintained in regard to the affairs of this country as that which has been manifested by our young friend in regard to the English and the French languages, the people of Canada might look forward to a great future for this Dominion. Unfortunately we find that gentlemen who speak that language, who are of that grand race, a race with which I claim kindred just as much as hon. gentlemen who sit on the other side of the House, displaying a different spirit outside of this House. If these gentlemen would be moderate and show the same spirit on the platforms and hustings in Quebec and up and down the side roads of that province, and if they would confine themselves to the same tone as that in which they address this House it would augur well for the future of this country. One would imagine from the remarks of the young speaker, that we were discussing the province of Quebec. I understand that these Bills with which we are dealing are for the purpose of erecting two new provinces in the Northwest of the Dominion of Canada and that the province of Quebec has nothing to do with this any more than any other province in the Dominion. No attack is being made on the rights and liberties of the province of Quebec; these rights and liberties are guaranteed by the articles of conquest and by the Confederation Act.

The question now before the House, simmered down to a nut shell is as to the authority, the duty, the policy of this parliament to enforce separate schools on the Northwest Territories. The right hon. the leader of the government told us that this was a question of the constitution, but his colleagues have told us that it is not a question of the constitution in any sense whatever. One of the ministers ventured to think that vested rights should be considered but that plea was abandoned when it was found that although the Roman Catholics have had every facility for years to establish separate schools there are only ten such separate schools as compared with over 1,000 public schools in the Northwest Territories. Therefore, the question simmers itself down to one of policy. Now, let us suppose for a moment that it was our clear duty under the constitution to establish separate schools, would our best method be to proceed with a bludgeon in the shape of this Act of parliament held over the people of the Northwest to force separate schools upon them? Would it not be better to omit from this Bill altogether any provision with regard to separate schools, and leave it to the people of the new provinces to carry out the constitution, for until the first meeting of the legislative assembly of the new provinces the Act of 1875 will be continued in force, and would remain in force unless repealed by the assembly. Sir, when the Bill now before the House becomes law it will force on the people of the new provinces the full enactment of the School Act of 1875, and nothing but mischief can result. If the Prime Minister is right in his argument, that by the constitution we are bound to give the new provinces separate schools, then the provinces cannot repeal this law and it will stand for ever on the statute-books. If the Prime Minister has any confidence in his contention, why should he not withdraw his educational clause altogether from the Act and avoid all the bickering, the heart burnings, the contentious spirit that permeates the Dominion of Canada to-day. If it is a question of policy, and we maintain that it is, then coercion—I think that is the proper term to use in relation to this clause—coercion is not in conformity with provincial rights; it transgresses the principle of provincial rights at the very outset. This is not good legislation, as I shall prove from the Prime Minister's own lips. It interferes with the rights of man as well as with the rights of provinces, but over and above all this question of coercion there stands another issue. The Prime Minister has instructed the House on some of the principles of the Roman Catholic religion; he has told us that in addition to the pure question of religion there is the great question of dogma which enters into the notion of those that hold that faith. With the question of religion, with the relationship existing between a man's conscience and his God I have nothing to do. I never allowed any other man to interfere in the relationship existing between my conscience and my God, and I never insulted any man by interfering with him in that respect. But in relation of the question of dogma, that is the business end of the proposition, and when any church corporation—be it Methodist, Roman Catholic, Presbyterian or any other—just the same as any railway corporation comes before the people of this country for legislation, it is the bounden duty of every man who commands his own self respect to deal with it, not on the sentimental issue, not to bow down before the cry that the church is behind the organization; but to deal with it on the basis of what is right and what is wrong, and considering what is in the best interests of the Dominion of Canada and of her entire people. On these lines I purpose dealing with this question. Taking it as a

question of dogma, as one who does not want to grow up in enmity with his Roman Catholic neighbour ; as one who does not want to pass through the world with the people divided on creed lines, I maintain that when we coerce the provinces to accept these separate schools, we are retarding for ever the wheels of progress and the up-building of the national life within these provinces. I do not think the union of church and state is for the best interests of humanity. The nations of the old land have given it up, and why this young country should adopt the fads and practices that have been discarded in Europe is beyond my comprehension. I am opposed to this parliament forcing on any province, against its will, a union of church and state. By the enactment of this law, this parliament is placing a blanket mortgage on the two provinces of the Northwest which will remain on them to the end of time and which can never be paid off. I object in general terms to this legislation. It is contrary to the spirit of a free parliament ; it is contrary to the spirit of a free people. I am afraid that I shall not be able to bring to bear on this great question the deeply sanctified and the emotional Christian spirit displayed by the Prime Minister ; nor the stern, defiant, aggressive militant christianity of the Minister of Justice ; nor the humility and the contrition the holy-dread and sackcloth-and-ashes demeanour of the Minister of Finance ; nor the fervid sanctimoniousness and brotherly love of the Minister of Customs ; nor the speculative religion——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Who wrote that for you ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I composed that myself after observing the exhibition made by the ministers. I may say, Sir, that I got it in a reflective mood, and after the beautiful exhibition of christian spirit and brotherly love displayed here one evening by the Minister of Justice, I went home and reflected and this is the result.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. You should reflect oftener.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Perhaps so. The Minister of Justice on that occasion displayed on the floor of parliament all the old time characteristics of the Champlain street youngster, and he displayed them to the great edification of the people of this country. Nor, Sir, can I bring to bear on this question the speculative opinions of the Postmaster General, who has had such an ample training working hand in hand with the Protestant Protective Association organization of the province of Ontario throughout the length and breadth of many constituencies. Nor can I bring to bear on this subject the illogical fanticism or the sparkling distortion of established facts displayed by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). I shall endeavour to discuss these questions without any appeal to prejudice, but simply on the basis of what are the facts, and what is for the best interests of the people of the Territories which are being erected into two provinces, and for the best interests of the people of the whole Dominion of Canada.

Now, I trust that the Prime Minister will excuse me for bringing to his mind some of his old speeches. In this connection, I may say that the young gentleman from Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne) struck the Prime Minister a very heavy blow beneath the belt when, in referring to the hon. member for North Toronto, he said that a man of principles always stuck to his principles, and never wavered. While saying that, he looked across to this side of the House, but I am satisfied that the Prime Minister, in his heart of hearts, felt that the reflection was upon himself and his friends on that side of the House, who have been 'everything by turns and nothing long,' and who have never known where they stood on questions of principle. On March 3, 1896, the right hon. Prime Minister, as reported in 'Hansard' at page 2737-8 addressing the leader of the government of that day said :

> The hon. gentleman is aware—more than anybody else, perhaps, he ought to be aware—that in a community with a free government, in a free country like this, upon any question involving different conceptions of what is right or wrong, different standards of what is just or unjust, it is the part of statesmanship not to force the views of any section, but to endeavour to bring them all to a uniform standard and a uniform conception of what is right.

I heartily commend these words to the Prime Minister to-day. What are the facts in regard to this question ? The Hudson Bay Territory was taken over by the imperial authorities and transferred by them to the Canadian authorities. I shall not enter into a description of those vast territories and their latent resources, and the great wealth that lies there to be developed. These are all well known to all the members of this House. Those territories were united with the Dominion of Canada, and in that Act of union, although it was known and intended that they were sooner or later to be erected into provinces, there was no mention of separate schools. They were given a constitution by the Dominion parliament, and, inasmuch as the few people living in the territories spoke the French language, the people of Canada allowed them to have their own schools. That, and that alone, was the reason why those schools were given to those people without any serious opposition. My hon. friend from Montmagny is in error in saying that it was thought at that time that those territories were going to become French and Roman Catholic. It was understood that there would be a large French settlement in the province of Manitoba ; but with regard to the territories, the understanding from one end of the Dominion to

the other,—and our friends in Quebec knew it, and they know it to-day,—was that they would become settled by a large English-speaking population. That was one reason why our French friends at that time claimed that the boundaries of Manitoba should be enlarged, so that it, being regarded to a large extent as a French province, would have more room for development; but the expectation was that the new territories would become English. They were given separate schools more on the ground of language than of creed. The teachers in those schools were principally the priests of the various localities. There were only five or six hundred families in all the territories.

A comparison has been drawn between the separate schools of the province of Quebec and those of the province of Ontario. We are told that the English minority in the province of Quebec were granted certain privileges. Let me tell the hon. member for Labelle and the hon. member for Montmagny that the concession in the province of Quebec was not to the English minority, but to the French Roman Catholic majority. At the time of the conquest they were granted the rights and liberties that had been won under the auspices of the gentleman under whom my good friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) gets the credit of serving, whose memory he reveres—William Prince of Orange. It was William Prince of Orange who gave to the British nation the liberties they enjoy to-day; and when Quebec capitulated, the liberties which had been guaranteed to humanity of all creeds and all races were given to the people of the province of Quebec, and have been religiously observed from that day to the present time. And let me tell the hon. member for Labelle and the hon. member for Montmagny that if any one undertakes to deprive our French Canadian fellow countrymen in the province of Quebec, of the slightest liberty that has been granted to them under the British constitution, my good friend the member for East Grey is sworn to marshall his boys and go down to their relief, not to their injury.

Mr. BUREAU. Hear, hear.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. So that my good friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) need not have any nightmares about the orangemen from the province of Ontario. When Ontario and Quebec became parts of the Dominion of Canada, each had its own separate school system established by law. When New Brunswick became part of the Dominion of Canada, it had its own school system established by the votes of its own people. When Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island came in, each had its own school system established by the votes of its own people. The Northwest Territories occupy an entirely different position. They came into the Dominion away back in 1870. They had no school system anterior to the union. The school system that was given to them, was given without a vote by a human being in those territories, and that system has been continued ever since; the only difference being that when they became organized and were represented in this parliament, their representatives had a voice in the making of the laws which applied to them. At the present time we are not uniting those territories to the Dominion of Canada; we are only transforming them into provinces, and the people of the whole of Canada have the making of their charter, not the people of the territories themselves. What we contend is that in granting them their charter, we must apply the British North America Act, so far as it relates to the establishment of provinces.

That is the point of difference we make between the union of the Territories as such with confederation and their entry into it as provinces. There is no union of the Territories, as provinces, with confederation. They came into confederation as Territories, and their creation as provinces is merely a development. I chanced to be in the Northwest during the months of December and November when the question of the new autonomy Bills was being discussed. As I passed along, I heard mention of mysterious trips taken by the First Minister here and there throughout the country, but not taken where he could consult his Finance Minister or his Minister of the Interior or his following in the House or Mr. Haultain and his cabinet in the Territories. It was understood then that there was question of a clause being put into the measure creating the new provinces, fastening upon these provinces separate schools. Last December, when that probability was mentioned to the followers of the right hon. gentleman in this House, they scoffed at the idea. They said that he who had been the champion of provincial autonomy in 1896, who had declaimed then against the coercion of Manitoba, who had advocated the policy of hands off Manitoba, was not likely to consent to anything which would fetter these new provinces and prevent them from working out freely their own destinies along the lines he had laid down with regard to Manitoba in 1896. In that year of 1896, I considered it my duty to oppose the Bill of my own leader (Sir Charles Tupper) just as I opposed the resolution of the right hon. gentleman, and I opposed both on the ground that I would vote against any attempt to coerce Manitoba. On that occasion I took a unique position and have seen no ground for changing any of the sentiments I then uttered. I took the ground then that the province of Manitoba should be free, that the people there were eminently well fitted to work out their own destiny, and should not be fettered or hampered by the federal power in that work; and I would have supported the right hon. gentleman on that occasion, had his resolution tallied with his professions in the country. But his declaration to the

province of Quebec then was : Put me in power and I will give the minority in Manitoba greater privileges than they can possibly secure from a Tory government. I will give them a Bill that will be of some service ; while in the provinces of Manitoba and Ontario, the cry of himself and his colleagues was : Hands off Manitoba ; no coercion of free men in the west ; we must never bow to the Roman Catholic bishops of the province of Quebec ; but must show ourselves free men. Much as I wished to follow my right hon. friend on that occasion, there was such great divergence between the position he took in Quebec and that which he took elsewhere that I was not prepared to give him the opportunity of coercing Manitoba and consequently voted against his resolution as I did against the Bill of my own leader. The stand I then took was that if the people of that province wanted separate schools, let them establish that system themselves ; but if they did not, I was determined to defeat any attempt to place upon that province the burden of separate schools against its will.

We may very well ask whence comes this demand for this clause in the Bill. I have pointed out that the moment those Territories become provinces, they have the Act of 1875 on their statutes. Supposing the educational clauses should be withdrawn entirely from this measure, the Act of 1875 will still remain. Therefore if the contention of the First Minister be right, if the Act of 1875 is the constitution in those Territories to-day and will be the constitution of those provinces when created, what has he to fear ? If on the other hand, the contention of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition is correct and it will be within the powers of those provinces to abrogate that law if they choose, why insist upon embodying it in this Bill. The Act of the First Minister is, I submit, irritating, illegal and unconstitutional.

The right hon. gentleman did not consult his Finance Minister in relation to the financial clauses nor did he consult his Minister of the Interior with regard to the educational clause. He did not consult the men behind him with regard to this measure. I am told that he did not dare to call his party together in caucus and consult them. Whom then did he consult? Is there any truth in the rumour that my right hon. friend had for his adviser a gentleman who does not owe allegiance to the Dominion and that he takes trips to the shores of the Rideau and there receives his inspiration ? I have not the slightest fault to find with any church—either the Church of Rome or the Methodist church which is my own or any other—for taking all it can get from weak-backed politicians. Any church will do that. We have seen in the province of Ontario, Protestant churches taking sops from the provincial government and giving in return their support to the government. We have seen the hierarchy of Rome do the same thing—and I make use of that word in the same sense as hon. gentlemen in that church use it. The churches are just the same as electric companies and railway companies and other corporations. They will take all they can get and ask for more. It is not the hierarchy of Rome but the leader of the government and his colleagues whom the people will hold responsible, and it is they who will have to stand the consequences. For my part I do not blame the churches for taking all they can get from weak-backed and weak-kneed politicians.

In his speech introducing the Bill now before the House, the right hon. gentleman alluded to the separate schools in the United States, and I must say that, as an old public school teacher, my blood boiled when he referred to that system in the United States in the way he did, and incidentally condemned public schools the world over. In the past the right hon. gentleman was more less inclined to look to American institutions. In the old days we had him and his followers looking to Washington until they got turned down, and I am satisfied that whatever may be or may have been his views with regard to that great nation in the past, he will not dispute one word I am about to quote from a well known authority regarding the value of the public schools of that country. But before doing that, I may take the liberty of quoting what Mr. Morley, a friend of the right hon. gentleman, says in the 19th Century of the great American republic. In a recent issue of that review, Mr. Morley says :

> Of a democracy originally British, the most astonishing and triumphant achievement so far has been the persevering absorption and incorporation across the Atlantic of a ceaseless torrent of heterogeneous elements from every point of the compass into one united, stable, industrious and pacific state with eighty millions of population, combining the centralized concert of a federal system with local independence, and uniting collective energy with the encouragement of individual freedom. How does this stand in comparison with the Roman empire, or Romanish church, or the Bysantine empire, or Russia, or Charles the Great, or Napoleon ?

These are the words of Mr. Morley about the great republic to the south of us—a republic which has taught the world how to mould together the different elements of various nationalities. In that country are to be found nationalities from Europe, who have been under the rule of parochial schools as well as those who have not been brought up under that system, and by means of the welding influence of the American public school system all these various peoples have become consolidated into one compact nation.

These are the people that have been made by the public schools of the United States. Now I will take the liberty of giving from the addresses of some of the presidents

of the United States certain brief quotations to show what the chief magistrates of that republic have thought of public schools. I do this not to attack the religion of any body of people, for the question of dogma has nothing to do with religion. If any man is interfered with in the free exercise of his religion, that interference should not for a moment be permitted. If in a matter of conscience any one were to attempt to interfere with the right hon. Prime Minister, I would be ready to resent that interference and to put the one interfering in his proper place. But, if the Prime Minister says: This is my dogma and you must bow to it, and if we do bow to it, what limit can we place upon demands of this kind? Why, we should see repeated over and over the humiliating spectacle of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) who says: we must yield because forty-one per cent of the people demand it. And next month they may demand something else, and so on; we must yield again and again upon the plea that it is a question of dogma, until the liberties which our ancestors suffered so much to gain for us are taken from us at the behest of men who are more anxious to hang on to office than they are to stand by a principle. Martin Van Buren, the eighth president of the United States—1837-1841—said:

> The national will is the supreme law of the republic. In no country has education been so widely diffused. All forms of religion have united for the first time to diffuse charity and piety, because for the first time in the history of nations all have been totally untrammelled and absolutely free.

And James K. Polk, eleventh president—1845-1849—said:

> No union exists between church and state, and perfect freedom of opinion is guaranteed to all sects and creeds. Who shall assign limits to the achievements of free minds and free hands under the protection of this glorious union? No treason to mankind since the organization of society would be equal in atrocity to that of him who would lift his hand to destroy it.

These are the sentiments of that president of the United States in relation to the great public school system that, even at that time, half a century ago had raised the downtrodden and disinherited people of Europe who were flocking to the shores of the United States and made them what the Almighty intended they should be, not slaves, but creatures made in the image of God and ready to take a part in the upbuilding of a great nation.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) believe that Salisbury and Gladstone were wrong and these presidents of the United States right?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am ready to discuss Salisbury and Gladstone, and Balfour and Chamberlain too. These men take conditions as they exist. But Great Britain is developing. Besides, Britain is a more densely settled country than Canada. The circumstances are entirely different——

Mr. BRODEUR. Why should that make a difference?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The Liberals of England do not like religious schools.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) if he thinks that England is behind the United States?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. England is behind the United States in the matter of education, undoubtedly. England is the mother of nations; it is to her we owe the great federations of the world, the application of the principle of central control in common matters with local control in local matters. The United States is the next nation, and, in spite of great drawbacks——

Mr. LEMIEUX. England is the greatest nation in the world in spite of what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) says.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is an entirely different sentiment from the one which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) expressed in Quebec in 1896, when he stood before the French Canadians and said: Are you going to vote for Tupper and the Tories, who spent $3,000,000 for guns, and who are ready to send your sons to fight Britain's battles abroad? That is what the hon. gentleman said, and it was proven in this House.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not know what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) refers to, but if he speaks of the Transvaal War——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No, I speak of what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) said—in the election campaign of 1896. Let me recall to his mind what he said—I know it almost sounds as if he were irresponsible at the time. The then member for Sherbrooke standing in this House, pointing his finger at the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) said: Instead of being here preaching loyalty you ought to be behind the prison bars for treason. This he said to the Solicitor General (Mr. Lemieux) in my own hearing, and in that of many members now in this House. And what was the reason? Because the hon. gentleman had appealed to the prejudices of the people of Quebec saying: Will you vote for Tupper and Tories, who spent $3,000,000 of the people's money to buy rifles and who will send your sons to fight Britain's battles?

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) is wholly astray. I never held any such language. I never met the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worth-

ington) in that campaign. But I did meet the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster)——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I refer to Mr. McIntosh, who formerly represented Sherbrooke in this House.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I never met Mr. McIntosh on the platform. I spoke once in the county of Sherbrooke——

Mr. BENNETT. Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, I spoke once in the county of Sherbrooke. And if the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) then, I think, the member for King's, New Brunswick, were here, I would ask him to corroborate what I say. I spoke in English, but I never used such language as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) attributes to me. I would not dare to speak in that way in the province of Quebec—I should be afraid of being stoned by my fellow-countrymen if I did so. But I am sorry to see an ultra loyalist placing Great Britain behind the United States. It is the first time I have heard the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) say such a thing.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. I was not stating what I heard myself. I said that the former hon. member for Sherbrooke, Mr. McIntosh had pointed his finger at the present Solicitor General and told him from his place in this House that, instead of being here and preaching loyalty he should be behind the bars of a jail for treason. These are matters for them to settle among themselves. I will proceed with the quotations I was giving from the presidents of the United States on the subject of common schools and public education. Millard Fillmore, the thirteenth president—1850-1853—said :

> Our common schools are diffusing intelligence among the people and our industry is fast accumulating the comforts and luxuries of life.

And Andrew Johnston the seventeenth president—1865-1869—said :

> Here more and more care is given to provide education for every one born on our soil. Here religion, released from political connection with the civil government, refuses to subserve the craft of statesmen, and becomes in its independence the spiritual life of the people. Here toleration is extended to every opinion, in the quiet certainty that truth needs only a fair field to secure the victory.

Let me commend the words of this distinguished president to the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). These words of the different presidents show that, step by step, as the great republic advanced, as it became broader, stronger and more inclusive, it was able to assimilate more of the disinherited masses of Europe, even in their ignorance and filth. And there is one cause for this regenerative power of the United States, a power that no other nation has been able to show. That power was due to the public school system of the United States. Ulysses S. Grant, the eighteenth president—1869-1877—said :

> We are blessed with peace at home, with facilities for every mortal to acquire an education ; with institutions closing to none the avenues to fame, or any blessing to fortune that may be coveted ; with freedom of the pulpit, the press, and the school.

Rutherford B. Hayes, the nineteenth president—1877-1881—said :

> To education more than to any other agency we are to look as the resource for the advancement of the people in the requisite knowledge and appreciation of their rights and responsibilities as citizens, and I desire to repeat the suggestion contained in my former message in behalf of the enactment of appropriate measures by congress for the purpose of supplementing with national aid the local systems of education in the several states.
>
> The sanctity of marriage and the family relation are the corner-stone of our American society and civilization. Religious liberty and the separation of church and state are among the elementary ideas of free institutions.

They develop the individuality of the citizen, and we find in the history of the United States a struggle between the individual man on one hand and a control by corporations on the other. Benjamin Harrison says:

> The masses of our people are better fed, clothed and housed than their fathers were. The facilities for popular education have been vastly enlarged and more generally diffused.

Another testimony to the upbuilding of a great people by the free public school, where Roman Catholic and Protestant, Jew and Gentile children sit side by side in the schools, never asking the question to what creed each belongs or what relationship exists between each one's conscience and his God, but all working together as Americans, or as Canadians, shoulder to shoulder in achieving the great destiny that is ahead of us. Wm. McKinley said:

> A grave peril to the republic would be a citizenship too ignorant to understand, or too vicious to appreciate, the great value and beneficence of our institutions and laws, and against all who come here and make war upon them, our gates must be promptly and tightly closed. Nor must we be unmindful of the need of improvement among our citizens, but with the zeal of our forefathers encourage the spread of knowledge and free education.
>
> Our hope is the public schools and in the university.

I may say that at the time these words were uttered a movement was going on hostile to the public schools, such as the movement we find now going on in the Dominion of Canada, and it was against this movement that President McKinley raised a warning voice, saying to people who came from foreign lands that they,

must observe the institutions of the United States of America. President Roosevelt the other day—and he cannot be charged with being an enemy of any church—one of the most tolerant and broad-minded gentlemen who have ever been honoured with the position of chief magistrate of the United States says :

We have no room for any people who do not act and vote simply as Americans, and as nothing else. Moreover, we have as little use for people who carry religious prejudices into their politics as for those who carry prejudices of caste or nationality. We stand unalterably in favour of the public school system in its entirety. We believe that English, and no other language, is that in which all the school exercise should be conducted. We are against any division of the school fund and against any appropriation of public money for sectarian purposes. We are against any recognition whatever by the state in any shape or form of state-aided parochial schools. But we are equally opposed to any discrimination against or for a man because of his creed.

We all say 'amen' to that.

We demand that all citizens, Protestant and Catholics, Jew and Gentile, shall have fair treatment in every way ; that all alike shall have their rights guaranteed them. The very reasons that make us unqualified in our opposition to state-aided sectarian schools make us equally bent that in the management of our public schools, the adherents of each creed shall be given exact and equal justice, wholly without regard to their religious affiliations ; that trustees, superintendents, teachers, scholars, all alike, shall be treated without any reference whatsoever to the creed they profess. The immigrant must learn that we exact full religious toleration and the complete separation of church and state. He must revere only our flag ; not only must it come first, but no other flag should even come second. He must learn to celebrate the fourth of July instead of St. Patrick's day. Those (foreigners) who become Americanized have furnished to our history a multitude of honourable names ; those who did not become Americanized form to the present day an unimportant body of no significance in American existence. Thus it has ever been with all people who have come hither, of whatever stock or blood. The same thing is true of all churches. A church which remains foreign, in language or spirit, is doomed.

These are the words of President Roosevelt, and I commend them to the First Minister. I believe that in his heart of hearts these are the sentiments of the First Minister, and at one time I believe they actuated him, and that even now, if he allowed his better judgment to rule him, he would rise up and give utterance to those sentiments. Now, Sir, having given these quotations from some Protestant authorities, I will come to an Irishman—the Minister of Justice will prick up his ears a little—for the gentleman I am going to quote is editor of the organ of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, a paper published in the city of Chicago. He is a distinguished Roman Catholic citizen of Chicago, by the name of Hon. John F. Finerty, a member of Congress, I believe, or a senator, and I commend his utterances to the Minister of Justice, because he speaks in the interest of the country rather than in favour of a church; I commend his sentiments to the Minister of Justice who has been junketting around at the expense of Canada, going to Rome and elsewhere in the interest of a section of the people of Canada, and I am satisfied that the tolerant and broad-minded sentiments of Mr. Finerty will appeal to that hon. gentleman. And I may say in passing that I see our good friend has sold his stock in the 'Soleil,' which has been telling the people of Canada that there will be no compromise on this school question. So we may expect that he will not take the extreme interest in that subject henceforward that he has in the past. Mr. Finerty says:

In brief, then, we say to all whom it may concern : Let American institutions severely alone, and do not kindle the flames of a bigot hell in this grand country by seeking after the unattainable.

These are the words of Mr. Finerty, speaking in the city of Chicago to the people of the United States. I will read them again:

Mr. LEMIEUX. Does the hon. gentleman know that Mr. Finerty belongs to the Clan-na-Gael?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am merely saying that even an extreme man like Mr. Finerty, and a member of the Clan-na-Gael—I do not know whether he is, I am not a member of the order, so I do not know; the hon. gentleman possibly knows—and I accept him as authority upon that point—I am merely saying that though he may be a member of the Clan-na-Gael, he holds these views on this great question, and I quote them as the views of a broad and tolerant citizen of the Roman Catholic faith in the United States :

In brief, then, we say to all whom it may concern : Let American institutions severely alone, and do not kindle the flames of a bigot hell in this grand country by seeking after the unattainable. Always bear in mind, that the vast majority of the American people, of all creeds, will stand by their country, her constitution, her laws and her institutions. Any evasion of either by any outside force whatever will mean war. What man, what set of men would be fatuous enough to bring such a curse upon this land ?

Continuing Mr. Finerty says:

We believe in the American non-sectarian public school.

These are the words of an Irishman and —I take the word of the Minister of Justice —no, the prospective Minister of Justice, the present Solicitor General—that Mr. Finerty is a member of the Clan-na-Gael:

We believe in the American non-sectarian public school, and we believe in educating the youth of all races side by side, so that they may grow up as friends, trusting each other, not as enemies suspicious of one another. We believe it would be a fatal mistake to have the American public schools run, or controlled, by ecclesiastics of any creed. As it stands, the Catholic, the Protestant, the Dissenter, the Jew, and the Confucian drink at the same deep fountain of knowledge. All have their separate religious instruction where it properly belongs —in the church, the temple and the Sunday school. If the latter is not provided by any particular church, the fault lies with the church, not with the state, the parents or the children.

These are the views of a prominent Irish Roman Catholic of the city of Chicago, the editor of the organ of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, and, as the Minister of Justice says, a member of the Clan Na Gael Society. When General Grant felt that he was at death's door, when the fatal disease that was wearing his life away had made itself manifest, and when he knew that his hours were numbered, he issued a mandate to the people of the United States. I shall give it to the right hon. First Minister :

I suggest for your earnest consideration, and most earnestly recommend it, that a constitutional amendment be submitted to the legislatures of the several states for ratification, making it the duty of each of the several states to establish and for ever maintain free public schools adequate to the education of all the children in the rudimentary branches within their respective limits, irrespective of sex, colour, birth-place or religions ; forbidding the teaching in said schools of religious, atheistic, or pagan tenets ; and prohibiting the granting of any school funds or school taxes, or any part thereof, either by legislative, municipal or other authority, for the benefit or aid, directly or indirectly, of any religious sect or denomination, or in aid or for the benefit of any other object of any nature or kind whatever.

As this will be the last annual message which I shall have the honour of transmitting to congress before my successor is chosen, I will repeat or recapitulate the questions which I deem of vital importance which may be legislated upon or settled at this session. First, that the states shall be required to afford the opportunity of a good common education to every child within their limits ; second, no sectarian tenets shall ever be taught in any school supported in whole or in part by the state, nation, or by the proceeds of any tax levied upon any community ; third, declare church and state for ever separate and distinct, but each free within their proper spheres.

Were those sentiments to be uttered in the Dominion of Canada, we would find some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House raising the cry of intolerance against those who gave voice to such sentiments. These are the sentiments which have made the United States a nation that it is to-day. The perversion of these sentiments, as it has been carried out in practice in European countries, has kept the people hewers of wood and drawers of water to the aristocracies of those lands. Speaking of perversion and the cry of intolerance, I do not charge the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) with any intentional perversion, but in quoting my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) last evening, I think he put a wrong construction upon his words. My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle had said :

I intend to claim the privilege of briefly putting on record the views which I hold with regard to this question. After nearly twenty-two years residence in the Northwest Territories, I believe firmly that the public school system as at present administered is the one best suited to the needs of the country.

Then the hon. member for Cape Breton went on to say :

He says that he has had twenty-two years experience in the Northwest, that he has seen many changes and that this law which is now on the statute-book has given satisfaction to that country.

I do not know whether the hon. member had read the speech of my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle, but what my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle referred to distinctly and clearly was the public school system and not the separate school system. I believe from what I know of the hon. gentleman that he would not wilfully misrepresent my hon. friend.

Mr. SCOTT. Has my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) ever heard from any quarter of the Northwest Territories a protest against the existing school system there ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The people took the school system as it was provided for them in the Northwest Territories. They never had an opportunity of expressing any opinion in regard to it. The separate school system of the Northwest Territories has been provided for them by the people of the eastern provinces, and I can tell the hon. gentleman that I have heard, and he has heard, and will hear, protests against the authority and tyranny of this parliament in attempting to dictate to the Northwest Territories.

Mr. SCOTT. If my hon. friend will permit me, I will say that he cannot get the hon. member for Qu'Appelle to say that there is any protest against, or any dissatisfaction in the Territories with the school system.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle gave utterance the other night to his views on this question, which I may say are very much more satisfactory to the people of this country than the utterances of the hon. member for West Assiniboia. The right hon. leader of the government went on to speak of crime in the Dominion of Canada. I am not going to take that up. Unfortunately, there is too much crime both in Canada and in the United States, but by a strange coincidence the very day on which my right hon. friend made that statement I saw on the bulletin

board a notice of two murders in the Dominion of Canada. You can scarcely take up a paper without seeing that in some part of this Dominion some poor unfortunate wretch has, in a fit of passion, committed murder. Considering that there is such a lack of respect for institutions, such a lack of respect for professions and such a lack of respect for public honour, the mystery to me is that there is not more crime than that which is committed in the Dominion of Canada. Speaking of divorces, I was a little surprised that the right hon. First Minister should touch on that question. He knows very well that the cost in the Dominion of Canada is a barrier to divorces. He knows that the facility in this country is not as great as it is in many states of the union for divorces. He knows that in Canada mediation very often comes in. Friends of the persons concerned and church dignitaries step in and prevent a consummation of divorces ; and he knows that if there is one thing that characterizes Canada, it is the goodness of the women of Canada in forgiving the derelictions of duty on the part of the men. I am sorry to say that there is some cause for divorce in Canada, and that, if the good women of this country wished it, they might have an opportunity of securing just as many divorces as they have in the United States. Then the right hon. First Minister read us a lecture on unity and harmony in his own gentlemanly way. He is always gentlemanly. He always throws down the gauntlet and leaves his radical friends behind him to create an agitation while he stands and looks on with calm and placid demeanour, regretting, of course, the excesses of his followers, and cries intolerance against those who oppose him. But we remember the conduct of the right hon. gentleman and his friends in 1885, which has been referred to by other hon. gentlemen in this House, when the right hon. First Minister himself threatened that if he had been on the banks of the Saskatchewan he would have shouldered his musket, because of the supposed wrongs of the half-breeds of that country. A lot of land grabbers and land sharks, knowing that the half-breeds had obtained their scrip in Manitoba after the first rebellion, knowing that these half-breeds had gone out and settled in certain other spots in the remote west and were claiming scrip again, and desiring to get control of that scrip, they kept urging them to raise a row and make a demand for the issue of the scrip. The government of that time, after consultation with the bishops and clergy of the Roman Catholic Church, they being the best educated men of that country in that time, and after consultation with the officers of the mounted police, determined, on the advice of and by the request of these officials and clergy, to issue no more scrip. They said : No ; we will not issue scrip again. You will sell your scrip for a bottle of whisky, you will sell it for a dollar or two, and at the end of the week you will be as poor as you were before ; but we will give you your scrip on condition that you settle on the land. This was done at the request of the authorities of the church and the police. The only excuse they had for rebellion was that when they did settle on the land they wanted the old river survey instead of the mile-square survey proposed by the Dominion government ; and from that hour to this these gentlemen have been unable to find one cause for rebellion other than as to the particular form the survey should take. But the right hon. the Prime Minister said on that occasion that if he had been on the banks of the Saskatchewan he would have shouldered his musket and fought for the liberties of the people.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He would not have written letters home about it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The Prime Minister was reported as having said that. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) in his speech referred some fifteen or twenty times to the question of rebellion. Let me inform the Solicitor General that some of us who have done a little talk of rebellion have not been afraid and are not afraid to back up our opinions by facing the music ; we do not simply stand away off in the province of Quebec at a safe distance from danger and do the talking and writing.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam Hughes) must have known my brother who served Canada and the empire in South Africa, came back with his medals, but he did not write any self-glorifying letters from the battle fields.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am glad there are some loyal men in the family of the honourable gentleman in Quebec.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. Can the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam Hughes) point out a single man in the province of Quebec who is not loyal ? The hon. gentleman has taken the responsibility of saying that he was glad to know there were some loyal men in Quebec ; does he know any disloyal men in Quebec ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does my hon. friend come from Quebec? I think he comes from Cape Breton.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. I come from Cape Breton, and I am a Canadian, Sir, and I hope I am broad enough to treat my fellow Canadians everywhere with respect.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. My hon. friend wants to know if you can tell us what is the law on the subject. The hon. gentleman (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) did not give us all his brief last night, and perhaps he wants to deal with that aspect of the case now.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. I will be very pleased at any time to deal very briefly with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes).

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. We find the First Minister, not satisfied with these inflammatory cries in the province of Quebec, coming to the province of Ontario and seeking to inflame the public of that province along other lines when he cried: 'Hands off Manitoba; down with Tupper and his Tory friends,' and all that sort of thing. And yet he stands up here to-day preaching unity and harmony while at the same time he throws into the arena of Dominion politics the greatest fire brand that has ever for the last thirty years been thrown before the people of Canada. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has been charged with being intolerant. Why, Sir, I have been surprised at the tolerance displayed by that hon. gentleman in his speeches in this House and in his speeches out of the House. He has displayed a spirit of Christian fortitude—if I may use the term, although I am not much of a judge in this line—he has displayed a spirit of tolerance which I commend to my friends on the other side of the House.

It is not my intention, Sir, to discuss the constitutional aspect of the question. The leader of the opposition dealt with that phase, and no gentleman of any standing in law on the other side of the House or in the country has dared to lay a finger upon his argument. Minister after minister arose and they practically had to admit that the contention of the leader of the opposition in his interpretation of the law was absolutely correct. Our good friend the Prime Minister claimed that he stood on the rock of the constitution, but after the leader of the opposition got through with him it turned out that the right hon. gentleman had landed on a mud bank. It is the leader of the opposition who stands on the rock of the constitution and who in doing so proclaims his adhesion to the principles of equity and justice and fair play for all. The leader of the opposition gives to every free man settling in the Northwest Territories a fee simple deed to liberty; the leader of the government would blanket mortgage the charter of every settler. The leader of the opposition reposes confidence in the people and shows his faith in his fellow man; the leader of the government mistrusts the west; mistrusts the people of Canada and he places a handicap on these new provinces for the placing of which he has no mandate from the electorate. The leader of the opposition regards his commission from the freemen of Canada as a sacred trust and grants to each of his followers full liberty to vote as he chooses on this question; the leader of the government refused to place this issue before the electors at the last election, for he ignores the people of Canada. The leader of the government also ignores the territorial government led by Premier Haultain, who not long since had his policy on this question endorsed by the people of the west. The leader of the government ignored the ex-Minister of the Interior, the responsible minister from the district, for he consulted only the Minister of Justice and the Postmaster General. The leader of the government ignored the Minister of Finance in relation to the great financial issues involved, and he hastened the Bill into this House so as to get the party committed to it while the minister was on his way from a foreign land. The leader of the government ignored even his party caucus, because he knew he dare not consult it; he ignored his colleagues in the cabinet, consulting only the gentleman who had the manipulation of the affairs from the beginning; he trampled the commission of the people of Canada under his feet and cast to the winds his boasted love of the English constitution, believing that his followers would meekly vote as he commanded.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to see that there is one good representative of the cabinet present (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) to take charge, I presume, of the business before the House. Before recess I was pointing out that the leader of the opposition stood on the principle of equal rights and equal laws for all, and special privileges for none, whereas the leader of the government took the position that it was the duty of this parliament to coerce the new provinces in the matter of education—in other words, to establish in those provinces a union of church and state. The maxim of the leader of the opposition was: Is it right, is it just, is it fair to those splendid people in the west, for this parliament, representing as it does all Canada, to seek to enforce upon them the will of people who have nothing whatever to do with the schools in that country, who should have nothing to do with them, and who are not justified under the laws or the constitution in interfering with them ? The leader of the government takes for granted, as is stated in the press and hinted at in the addresses of hon. gentlemen opposite, that the excitement over this question will soon pass away, and that in a few weeks all this discussion will be forgotten. Let me tell the First Minister that down deep in the hearts of his countrymen, those who support him as well as those who oppose him, is the conviction that he has made the mistake of his lifetime—that he has destroyed the high opinion in which he was held by a great many of the people of this country, who had absolute faith in his struggles for liberty in 1896 and on other occasions in the history of this country.

The Minister of Justice in replying to the leader of the opposition, abandoned the ground of the constitution and the ground of vested rights, and stood simply on the

foundation rock that forty-one per cent of the people of this country demanded these schools and were going to get them. Let me tell the Minister of Justice, in the first place, that not forty-one per cent, and I believe not ten per cent, of the people of this country demand this class of schools. Similar assertions are sometimes made in the United States by gentlemen who hope by that means to advance their own political ends, to the effect that a large percentage of the Roman Catholic people of the United States are in favour of parochial or separate schools instead of public schools. I shall take the liberty of quoting to the House, not my own authority, but the authority of one of the cleanest and best Roman Catholic priests that has ever graced a pulpit. I refer to the Reverend Jeremiah Crowley, of the city of Chicago, who says :

> Catholic public school opponents declare that at least one-third of the American people favour their position. I deny it. I am morally certain that not five per cent of the Catholic men of America endorse at heart the parochial school. They may send their children to the parochial school to keep peace in the family and to avoid an open rupture with the parish rector ; they may be induced to pass resolutions of approval of the parochial school in their lodges and conventions ; but if it ever becomes a matter of blood not one per cent. of them will be found outside of the ranks of the defenders of the American public school. If a perfectly free ballot could be cast the Catholic men of America for the perpetuity or suppression of the parochial school, it would be suppressed by an astounding majority. The plain Catholic layman knows that the public school is vastly superior to the parochial school in its methods, equipment and pedagogic talent. They know, too, that the public is the poor man's school. They know that the public school prepares, as no other can, their children for the keen struggle of American life and the stern duties of American citizenship.

Bishop Spaulding, a high dignitary of the Roman Catholic church in the United States says :

> Fifty years ago there was a great difference of opinion amongst Catholics in this country about the religious (parochial) school. Unfortunately the clean prelates and priests of 'fifty years ago' were whipped into line, and the unpatriotic and ruinous course of attacking the public schools prevailed.

I have some expressions of opinion also from gentlemen occupying very good positions in the Dominion of Canada as to whether forty per cent of the people of Canada are in favour of separate schools. I quote from an article in the Woodstock 'Daily Express' of Wednesday, March 8, 1905, written, I am informed, by a Roman Catholic, the editor of the newspaper being himself of that faith. I may say that a contributor to this paper had criticised the action of the government in relation to these Autonomy Bills and that the 'Catholic Record' of London, Ont., had attacked him, and this is the reply of the Roman Catholic editor of the 'Express' :

> What the freely expressed opinion of Roman Catholics would be with reference to separate schools is a matter of speculation, and our contributor has as much right to his opinion as the editor of the 'Catholic Record' has to his. The very fact that Roman Catholic ratepayers are not invited to express an opinion preparatory to the establishment of a separate school may be interpreted as meaning either that their opinion is not considered of any great value, or that the bishops are afraid to trust an appeal to it. If our contributor was so very far wrong in his opinion, why is it that Roman Catholic ratepayers are not consulted about the establishment of separate schools ? Why is it that in so many cases they are permitted no more say in the management of separate schools than is necessary to give an appearance of compliance with the law ? Why is it that the bishop deems it necessary to invoke the spiritual powers of a church to compel support and attendance ? Why are Roman Catholic ratepayers not allowed the use of the ballot in the election of trustees ? Why are the trustees, in some cases at least, not allowed to act after they are elected ? Is it bigotry to draw attention to these facts ? It seems to us that the 'Catholic Record' would be showing more respect for intelligent Roman Catholic sentiment by dealing squarely with the facts than by imputing motives.

Further on the 'Express' says :

> The state has assumed the responsibility of providing for the education of the people up to a certain point. To discharge its obligations properly the state should guarantee that the schools should be free and open to all, Protestant and Catholic, Jew and Gentile. The state does not interfere with any religious denomination ; it leaves all free to teach what doctrines they will and how they will ; the denominations, on their part, should leave the state free in the matter of secular education. The duty of a state is to encourage the children of all creeds and races to grow up together, as Canadian citizens. Surely it is not bigotry for a public journal to work for the removal of differences, dissensions and prejudices in a country whose destiny depends on the ability and willingnes of all her people to live and work together in harmony.

These views of Roman Catholic writers in the province of Ontario refute the utterance of the Minister of Justice made before this House in tones of defiance, that forty-one per cent of the people of this country demand these schools and are going to get them. Let me tell the Minister of Justice that a percentage of the people of the United States of America, away back in 1861, decided that they would have certain rights, and they sought to enforce their will by arms ; they sought to disrupt the union ; but the union to-day is stronger than it ever was. And let me tell the Minister of Justice that he cannot get forty-one per cent, or even a corporal's guard of the people of this country to follow him in any racial and religious cry, or in any racial or religious struggle in order to plant separate schools in the Northwest of Canada.

Should he undertake it, the result will be that Canada will be bound together more closely just as the United States has been, since the great civil war, than it ever was before. The Minister of Justice will find that he has not caused the slightest tremour in the hearts or minds of the people by threatening rebellion and the destruction of the constitution, as he did when he said 41 per cent of our people would have their way in this matter or there would be trouble. The hon. the Minister of Finance slid off the rock of the constitution and took to the water, as my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has pointed out.

Mr. BENNETT. He got thrown in.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes, he was thrown in but clung to the cabinet, and when he stood up in this House and made the plea he did, he presented the most abject, pitiable spectacle it has ever been my privilege to witness in this parliament, and this is the sixteenth session I have had the honour of occupying a seat in it. Just fancy the man who made the welkin ring from one end of the Dominion to the other in 1896 against any interference with the province of Manitoba, who has been quoted often in this House as against any coercion of any province—just fancy this man, when brought face to face with the issue of his own creation, renouncing every shred of principle he then stood for. Shall I quote his language ? I really do not think it necessary, and I do not like to see it any oftener than I can help in the pages of 'Hansard.' But what was the pitiable plea he made ? Oh, he said, if we don't accept this clause the First Minister will have to resign and we will be all out in the cold. That was the sum and substance of his remarks. Why, the whale and Jonah were not in it compared with the hon. gentleman and his principles. The whale merely swallowed Jonah, but the Finance Minister swallowed both himself and whatever principles he ever had. He pointed out that in Nova Scotia the Roman Catholics were handsomely used by the Protestant majority, but in the next breath he turned around and said we cannot trust the people of the Northwest to do the Roman Catholic minority in those new provinces what is being done to that same minority in the province of Nova Scotia. That was the result of the hon. gentleman's logic. I might remind him of an old expression taken from the same authority as he quoted from :

> The man who sells his freedom in exchange for broth shall make eternal servitude his fate.

Both the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Finance practically threatened civil war when they stated that because 41 per cent of the people of this country wanted to control the schools in a certain way, forsooth we must yield to them. Where would government begin and end if such a principle were to be recognized ? It would have been a thousand times better for the Minister of Finance if he had quietly remained on the ocean until this matter was finally settled, and still kept to the water, rather than have made the exhibition he did in this House. How a minister who has sworn to give advice to His Majesty's representatives according to the dictates of his conscience can remain in the cabinet after publicly enunciating the principles he expressed here, passes my comprehension. Had that hon. gentleman done his duty, the First Minister would very quickly have found a way out of the difficulty. Had he stood to his guns with the solid province of Nova Scotia at his back and supported by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) with the solid Northwest behind him, the First Minister would never have dared to resign and go to the country, but would at once have removed the difficulty and left the people of the Northwest free to deal with their own schools. Had he adopted the motto taken from his own favourite author, he would have been by long odds the most popular man in this country. If he had taken the motto :

> Freedom sternly said :
> I shun no pang,
> No strife beneath the sun,
> Where human rights are staked and won.

He would have been master of the administration to-day in place of meriting the contempt of every member of the House of Commons. Personally I have always been opposed to the introduction of religion into politics and have always endeavoured to keep the two apart. But at times religious contentions have been forced on us, as I shall point out later in answer to the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). In the province of Ontario we have had, on the question of separate schools, an agitation, prompted by differences, to have the improper amendments made to our school law removed. I stood up in that fight and we won and prevented these improper amendments being perpetuated and put into practice in our province. I remember well pointing out that if every adviser of Sir Oliver Mowat were a member of the Roman Catholic church, it did not matter so long as he was chosen on the ground of fitness and ability, but that no one should be chosen for a cabinet position simply because he happened to be an Irishman or a Scotchman or a Frenchman or an Englishman and a member of a certain church. Let ability be the test, I contended, and there would be no trouble. But on all these matters, there are demagogues who take advantage of national and religious prejudices, men who have no qualifications or fitness for public office other than that they handle the Irish vote in this locality, or the French vote in another locality, or some other votes somewhere else ; and these are the men who have gained ascendency in the Liberal party

from the days as far back as 1837. It is this class of politicians who create these religious and racial agitations throughout the country, hoping thereby to gain a prominence which they cannot achieve in any other way. But it is not necessary for the men of any race or religion in Canada to resort to that kind of thing. There are plenty of Irishmen, Scotchmen and Frenchmen and men of every nationality who can command the respect of their fellow countrymen without resorting to such pernicious methods. We had another exhibition of these methods in the person of the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). On one occasion, when speaking in the city of Brantford, that magnificent voice of his was raised to such a pitch that just as the audience left the building, the roof fell in. Well, the only resemblance between the Minister of Customs of to-day and the Minister of Customs of years gone by is that sonorous voice of his. It was heard in Ontario in 1896, when he exclaimed in stentorian tones: Hands off Manitoba ; down with Tupper and the Church of Rome ; we will never be ruled by the Bishops of Rome ; let the free men of the west show their independence. The newspaper speeches and posters of hon. gentlemen opposite reeked with this sort of thing.

And he stood up here saying in effect: Pity the sorrows of a poor old man who wants to hold on to office ; who has been for thirty-two years in the saddle—I think that was what he said—with the First Minister, and has learned to love him. Well, these are great constitutional reasons why two provinces of this Dominion should be tied hand and foot for all time to come. In some of his speeches, the hon. gentleman was wont to quote those grand old words from Junius, which the Toronto 'Globe' years ago adopted for its motto: 'The subject who is truly loyal to the chief magistrate will neither advise nor submit to arbitrary measures.' But there was not a word of independence from him the other night. It was only : Let me hold down my job in the custom-house ; keep the ship together and keep her off the rocks ; I have been thirty-two years in the saddle with the Prime Minister, and I love the dear old man; and I am not fit for much else. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that the rule of life is that men go down and give place to others. In politics, as in every walk of life in which there is struggle, men disappear. But the sun rises and sets and the men are soon forgotten. Had these hon. gentlemen stood to the constitution there would have been no danger of the Prime Minister going out of office on this question, no danger of the government being broken up. On the contrary, it would have been much stronger than it is to-day. Had they done this, the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) would not have been afraid to face his electors ; Centre Toronto would not have gone by default ; the government would not have been obliged to dangle jobs before the eyes of their partisans from the Northwest Territories; and, as I am reminded, the tomato man of the party, the member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) could have been made Minister of Agriculture and need not have been afraid, on this account, to face his electors. Not a constituency in the country but would have supported the government on this subject. Men come and go ; members of this House appear and pass. And when every man who has occupied a place in this House shall have passed and been forgotten, the principles that are being discussed to-day will live ; the principles—or lack of principles—that are being fastened upon the people of the new provinces will remain to remind the future generation of those

> Patriots self-bound to the stake of office,
> Martyrs for their country's sake,
> Who fill, themselves, the hungry jaws of fate
> And by their loss of manhood save the state.

Now, Sir, we all admire the open fearless dare-devil rather than the sneak ; we admire the man who holds up a train or, flying the black flag, orders the merchantman to heave to, but we despise the man who slinks around by the back door to commit some petty theft. Therefore, it was a refreshing thing to see the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) stand up and to hear him boldly and brazenly admit that the whole policy of the government was wrong, that there was no question of the constitution in it, no question of vested rights or control by this parliament, nor could there be any question of policy, for it was a wrong policy. He said in effect: I do not believe in separate schools, but I want to keep the old aggregation together, and I will see them through. I have not before me the oath of office taken by that hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) as a member of parliament—he had the decency to resign his position in the cabinet before he made the speech to which I have referred—but I would recommend him to walk into the clerk's room and read it. And if, in the light of that oath, he can reconcile his speech and his vote, he will prove himself able to turn a shorter corner than I think he can.

The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), who is now conveniently out of the House, is credited with having written certain articles for 'La Nationaliste,' warning the ex-Minister of the Interior of his duty to support the party, and warning him that if he persisted in wrecking this government some very unpleasant things would be brought before the public. It is the duty of this House to know what it is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) referred to. We want him to stand up in this House, to show himself brave for once in his life, and let the public know what was meant by this threat that brought the ex-Minister of the Interior so quickly back into line. I

suppose that occasion will be found, later on, to inquire further into this matter. A friend of mine, always a great admirer of the ex-Minister of the Interior, dropped me a line the other day. He says :

I am reading carefully all that is being said and done these days at Ottawa. The situation is simply appalling. The people are perplexed and confounded. This is the boldest card ever played in Canada, and I am afraid that it will win. I am anxiously waiting Sifton's speech in the papers to-morrow. My present notion is, that he will go back to Laurier. If he does my suspicion is, that the whole thing was a fake from the beginning. He did not 'go' out, but was 'sent' out for the purpose of leading the westerners back. He recalls the artful method resorted to by Armour of Chicago, in leading his wild steers from the ranches up to the slaughter house. As they smell danger from afar, Armour keeps a large Mexican steer, fat and sleek, which he has trained to rush into the bolting stubborn throng, frolic round and play up 'big' for a few minutes, then he takes the lead straight for the slaughter house, when all the others follow ; the gates close behind, and the big brute quietly steps to one side into a stall for a fine feed of boiled oats.

The next day, on March 25th, he wrote again. He said :

I have just read Sifton's speech. I forgot to tell you that the boys around Armour's call that big steer Judas.

Now, let me quote an extract or two from the Reverend Jeremiah Crowley, a Roman Catholic priest of the city of Chicago. Recently the government of France, which has been Roman Catholic from time immemorial and which had a concordat with Rome, has abolished that concordat and has expelled certain religious orders in that country. The Reverend Mr. Crowley, himself a Roman Catholic priest in good standing, against whom his most malignant enemy has not been able to produce a single charge as to either his moral or spiritual conduct, points out that these members of these religious orders come in large numbers to the continent of America and are encouraged by the higher authorities of the church, and that they work against the best interests of the Roman Catholic Church as well as against the public schools of the United States. And he closes his argument upon that subject with these words :

I submit to the American people this question : Is it to the best interests of the nation that a multitude (now over a million) of its children should receive their secular education in schools which, for their highest supervision, are subject to ecclesiastics whose perpetual residence is in Europe, who have never seen the shores of America, who are strangers to our language, our customs and our laws, and who attack Americanisms ?

This is a quotation from that gentleman. I will now come to some of my Irish fellow countrymen, citizens of the United States, who have expressed very strong opinions on these matters. In the United States, as well as in Canada, there is an organized attempt to force clerical schools upon the people. There is there what is called a federation of church societies who are engaged in this work, openly, there is no secret about it. I know that it is customary for some people to speak with bated breath and bowed head when speaking of corporations ; but a corporation is a corporation the world over, whether in the United States or the Dominion of Canada. As I say, there is in the United States a union of Roman Catholic church societies whose openly proclaimed object is to bring this question into the politics of the country, and to create a great middle party if possible, and thus to force the two parties in the United States to come to its terms. Now, a number of prominent Irishmen have been consulted on this matter, Irish Roman Catholics, and I will give quotations from a few of them. Here is one from Mr. John P. Kelly, a leading resident and business man of the city of Milwaukee, Wisconsin—these quotations are all from the residents of the city of Milwaukee. Mr. Kelly says :

A Catholic political party or a Protestant political party or a socialist political party has no place in this country.

Mr. John Toohey, another Irishman :

I am utterly opposed to the taking of any steps in this country that will have a tendency to arraign the different denominations against each other in governmental affairs. I firmly believe that the confederation of all Catholic societies into one grand body as proposed, would be one of the gravest mistakes that the Catholics of this country ever made. It would be a step backwards, one that would do the church more harm than good. It naturally would beget counter sectarian political action.

Mr. John F. Donovan :

I can see no reason for any organization of that kind in America. Catholics have no complaint to make as to their treatment by legislatures or by citizens generally. On the contrary, I believe that we are receiving all that we can decently expect or demand.

J. H. Kopmeier :

While I know the motives and purposes of its organizers are praiseworthy and commendable, I am convinced that the federation movement will stir up feeling and latent bigotry, defeat its own purposes, and injure Catholics individually and collectively. A Catholic movement of this nature will beget a counter movement which will do us irretrievable injury.

C. M. Scanlon :

At the launching of the movement, Bishop McFaul advocated that it be a factor in politics, and from that time down to its last meeting it has been dabbling in politics. Its conventions uttered loud protests against phantom wrongs and passed resolutions that have served no other purpose than to record its blunders and bring reproach upon the church.

These are the opinions of leading men in reference to this organization, given on July

2, 1904. This organization had just been perfected, and is throwing itself into the arena of politics. In this same work, this Roman Catholic priest says :

I love my church, and for this reason I am fighting these organizations in it.

This gentleman comes to the front and boldly proclaims the object of this movement—the same movement I presume that we find in Canada, with a similar object in view.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. That is what the hon. gentleman does not demonstrate.

Mr. SAM HUGHES (reading) :

The fact is that priests and prelates hope to establish in the United States a Catholic party modelled after the Centre party in the German Reichstag, and to make the Catholic societies the nucleus of such a party.

And he points out :

They think they can work it out in this way : Set afoot a movement for a division of the school fund. That movement to mean anything must exert itself in securing pledges from candidates for the legislature. Neither Republican nor Democratic candidates will give such pledges.

I will not go into details, but I will say that these gentlemen are openly——

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. That is in the United States.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Well, the same game is going on here.

There is an open, notorious and virulent hostility of priests and prelates at home and abroad towards the public school.

Then he goes on and shows what their tactics are.

1. Bringing of the public school into contempt by characterizing it as 'Godless,' 'vicious,' 'a sink of corruption.'

Have we heard any arguments like that in this House ? I think we have.

2. The securing for the Catholic parochial schools the largest possible share of the public school tax funds.

Have we heard anything of that kind in this House ? I think we have.

3. The encouragement of other sects to start sectarian schools and to demand public moneys in payment for the secular education of the children.

4. The securing of a Catholic majority on public school boards and on the teaching staff of the public schools in the hope of being able thereby to lower the tone of instruction and discipline in the public schools and thus bring the public schools into disfavour.

5. Securing the employmnt of nuns and monks as public school teachers.

And so on, page after page. I commend the book to hon. gentlemen opposite. It is written by Rev. Mr. Crowley, of Chicago, and if our hon. friends will send for it he will be delighted to send it to them. He says :

A hurricane of hate is brewing. I love the Catholic church, and to save her from destruction in America I write this book.

This is from the pen of Mr. Crowley himself.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman is in very good company. The man he is quoting has no authority whatever to speak for any one but himself. It is not worth while to take much notice of what the hon. gentleman says, but he is really making statements that have no foundation in fact when he says that that man has authority to speak for anybody.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am merely telling what this gentleman says, and I challenge my hon. friend, and he may hunt from now till the morning of the resurrection, to point out one solitary objection to this gentleman, either to his personal or his ecclesiastical position, which will reflect upon his character. Now, we are told that in Canada this does not apply. I will read an article from the Bobcaygeon 'Independent,' whose editor is a Roman Catholic, and who says :

Mr. Laurier, in forcing the separate schools on the northwest, cannot be thoroughly aware of what he is doing. The moment that Bill passes a movement will be inaugurated for the annexation of the Northwest to the States A break-up of confederation, and annexation means an end of French domination and a clean sweep of separate schools.

This is from a Liberal and a Roman Catholic, the editor of the Bobcaygeon 'Independent,' in the province of Ontario.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is that an authority for the hon. gentleman ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He is a very good authority.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am informed that he is a pro-Boer.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Well, he is in good company. I am told that my hon. friend the Solicitor General was a pro-Boer. I am told that my hon. friend the member for Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne) also expressed himself in very strong terms against the action of the British government in the South African war ; and other hon. gentlemen opposite have very strong views in favour of the Boers—anything so long as they can hit the British empire. Now, Sir, I stated to-day, as one of the offences of these gentlemen against the Dominion of Canada, that they had destroyed all respect for public principles in this Dominion. We have seen them on the trade question, we have seen them on every question, box the compass to suit their own purpose, in various ways they have proved themselves true opportunists, with the result that the public

conscience in the Dominion of Canada to-day is at the lowest stage it has ever been in the history of Canada.

Public sentiment is gone, honour is practically gone, and now they are endeavouring to disrupt and smash up our public school system and when any hon. gentleman stands up and opposes them the cry of intolerance is raised. If a man stands by his rights and opposes these iniquities, why he is intolerant. These are the charges that are made by certain hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House from time to time. More than that, we have seen the hon. Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) stand up and in place of replying to the argument advanced by my friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) read a lot of rigmarole stuff, debates in other Houses and adverse criticism of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance and we have seen that sort of thing going on day after day in this House. We had the hon. member from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) the other night standing up adversely and unfairly criticising my hon. friend from North Toronto and bringing in arguments that had no force or effect and no bearing on the question before the House. That has been the policy of these hon. gentlemen throughout. They do not meet argument with argument or fact with fact, but seek like ink fish to cover the trail by improper references. This is not a question of what is right; it is simply a question of what is expedient. Abandon your principles, look to your pocket and position no matter who is injured. These are the maxims of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Pay no attention to the pledges given to the people. They are made to be broken. The maxims of the government are simply trampled under foot. The principles for which freemen have fought in all ages are taken as naught. Secret intrigue takes the place of free discussion and free conference among the members of the government and among the members of the party. Is there a minister in his place to-night who can stand up and conscientiously say that he was consulted about that clause? A great party following the principles of constitutional and responsible government and yet, besides a paltry little committee of the cabinet, not one member of the government, not one of their following in the House, not one member of the territorial legislature and not one of the members from the west, although only fresh from the country, is consulted as to this clause, although it is said that we are living under constitutional government. Why, the Czar of Russia, surrounded by the grand dukes, would not attempt to pass that sort of legislation. It is worse than taxation without representation which caused the American war. Now, the policy laid down by the First Minister, as well as the second or amended clause, imposes the will of other portions of Canada on the western freemen. It imposes it in defiance of the constitution of the country and it establishes a principle of federal interference in purely provincial matters which has always been avoided in connection with the government in Canada heretofore. It establishes separate schools in the Northwest Territories and perpetuates the union of church and state in that great country.

Now, we have heard our hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) point out, in the course of his speech, a great many things, some of them nonsensical and many of them very untrue and incorrect. I shall take the opportunity of running through a few of the choice extracts from his speech. In one of these he makes an appeal to the English-speaking majority in this country and says: Consider what the French Canadians in the past have done for the development of this country. He makes the same mistake as the hon. member from Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne) of believing that we are dealing with the province of Quebec, or that the whole Dominion is the province of Quebec, or vice versa, the province of Quebec is the whole Dominion. Let me inform him that the province of Quebec is only a portion of the Dominion, and a very small portion, although a very important one. He says that:

> Sir, when the English settlers of His Majesty were still on the banks of the Atlantic and had not crossed the Ohio and the Missouri, French Canadian priests, French Canadian traders and settlers had opened up that country.

Slightly exaggerated, but let me tell that hon. gentleman that had it not been for the schools which he is advocating to-day and the system which he is endeavouring to perpetuate in this country the continent of North America would largely have been under the control of the French people to-day. Anterior to the date referred to by him free Frenchmen had planted colonies in Brazil, in the coast of Florida, Georgia and the Carolinas, prosperous colonies of free Frenchmen, but these colonies were blotted out by the connivance of the French government engineered by the same system that he wishes to perpetuate in the Northwest Territories, and the label over the graves of the thousands of men who were massacred in cold blood was this: 'This is not done as to Frenchmen, but as to Lutherans.' Had it not been for the interference of an organization such as he is endeavouring to force on the west the whole continent of North America would have been colonized by free Frenchmen—the word 'French' means free—and we would not have had the improper struggles that are now dividing this country. I commend these notions to my hon. friend from Labelle. Another point he dwelt upon was this—I shall not take up his reference to rebellion to any great extent—but he spoke about twenty times in reference to rebellion—the rebellion in the Northwest Territories of 1885, the rebellion in Manitoba—and he seemed to regret that there did not spring

up another rebellion in 1892. Take the rebellion of 1885; as I explained this afternoon, when the government wanted the few settlers at the village of Batoche to take the square mile survey in place of the long survey a rebellion broke out. This hon. gentleman claims that rebellion was justified, and he regrets that he did not bring on a rebellion in Manitoba at the time the Manitoba Act was passed abolishing separate schools there. There are occasions when rebellions are just. I think the people of the Northwest Territories fully appreciate their position and that they will make it rather warm for the right hon. First Minister and the government of Canada in connection with this Bill, first by a constitutional agitation, and then, if it is found out that this government, in spite of the constitution, are determined to insist upon forcing this clause upon them, I think it would be advisable for them to take the management of their own schools for their own ends.

Further on the hon. member for Labelle says:

When you speak of the liberty granted to the Roman Catholic to go into a non-sectarian school, there is no such a thing as liberty.

I have shown by expressions of opinion from the best Roman Catholics in the United States and Canada and from some of the finest Roman Catholics in the province of Ontario, that he is not talking for the Roman Catholic people of either Canada or the United States, and I shall give him one extract further from the Rev. J. O'Donovan —another gentleman and Roman Catholic Irishman, by the way—who takes the ground that public schools are what the people want. He says :

But the statement that state secular education has this effect has never been proved. In fact when one tests it by one's own experience in the immediate circle of one's acquaintances the assertion proves baseless. Several of my friends were educated in non-Catholic schools and colleges without the slightest injury to their faith.

I do not know the gentleman who writes this article——

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Ask the member for Jacques Cartier and he will tell you all about him.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have this to say, however, that if this gentleman were not what he should be the public would mighty soon know all about him. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) goes on to say :

When, by any measure in this House or in any provincial parliament you force a Roman Catholic to send his children to a non-sectarian school, you are committing an act of injustice just as direct, just as much against the conscience of the Roman Catholic, as if you would force the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec to contribute to Roman Catholic denominational schools.

Here we have this young gentleman discussing the question of schools ; he is a bachelor I believe, and it is peculiar that we find that those most ready to give an opinion on how to manage children are generally old bachelors, aged maiden ladies, or persons who have no children. The member for Labelle further says :

We ask you to stand by us and give the same protection to the Catholics of the western province that the Protestants have in the east.

He goes on to talk about Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper and he praises them, but these two statesmen never had a more bitter opponent than the member for Labelle. He calls these schools Godless, and we have heard a great deal about Godliness and holiness although we do not see such an awful lot of it. I have always observed that : Holy life is more than rite, and spirit more than letter. You can step into a school where the Bible is read and prayers are recited and religious instruction given, but when you have not the proper spirit evidenced in the life of the teacher you have no Godliness. Place a school in charge of an honest-hearted, clean young fellow or any one of the thousands of noble young women throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion, and Sir, the very atmosphere of that school is holiness, purity and Godliness. To talk about these being Godless schools where the noble young women of this country are in control is absolute nonsence. This gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) speaks of his entry into the arena of Ontario provincial politics, and he says :

I was but a boy at the time, but I was proud to stand by Sir Oliver Mowat and help in his campaign for justice and equality.

Well, let us see what this campaign of Sir Oliver Mowat's was, for justice and equality. The Protestants of Ontario never attempted to prevent the Roman Catholics perpetuating the separate schools, nor did they ever attempt to do away with separate schools in that province. What they did object to was the illegal, unfair, and unequal concessions given to the Roman Catholics of that province, and I am very much surprised to find that this gentleman who tells us he was but a boy at the time, started out in such a bad cause as to advocate the campaign of Sir Oliver Mowat. One of the things that grated on the ears of Protestants was, that we were classed with the negroes, because the third section of the Act says :

Protestant and coloured separate schools, may be established in the province of Ontario.

We were classed with the darkey. Where we were in the minority and the negroes were in the minority we could form separate schools, and that is one of the things we objected to. Another thing we objected to was this : Where a Protestant separate school was established in the province of

Ontario, all that required to be done to break that school up would be that a Protestant teacher should be engaged in the school section adjoining. The people after having gone to the expense of building a school and taxing themselves to engage a teacher, if the school section from which they had separated themselves engaged a Protestant teacher that instant their school closed up and the people were put to great loss. Section 8 of the Ontario Act says :

No Protestant separate school shall be allowed in any school section, except when the teacher of the public school in such section is a Roman Catholic.

If the adjoining school section engaged a Protestant teacher it closed up the Protestant separate school, and the people were out the money they paid for it. We fought against these things in Ontario and we were right in fighting against them. We fought against this injustice and we were called intolerant and fanatical in the press and on the public platform, but we stood to the fight and although as history shows, we were swindled out of election after election, we taught the people of that province what it is to be freemen. Another injustice was this : There is a clause in the Ontario Act, and it is a good one, which allows a Protestant tenant of Catholic property to determine that his taxes shall go to the public school, and the Catholic tenant of Protestant property to determine that his taxes shall go to the separate school. We never objected to that in principle, but when I tell you that my own taxes for two years went to the separate schools you will see that there was a necessity for a change in the law. The clause in the Act is as follows :

Every person paying rates whether as proprietor or tenant, who by himself or his agent, on or before the first day of March in any year, gives to the clerk of the municipality notice in writing that he is a Roman Catholic and supporter of a separate school, situated in the said municipality, or in a municipality contiguous thereto, shall be exempted from the payment of all rates imposed for the support of public schools.

We objected to that because the Catholic landlord could give notice that he wanted the taxes applied to the separate school and for years in the province of Ontario that was done, and although the Roman Catholic tenant of a Protestant property could send his taxes to the separate school the Protestant tenant of Catholic property could not in very many cases do so. I will give you another instance: At the village of Downeyville in the county which I have the honour to represent, the people were living in peace and harmony until a few monthe ago. There were only four Protestant families in the whole school section and some forty odd Roman Catholic families. Thirteen or fifteen of these Roman Catholic families yielded to the influence of the Roman Catholic clergyman of the place and they went in for a separate school. The balance of the Roman Catholic people objected to the establishment of the separate school, but they were all obliged to come into line and to-day there are four Protestant families in that school section who cannot afford to get a teacher of their own, and who either cannot send their children to school or have to drive them miles to an adjoining section. And because we objected to this sort of thing some gentlemen stand up and brand us as intolerant and tyrannical, and not in favour of equal rights to all. Such a statement is absurd. Another assertion made by the member for Labelle was this :

I wish to be able to point out to all men that here is laid down in our constitution the clear written principle that equal justice exists for all and that Catholics as well as Protestants have the right to live in this country.

Will he point to any Protestant country where Protestants and Catholics have not the right to live side by side ? Will he point to any country over which the British flag floats where liberty is not equally given to the Roman Catholic and Protestant subject ? That is one of the principles for which my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) who sits beside me contends. We have heard some jeering about him lately, but he is a man who during his life has striven for that principle. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) is head of an order in which he as well as the humblest in its ranks is sworn to give to his Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen the same rights and privileges as he claims for himself. Is there anything tyrannical or intolerant in that ? You cannot show, in the history of the Dominion of Canada, where any gentleman pretending to live up to the principles I have enunciated has refused to grant what I have stated. I could show in the city of Hull, in the province of Quebec, the Protestant stock of four companies—the E. B. Eddy Company, the Ottawa and Hull Power Company, the Gilmour and Hughson Company and the George Matthews Company—every member of all these companies being Protestant, pay $8,966.50 of taxes, of which the Protestant schools of Hull receive only $695. In the province of Ontario, were this stock held by companies, every dollar of taxes upon that stock would go to the support of the Roman Catholic schools, if the stockholders were Roman Catholics.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. If my hon. friend will permit me, to-day that stock may be in the hands of Protestants, and to-morrow it may be in the hands of Catholics ; and where would you be if there were not a law to distribute the taxes proportionately ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There is a certain date fixed by statute in the province of Ontario on which it is determined where the taxes shall go.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. In this instance it is not a partnership of persons, but a part-

nership of interests, in which anybody may have a share in the stock. In the case of a partnership of persons, you would take into consideration the religion of the persons, but not in a partnership of interests.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am only pointing out that in the province of Ontario, were this stock held by people of the Roman Catholic faith, every dollar of taxes on that stock would go to the support of separate schools.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. Yes, but any stock can be sold to any person.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And any business can be sold just the same. In the Montreal 'Gazette' of March 25, 1905, I find that a gentleman of the name of Alderman Deserres rose and said :

I have secured from the city comptroller, a statement showing the following proportion of commercial property owned in the city:

Roman Catholics..	$ 634,900
Protestants..	5,577,800
Neutral..	21,522,420

The amount which the Protestant business houses have to pay to the 'neutral' fund exceeds by $4,900,000 that paid by the Roman Catholic business houses. This sum at 40 cents a hundred dollars, gives a sum of $19,600, which divided pro rata according to population, gives the Roman Catholic schools the sum of $16,200, which according to the claims of my fellow alderman should belong to the Protestant panel.

I am merely pointing out that the Protestant majority of the province of Ontario have been unjustly charged—not that we care anything about it—with being intolerant, I assert that the laws in Ontario are more favourable to the Roman Catholic minority there than the laws of Quebec are to the Protestant minority of that province.

If my hon. friend from Labelle were to remove from his speech all that he says about rebellion, toleration and intolerance, there would be a very little left of it. He makes the mistake of supposing that the privileges of the English-speaking people of Quebec were granted to them. On the contrary, the concessions were granted to the French people of that province, as England always grants concessions to any people in any country where she has the management of affairs—the right to use their language and the right to observe whatever religion they choose to follow. These concessions the British government granted to our French friends in the province of Quebec, and all honour to her for so doing. And, should any attempt ever be made to deprive our fellow-countrymen of the province of Quebec of the right to use their own language or their right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences, they may rest assured that my hon. friend here (Mr. Sproule) would be one of the first to go down and resist any such injustice to them.

Mr. SPROULE. Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not want to hurt the feelings of my good friend from Labelle. His history, of course, was absurd. All through his address he talks as if the people of Quebec, and they only, owned the Northwest. The French Canadians in the province of Quebec, toleration, intolerance—these are the stock-in-trade arguments of the hon. gentleman. He says :

I may remind my English-speaking friends that three centuries before there was anything like English civilization, Catholic Spain had covered the world not only with physical power, but with civilization and enlightenment—with schools of higher education and primary education and with a knowledge of all human sciences that were available at that time that no nation has since surpassed.

Let me tell the hon. gentleman that Spain has not been in existence for more than five hundred years. Prior to that time Spain was made up of a lot of free republics, and later free monarchies.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. What date ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. At the close of the fifteenth century. It was not through the schools of Catholic Spain that the arts and sciences and learning were maintained there, but through the schools established by the Moors in the old Iberian peninsula, before the dark ages swept over Europe. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong in his history. Another mistake made by the hon. member for Labelle was in speaking of the United States, where, he said :

People recognize that what must save the United States from the social plague which is going to involve all nations between the crushing burden of capitalism and the equally crushing burden of standing armies, is the influence of the Catholic Church on the working classes.

Well, if the hon. gentleman wants to belittle his Roman Catholic co-religionists, it is none of my funeral ; but let me tell him that I would hesitate a long time before I would offer to the Roman Catholic people such an insult. In the United States there are only 10,000,000 Roman Catholics to 70,000,000 who are not Roman Catholics, and if the hon. gentleman says that these 10,000,000 are going to lead the anarchical, socialistic and revolutinary movements, he is paying a poor compliment to the people of that faith.

I would not dream of insulting the Roman Catholic people in any such way. Let me tell him that what is going to save the United States is her free public school education, given throughout the length and breadth of that great nation, and not any church or system of separate schools. He says that never in the province of Quebec

or in any part of the country in which Catholics have any control, do we find the display of passion and prejudice we are now witnessing among those who advocate public schools against separate schools. Well, I do not believe in quoting newspaper against newspaper or speech against speech, but you can take every minister of this government and you can quote any speech of his one year against another speech the following year, any time within the last fifteen years. And no papers have been more active than papers supporting the government in the province of Quebec—which I presume are Roman Catholic papers—in exciting religious and race antagonism. You will find them excelling in charging all sorts of intolerance against the Protestants of Ontario, and you will find men like the hon. member for Labelle going through that province and appealing to the fanaticism and prejudices of that magnificent people. I have every faith in that people, but we must admit that they are not as well posted in public affairs as they should be. I regret that we have no Chapleau in the province of Quebec to-day to set the people right and counteract the schemes of hon. gentlemen opposite. I remember when the late Sir Joseph Chapleau stood in the province of Quebec and faced the demagogues of the Liberal party, led by the late Mr. Mercier, who sought to inflame the public mind of that province in connection with the Northwest rebellion and other matters. I regret that to-day there is not one to take the place of that great statesman and stem the torrent of fanaticism which is being spread throughout that province by the demagogues of the Liberal party. But I am confident that the good sense of the Quebec people will yet assert itself and that in a short time they will realize how they have been misled and told fairy tales in connection with the treatment of that province by the British people. When the people of Quebec find out how they have been bamboozled and humbugged by men like the hon. member for Labelle, they will place no more faith in that type of man, but stand by principle rather than appeals to prejudice.

When Lord Aylmer was Governor, there was an address presented to the King which was signed by a number of French and English-speaking people.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What book are you reading from ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. From McMullen's History of Canada, a very good authentic work.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Lord Aylmer said :

> To be stigmatized as a foreigner, said he, while treading the soil of a British colony, sounds strange to the ears of an Englishman. Those who make use of the term should be emphatically told, that in every quarter of the world where the British flag flies every British subject is always at home.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Mr. John Neilson, who was the publisher of the Quebec 'Gazette' and the 'Nestor of Reform' in Lower Canada, was stigmatized by the Liberal leaders as a foreigner because he refused to endorse the treasonable sentiments of Mr. Papineau and those who signed the ninety-two resolutions. This is what he said of the ninety-two resolutions :

> But they have not only usurped authority which was not given to them, and produced all the consequences before stated ; they have excited to sedition, rebellion and treason. Their 92 resolutions of last winter are a long declamatory address to the passions and prejudices of the majority of the people, whom they formally designate and class in these resolutions as of French origin, in contradistinction to British or foreign origin. They grossly insulted and falsely accuse individuals, public authorities, and whole bodies of men, in aid of their attempted usurpation on the established constitution and the rights of their constituents. They tell the people that they have been subject to a long series of injustice and oppression under the British government.

Just like the appeal of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). We have exactly the same whine made by demagogues appealing to the people, we have had this for nearly a century, and it is about time some one undertook to educate the people.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. Does the hon. gentleman contend that the people of Quebec had then no grievance ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I contend that the people of Lower Canada then were infinitely better off than corresponding people in any other part of the world.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. That is not an answer.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The people of England at that time had not the liberty of government they have to-day.

> They tell the people that they have been subjected to a long series of injustice and oppression under the British government—that allegiance and protection are correlative obligations—refer to the example of the United States—and finally threaten to seek a remedy elsewhere, if their demands are not granted by the British parliament. If there is a man of unsophisticated mind and common honesty, who has read or will read the 92 resolutions, and say, before God and man, that such is not the bent and character of these resolutions, then I will consent that these latter allegations against the members of the late House of Assembly should be taken as not proven.

These were the opinions of a Liberal who had fought shoulder to shoulder with these

gentlemen in the province of Quebec in the olden days. The object of these gentlemen, Sir, in those days was agitation just as it is the object of these demagogues to-day. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) endeavoured to prove the other day that the agitation in favour of independence or the establishment of a republic was not due to Papineau. But in the heat of debate in 1835, Mr. Papineau forgot his ordinary prudence and avowed himself a republican in principle. He said :

The time had gone by when Europe could give monarchies to America. On the contrary the time is now approaching when America will give republics to Europe.

This is the sort of stuff our good friends in the province of Quebec have been fed upon all these long years, and unfortunately the plain truth, except at very brief intervals when men like Chapleau stood well to the front, has never been placed before them.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In the good city of Toronto does my hon. friend not know there is a gentleman named Goldwin Smith who advocates political union between Canada and the United States?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have never said that we have not gentlemen in the English-speaking provinces who profess these sentiments, but what I do say is that when men like Goldwin Smith come to the front and advocate such doctrines, they are answered by gentlemen who speak and write the English language. But when men advocating such theories go through the province of Quebec, our friends bow before them and wait for a reaction to set in when the people of that province will find out for themselves the true facts of the situation. Speaking of the agitation in favour of toleration and the rights of the people and all that sort of thing, the historian points out on page 44 that indignation meetings were held in various parts of the province at which violent resolutions were passed, and at these meetings Mr. Papineau was the chief orator, and was escorted by his countrymen from one district to another.

Again the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne) as well as the hon. member for Labelle, dilated at length on the injustice of the Britishers after they had conquered that country. I wish to point out, and to prove, that the British people used the people of the province of Quebec exactly as they have used the people of every country they have conquered, they used them as liberally as the people themselves wished to be used, and finally the imperial government gave to the people of Quebec liberties that they had never asked for and did not want. This historian says :

Before the conquest Canada was a purely military colony, and subjected like France, to a despotism of a most exacting and imperious character. While the custom of the Parisian tribunals, and the edicts of the French monarch, formed the statute law of the country, its administration was confided to a governor and an intendant, who, unchecked by a public press, and having the patronage of the whole colony completely at their disposal, usually acted upon the caprice of the moment, and were generally to set public opinion, such as it was, completely at defiance. Having thus means to provide for the more educated, they either silenced or enlisted on their side every person of influence. The common people, steeped in the grossest ignorance, and oppressed by feudal exactions submitted without a murmur, from long habit, to the arrogant claims and pretensions of their seigneurs and also of the public officials. The meanest officer of the government was regarded with the most slavish fear, and his mandate promptly obeyed, while their superiors were generally looked upon by the habitants as almost beings of a higher order in creation to themselves. By these they were treated with the greatest severity. In the law courts, as we have already seen, the torture was frequently applied, while, by the military authorities, they were compelled to serve as soldiers without pay, and in every condition of life taught that the one cardinal virtue was a blind and implicit obedience to those in power.

This was the condition of this splendid people when the British government took hold of the province of Quebec in 1763, as portrayed by an eminent French clergyman at the time.

The people, ignorant, and what was worse, contented in their ignorance, looked upon their own laws and customs as equally admirable and excellent, and, like the Chinese, regarded the rest of the world, France alone excepted, as 'outside barbarians.'

Then there is the testimony of clergymen and others writing about the country. I will quote only one of them—the Duke de Rochefoucault :

No Canadian has just grounds of complaint against the British government. They acknowledge they are better treated now than ever, but they love the French—forget them not, long after them, hope for their arrival, and will always love them. In their estimation a Frenchman is a being much superior to the native of Great Britain. The farmers are a frugal set of people, but ignorant and lazy.

These are the words of a Frenchman, writing of these people after a visit to Canada forty years after the British conquest. Then an American writer of that time, the distinguished scholar Silliman, says :

It is questionable whether any conquered country was ever better treated by its conquerors than Canada ; the people were left in complete possession of their religion, and the revenues for its support, as well as their property, laws, customs and manners, and even the defence of their country is no expense to them.

Then what becomes of the cry of these hon. gentlemen, that the people were ground down under the heel of the British govern-

ment and the British aristocrats ? No country has ever been more justly treated than was French Canada under the British government. Here is another extract that will show the conduct of the British government:

The impolitic desire of the home government to preserve the French element distinct from the British, as a safeguard against future revolution, completely destroyed this prospect——

Referring to the amalgamation of the two peoples.

——and precipitated the consequences it sought to avoid, aside from preventing the gradual amalgamation of the two races. For a brief space, however, the British inhabitants were lulled into security by the moderation of the French Canadians.

So, it was the British government themselves who first insisted upon these people taking an active part in the management of their own affairs.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Has my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) lost sight of the little rebellion that took place in Upper Canada ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have not come near the rebellion in Upper Canada yet, or near the rebellion in Lower Canada either, but I am gradually coming to it.

But no sooner had the French Canadian leaders become fully aware of the nature of the power with which they had been invested, than they gradually excluded persons of British origin from the House, until only some three or four remained.

And this was under the progenitor of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). And that hon .gentleman has the hardihood to stand up in this House and preach about the tolerance of the French Canadian people. Thank fortune that they have been tolerant. But it does not belong to the Liberal party or the family of Papineau to boast of tolerance.

The French, instead of the English, now became altogether the dominant language, and assumed the aggressive in the most decided manner. If a person of British origin aspired to political influence, he had to cast aside every predilection of birth and education, connect himself wholly with the French Canadians, and also learn their language.

This, Sir, under the rule and management of the progenitor of the hon. member for Labelle. Yet that hon. gentleman will get up and prate about the tolerance shown by the French Canadian people. As I have said, French Canadians are a tolerant people, but the family of Papineau has no share or part in that tolerance.

Prior to the formation of the Papineau party, no systematic attempt had been made to excite the prejudices of the masses against the natives of British origin.

Another factor against the hon. gentleman. And further on :

Nor is there any ground whatever for the supposition that the conduct of the French Canadians during the war with the United States arose from a feeling of loyalty to Great Britain.

Now, I just want to make it clear that the hon. gentleman is a pure agitator and that he has not given this House or this country in his addresses, from one end of it to the other, the facts of the conduct of a certain wing of the Liberal party of Lower Canada towards the English-speaking people of this country :

But, although the French Canadians were apparently the Liberal party of Lower Canada, owing to the manner in which they advocated reforms in question of a purely British character, while at the same time they clung tenaciously to almost every abuse of French origin, the citizens of the other race were the real reformers. The very constitution itself, the first great measure of reform was the result of their solicitation——

So these Britishers could not have been so bad. They had to force these liberties upon the French Canadian people.

——and the fact of the province having been divided was not owing to them, as the able protest, at the bar of the House of Commons, of Lymburner clearly shows, but to the blind infatuation of the imperial government. They were foremost in all great public measures of utility, in the building of steamboats, in commerce, in agricultural improvements, in liberal educational measures——

And yet, the hon. member for Labelle contended that the British government had kept these people in subjection and in ignorance, when the facts show that the British government had to force educational measures upon them.

——in the social elevation of the industrial classes, and thus kept full pace with the progressive spirit of the age. The great majority of the French Canadian population, on the other hand, clung to ancient prejudices, to ancient customs, to ancient laws, with the unreasoning tenacity of an uneducated and non-progressive people.

These are the words of the historian I have quoted and they cannot be contradicted or gainsaid. I want to point out that what the province of Quebec has always wanted was a free man, a man who would stand to the front and lead that magnificent province and that splendid people and let them know the facts as to the splendid treatment meted out to them by the British government in the days gone by.

This was under the regime of Papineau, the grandfather, I believe, of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). Speaking of toleration, the writer says :

In order to check the settlement of the eastern townships by British immigration, it was persistently refused to make grants for roads therein, for the administration of justice, for registry offices, or even to permit of their parliamentary representation.

Why, I am satisfied that half of our French Canadian fellow-countrymen before me never knew that such tyranny had been practised towards the English people in the province of Quebec by the ancestor of the hon. member for Labelle. They did not know that it was possible that men who now go round prating of tolerance could have had any connection with such tyrannical acts.

While Papineau and his followers were declaiming against the tyranny of being taxed without representation, they deliberately disfranchised for years 80,000 English-speaking settlers in the Eastern Townships region, lying between Salmon River and Lake Memphremagog; and who, until 1830, had no voice whatever in making the laws by which they were governed or in expending the taxes which they paid. And when parliamentary representation was at last reluctantly conceded them, it was so hedged about by restriction and adverse conditions as to be of little comparative value. In some cases when English-speaking electors could not be otherwise obstructed in the exercise of their franchise, polling places were established at distances ranging from thirty to fifty miles from their settlements.

So an elector had to travel, under the benign rule of these gentlemen, from thirty to fifty miles in order to record his vote. Is there a French Canadian before me who knew that such exactions were practised upon the British people of Quebec? I trust that when the hon. member for Labelle again traverses the province of Quebec, seeking to inflame the honest peasantry of that province, he will be met by honest French Canadians themselves who will tell him that he is not taking the proper course, who will tell him to go back home and remain there and give up his demagogueism. Another point:

They made immigration from the British islands——

Mark you, that is the Papineau party, the party of toleration.

They made immigration from the British islands a standing grievance, maintained that they alone had the right to the soil, continued their wretched mode of agriculture, save in the limited area where the example and success of good Scotch farming had led them to make some improvements, disliked all nations but France, and, as a safeguard against the innovations and language of neighbouring Anglo-Saxon people, would, were it possible, surround themselves with a Chinese wall of exclusiveness.

The conduct of the hon. member for Labelle to-day shows that he is a direct lineal descendant of his ancestor. Now, Sir, I find here a description of Papineau, and in many respects it resembles the hon. member for Labelle to-day:

It is evident that Papineau, the great master spirit of the crisis, had never carefully gauged the probable results. He was a brilliant orator, but no statesman; a clever partisan leader, but a miserable general officer; a braggart in the forum, a coward in the field. He excited a storm which he neither knew how to allay nor direct. Nor had Papineau the excuse of youth to plead in extenuation of his folly. In 1837 he was 38 years of age, a period of life when the intellect stands at its meridian. In height he was of the middle size; a man of good presence; with features of a Hebrew caste; while his heavy dark eyebrows shaded, in a higher arch than usual, a keen lustrous eye of quick and penetrating glance. He appeared to be formed by nature for the eloquent agitator, but not for the wise or prudent legislator; to act upon the passions and prejudices of his ignorant or unreflecting countrymen, not to make them happier, wiser or better. Familiar with French literature and all the old lore of La Nouvelle France, he appealed to the feelings and prejudices of his countrymen with irresistible effect, and completely carried them captive by the force of his oratorical and conversational powers. But while Papineau thoroughly understood the people of his own province he knew very little of the people of Upper Canada; and appeared to be wholly ignorant of the feeling of loyalty to the Queen and constitution which then ran like a deep undercurrent beneath their political squabbles.

There we have a description of the province of Quebec under the rule and subject to the agitation of the great Papineau family. I trust we will never again see in the province of Quebec, or in the Dominion of Canada, other agitations started by these gentlemen. The hon. member for Labelle has inflamed the minds of the people in the province of Quebec, and has attempted to justify himself by preaching the same stuff in other provinces. He recently spoke in the city of Toronto, and I was asked by a gentleman who heard him if it was not scandalous that such things could have been allowed in the province of Quebec as had been described by the hon. member for Labelle; he really believed the statements that the member for Labelle had been making. I want the people of this country to know what the facts were under a Liberal agitation in the province of Quebec, and that, in place of their having any just complaint against our English-speaking fellow-countrymen, the reverse was the case under the agitation carried on by Liberal leaders in the province of Quebec in the old days. I trust these days will never return.

Now, Sir, I have disposed pretty well of the various points which it was my intention to discuss. I have endeavoured to show that the people of Ontario are tolerant. I have shown that the government practically admit now that they have no case under the constitution for their school clauses of the Autonomy Bill, that they are simply governed by policy. I have shown that by putting this law on the statute-book without these educational clauses inserted the separate school law of 1875 will remain the law in the new provinces. Then if, as the Prime Minister asserts, the constitution gives them the right to separate schools, that law must remain on the statute-book; but if the constitution does not demand that separate schools shall be per-

petuated, then it rests with the free will of the legislatures of the Northwest either to perpetuate the present system or to change it. It stands to common sense that if the law is as mild and as gentle and as inoffensive as hon. gentlemen opposite say it is, no legislature in the new provinces is going to step in and take away from the people the small measure of separate schools that is given them under that constitution. Remove the objection and you preserve the self-respect and honour of the people of those great Territories; perpetuate coercion, and you bring about a struggle in every province of the Dominion, because the people of the province of Quebec are by no means a unit in favour of coercion. They have shown in 1896 that they are not in favour of coercion, and if you give them an opportunity, I believe they will show again that they are not in favour of coercion no more than are the people of Ontario. There is not even a suggestion of tyranny and the freemen of Quebec will not hesitate to record their votes against tyranny just the same as the freemen of Ontario. I have no further desire to discuss this matter until it reaches the committee stage but I would appeal, as I appealed in the earlier part of my address, to the right hon. Prime Minister to remove this coercive clause. If his contention is right he has all he wants in the Bill without the coercion at all. If his contention is wrong I want to point out to him that the Act of 1875 will be part of the laws of the new provinces until the legislatures meet and change it and it must be supposed that the Roman Catholic minority in these Territories will have a far greater chance of succeeding by the kindly means I have outlined than they will by attempting coercion of that country.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (East Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, as the Bill now before the House deals particularly with the part of the country that I come from, and as I represent one of the largest and most populous districts there, I do not feel that I would be justified in casting a silent vote on this measure. I would therefore ask the indulgence of this House for a short time—and it shall be a very short time—while I give the reasons why I intend to give this Bill my full and hearty support. I do not intend to follow the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) who has just spoken through his long and rambling speech. He has gone all over the United States, he has gone all over the British Isles, he has gone through the provinces of Ontario, Quebec and Manitoba and he has dealt with almost every subject under the sun except those subjects which are mentioned in the Bill which we are now discussing. I intend to discuss the subjects which are mentioned in this Bill. During the discussion that has taken place, so far I have noticed on the part of almost everybody who has spoken a desire to make this a school question. I do not wish for one moment to minimize the importance of the school clauses of this Bill. On the contrary, I would say that they are very important. The education of the youth of any country is of the first importance, but this is only one of the subjects dealt with by this Bill and there are others of equal, and to my mind as a representative of that western country of even greater importance. Mr. Speaker, I notice that hon. members from other provinces, especially from the province of Ontario, seem to take a tremendous interest in that particular question. I am very glad to see that hon. members do not treat this question from a local standpoint, but I would think that when the people of the Northwest Territories are satisfied it ought to be pretty good ground why the people of the other provinces should also be satisfied.

Some time ago, before this Bill was read a second time, the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) was very anxious to have the matter discussed, and so was the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), and we heard a great deal about dissension in the government ranks from the hon. member for North Toronto. But, Mr. Speaker, we do not hear very much about that now. Why? Because the right hon. Prime Minister of this country (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), is coming before the country and before this House with this Bill with practically a solid support behind his back. We do not hear anything about dissension now simply because when the hon. leader of the opposition came down to the second reading of the Bill he was not able to say that he was leading the opposition. He said that he was leading himself and that was all he was doing because every hon. member behind him was going his own way. The members from the Northwest have been criticised, and criticised very severely, especially before the second reading of this Bill, by the hon. member for North Toronto. We were told we were simply a flock of sheep, that we were dumb, that we had been muzzled, that we had been told by the right hon. Prime Minister to get out of the House so that we would not be called upon to say anything—This was before the second reading of the Bill. He apparently was fishing for information and on that occasion he seemed to be endeavouring to show hon. members on the other side of the House how better he could fish than the hon. leader of the opposition who was sitting beside him. He criticised us very severely and while he was calling us dumb followers I could not help thinking that it would have been well for him if some kind friend had put a muzzle on him on some occasions in the past so that he would not have been in the position that he is in to-day of having his old leader in the other House giving the

correct record of some of the things that had taken place and putting him in the very awkward position before the people of the country of having given an incorrect statement of the facts. On that occasion he also told us that he had great pity for the Northwest Territories—no Minister of the Interior, not a friend in the government and all the members from the Northwest dumb and muzzled. Within five minutes after making that assertion he made the assertion that the terms granted to the Territories by these Bills were so good, were so liberal, were so magnanimous that they would bring every other province knocking at the door of the Dominion for better terms. If the Northwest Territories had not any member in the government and had not any friends in the government and if the Northwest members did not do anything to help the Territories, they have not fared very badly according to that hon. gentleman.

On that occasion he was very anxious that the portfolio of the Interior should be filled and, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that he is not half as sorry as the members from the Northwest Territories are that the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) is no longer the Minister of the Interior. Why? Simply because we members from the west know better than any other class of men in this country just what the Northwest Territories and what Canada has lost by that hon. gentleman not being a member of the government. I had the pleasure of going to that western country in 1878, just in the month that Sir John Macdonald came into power, and I know what the conditions were. We know what their rule was for eighteen long years. We saw the Canadian Pacific Railway built through that country, we saw thousands and millions of dollars expended, we saw thousands and thousands of workmen brought into that country and we saw hundreds of thousands of dollars expended per annum in bringing in immigrants. What was the result? The government of Sir John Macdonald spent money with a lavish hand in bringing in immigrants but they passed laws and regulations of such a nature and carried them out in such a manner that they drove the people out of the country. That was the result of their administration for eighteen long years. But, in 1896 a brighter day dawned for Canada and especially for the Northwest Territories and if ever the right hon. leader of the government did one good day's work for Canada he did it on the day that he appointed the Hon. Clifford Sifton as the member of his cabinet representing the Northwest Territories. What has taken place since that day about eight years ago? The whole history and the whole development of that country have undergone a change and you would not know the west now comparing it with what it was eight years ago.

Just to give an instance that can be readily understood by every hon. member of the House, I may say that at that time we had four members in this House from the Northwest Territories. In 1901, when the census was taken, we were entitled to six members, and I have no doubt that the House of Commons here thought they were doing a very generous act, as in fact they were, when they gave us ten members instead of six. But, if we had representation by population in this House the Northwest Territories would be represented by not ten members but by fifteen. Whatever advantage has been obtained for the Northwest in the past has been brought about largely by the active and energetic work of the ex-Minister of the Interior. And, Sir, I am sure I will meet with the approval of every member from the west when I say, that nothing would please us better than if it could happen that the Hon. Mr. Sifton were again to take up his portfolio. I believe every member from the west will agree with me that we have not another man who is in the same class as he is, as regards ability for carrying on that work in the west and benefiting the country generally.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. TURRIFF. The hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) may point over to this side of the House, but I venture to say that neither the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) nor the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott), or any other man from the west will for a moment disagree with me, when I say, that there is no other man in the Liberal party, or in the Conservative party either, in the west, or in any other part of Canada, who is able to take the place of Mr. Sifton as a representative of the west—not even the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean).

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Why is he not here to-night to accept your compliment?

Mr. TURRIFF. I would say further, that the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) is too young a man and too able a man that Canada should lose his services. It is our hope, we Liberals at all events, that the country will be able to avail itself of his services before long, and that in the interests of the whole Dominion of Canada we shall long retain him. When the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was recently fishing for information, he talked about dangling the portfolio of the Interior, and senatorships, before the members from the Northwest in order to get their support for this Bill. Let me tell him that there is no member from the west who is not supporting this Bill on its merits, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) went very far astray when he made the assertion to which I have referred. But, of course, he ought to know; he has been in the government and he has been out of the government and he went back into the government and he probably

is in a first-class position to say that cabinet positions are the price for men supporting certain measures; but in the present instance I can tell him that such a thing does not exist.

In dealing with the provisions contained in this Bill, I shall first take up the question of the division of the Territories into two provinces. When we had our first interview with the Prime Minister, and I was asked whether I favoured one or two provinces, my reply was that I favoured two provinces. But I want to say, with all due respect to the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, that even if he to-day wanted to extend the province of Manitoba west, he could not do it and there is nobody else in this country who can do it. The people in the Northwest Territories—in eastern Assiniboia especially, and my constituency runs for 144 miles along the boundary of Manitoba—would not tolerate it. Talk about agitation—there has been no agitation whatever in the west over this school question, but if this government or any other government or any power on earth tried to coerce us into the province of Manitoba, you would see an agitation that would be remembered. The first mistake that was made in defining the boundaries of the province of Manitoba was made by the Conservative government. These gentlemen opposite now endeavour to put the blame on this government or on the leader of this government for not extending the province of Manitoba, but the real blame rests with the government of Sir John A. Macdonald. During the years between 1884 and 1896 many of us were in favour of extending Manitoba away up west to Moosejaw, and the matter was discussed not only among the settlers, but among the more prominent politicians of that territory. When a brighter day dawned in 1896, and we thought that possibly we would be able to have this mistake of the Conservative government remedied, as well as a great many other mistakes of theirs, the matter was discussed very fully in the west, and a year or two afterwards the Prime Minister of Manitoba was invited to East Assiniboia to discuss the question. A meeting was held at Indian Head and Mr. Roblin advocated his case, and Mr. Haultain, one of his own political friends, took the other side. And, because the Hon. Mr. Roblin got the worst of the debate he lost his temper a little bit, and with some of those characteristics of his that we in the west are familiar with, he undertook to threaten the people of East Assiniboia and the people of the Northwest as to what would happen if we did not agree to join the province of Manitoba. He told us that if we persisted in remaining a part of Manitoba, then Manitoba would regulate our freight rates and would not allow us to build railroads across that province, thus endeavouring to coerce us into joining with Manitoba. On that occasion, for ever was lost the chance of the eastern portion of the Northwest Territories joining the province of Manitoba, because we would not be coerced then and we will not be coerced now. That was, however, only a sentimental reason. We objected to being annexed to any province which would elect as prime minister a man who harboured the thought, that because we did not agree with him he would coerce us by increasing our freight rates and preventing us from building railroads. But, if we objected on that ground, we objected ten times more to being annexed to a province which would elect a premier, who having harboured such a thought had not any more sense than to give expression to it. There is another and a far greater reason why we object now to being annexed to the province of Manitoba, and it is this: We in the Northwest Territories are being formed into new provinces, without any debt, and we are getting a large debt allowance. The province of Manitoba had in 1898 liabilities amounting to about $7,000,000; but since that time those liabilities have been increased to nearly $30,000,000. The province of Manitoba has given guarantees to one railway company alone to the extent of between $19,000,000 and $20,000,000. So that it would be absurd to suppose that the people of the Northwest Territories would desire to join with the people of Manitoba, with these great liabilities resting upon them. Even during the last session of the Manitoba legislature guarantees amounting to some $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 were given to the same railway company, one of which was for terminals in the city of Winnipeg. Did anybody ever hear of such a thing in the Dominion of Canada before? You may search the legislation of any other province in the Dominion, and you will not find such a thing. I noticed in the Bill that passed through the legislature that there was also a guarantee of bonds for $10,000 a mile on an old track seven miles long running into a gravel pit from one of the branch lines of the same railway. These are the ways in which the province of Manitoba is piling up its liabilities, and this is the reason we would not listen to the proposition of that province to enlarge its boundaries westward. So that if the province of Manitoba is not enlarged towards the west, it is not the fault of the Prime Minister of the Dominion. The members from the west are prepared to take the responsibility of standing in the way of that extension. A little while ago two of the Manitoba ministers were down here, and one of the reasons they gave why Manitoba should have all the country north was that it had always governed that country. That is not a proper statement of the case. It is true, the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba had jurisdiction there; but he was paid out of the Dominion treasury for all the expenditure in connection with

that unorganized territory. They also claimed that the magistrates of Manitoba had jurisdiction there. They had; but the magistrates of the Northwest Territories had equal jurisdiction. The people of the Northwest have no objection to the province of Manitoba being extended to the north. In fact, they think that right and proper, and will not stand in the way. But if the province of Manitoba wants to get all the territory to the north of Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec, and if the people of Ontario and Quebec are satisfied that their hinterland should go to Manitoba, well and good; there will be no objection raised by the people of Saskatchewan. But a portion of the old district of Saskatchewan has been left out of the proposed province of Saskatchewan, and has been left in the unorganized territory, and on that territory we have not relinquished our claim. There are a number of settlers there who have a right to be consulted; and we propose when the time comes, to make a claim to have our province extended to Hudson bay. We also want a port on Hudson bay. The Territories have far more interest in the Hudson bay route than the province of Manitoba can have. If you take a point in the centre of the wheat-growing portion of Manitoba, you will find that it is as near to navigation on Lake Superior as it is to Hudson bay; but when you take the centre of the wheat-growing portion of the Northwest Territories, you will find that a line drawn from there to Port Arthur or Fort William is nearly double the length of a line from the same point to a port on Hudson bay. Not that I think it makes much difference whether that port happens to be in the province of Manitoba or in any other province. I do not agree with the remarks made by the premier of Manitoba on that subject at all. At the same time, that part of Hudson bay is nearer to our province; and as there is an immense coast line there, there will be plenty of room for each of the provinces—Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec and Saskatchewan—to have a good sea frontage on Hudson bay.

Mr. SPROULE. If I understand the hon. member correctly, he is showing the importance to the Northwest Territories of having a port on Hudson bay. The Bill does not provide for that; and yet I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the people of the Northwest were perfectly satisfied with the Bill.

Mr. TURRIFF. What I said was that a part of the old district of Saskatchewan had been left out of the new province of Saskatchewan; it has not been given to Manitoba, but has been attached to the unorganized district of Keewatin; and, when the time comes, which was foreshadowed by the Prime Minister, when Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan will be consulted, we will make our claim to have our boundary extended to the shores of Hudson bay.

Mr. SPROULE. Why do you not do it now?

Mr. TURRIFF. For one reason, because we are running this thing now. When my hon. friend, after doing penance for another ten or fifteen years, may come back to power, he will have the pleasure of doing things as he has done in the past.

Mr. SPROULE. Not if he has lived on the pap of office, as the hon. gentleman has done under the present administration.

Mr. TURRIFF. Well, I lived for five years under a government salary, and I never worked as hard in my life as I did during those five years, and I never in my life earned money better than I did then. What is more, I gave good value for the money that was paid me. I was paid $3,000 a year for doing well the work that the man appointed by the hon. gentleman's government was paid $5,000 for doing badly. I did more work in one year than he ever did in five. It comes with ill grace from the hon. member to accuse me of living on government pap. I never lived on government pap. I worked for my money. I was offered the position and refused it; I was offered it a second time and accepted it; and I resigned it of my own free will, and against the wishes of the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. SPROULE. A man who writes his own certificates of character is extremely modest.

Mr. TURRIFF. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) took a fling at the ex-Minister of the Interior because he had not said anything about the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba. The ex-Minister of the Interior knows better than the hon. member for Marquette that the rights of the province of Manitoba are absolutely safe in the hands of the right hon. gentleman who leads the government at the present time, and that it was not necessary for him to have anything at all to say about that. The other day, when the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) was criticising the government for the manner in which it divided the country into two provinces, he claimed that the line of division should have been sixty miles further east. It seems to me that my hon. friend is a great deal more anxious to favour the district of Calgary than to get a proper dividing line. He said himself that the only difference in the areas was about 8,000 square miles, whereas if you put the dividing line sixty miles further east the difference would be 75,000 square miles. Well, I do not think that if you were to try for a month, you would get a more reasonable and fair di-

viding line than the fourth meridian. It is a well-known line, and in that respect more acceptable than any of the lines between the different ranges. One of the reasons advanced by my hon. friend was that this dividing line would not include all the ranching country in the western province; but, Sir, the ranching country extends right down to the province of Manitoba. I have in my own constituency, within thirty or forty miles of Manitoba, dozens of men who have made their living the last fifteen or twenty years in ranching—men who do not grow any grain, but depend solely on the raising of cattle, and whose cattle are let loose all summer and branded just as they are up in southern Alberta. So that if the hon. gentleman wanted to make the western province wide enough to take in all the ranches, he would have had to bring it down to the borders of Manitoba. In addition, let me say that, from my knowledge of the country, gained in the course of twenty-seven years' residence there, during six years of which I was Commissioner of Dominion Lands, the two new provinces are about as nearly equal as any one could wish, not only in area, but in their capacity for supporting population. To prove that, all I need say is this, that the different railway companies which had the right to select railway lands all over that country, have selected 13,000,000 of acres in the proposed province of Saskatchewan and 12,000,000 in the proposed province of Alberta; and, from my own knowledge, I know they would have selected a good deal less in Saskatchewan and more in Alberta, were it not for the fact that there are more railways under construction in the new province of Saskatchewan than in its twin sister Alberta, so that the lands in the former, though in some respects not as good as in the latter, are on that account more saleable. In the two provinces, therefore, the area of grain-growing land is about equal. In addition, we must not lose sight of the fact that the province of Alberta has the greatest deposit of coal of any country in the world. I do not think that even British Columbia has as great coal deposits as are to be found in Alberta. Wherever you go into the Rocky mountains, from the American boundary right up to the Peace river pass, vast deposits of coal have been discovered. Right in the Crow's Nest pass there are seams of from ten to seventy feet in thickness of bituminous coal, and for hundreds of miles we find large deposits of coal right up to Edmonton, the Peace river pass, so that outside the agricultural wealth of that country, you will have in the years to come large settlements growing up all along the Rockies owing to the coal industries there. All along the Rockies, especially north of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, there are also thousands of miles of valuable spruce and fir now beginning to be exploited, so that in a few years that country will be able to supply all the timber required by the settlers in the prairie country and in the east. So that, although the proposed province of Alberta may have from 6,000 to 8,000 miles less of area than its twin sister Saskatchewan, the deficiency is more than made up by its coal deposits and timber limits. In making this comparison, I am not taking into consideration the great Peace river country. I do not know personally what that country may be. I have heard reports good and bad about it; but I want to say this, that after an experience of twenty-seven years, I have come to the conclusion that there is no one part of the Northwest, from the boundaries of Manitoba to the Rocky mountains, which does not turn out better than expected the more we learn about it. I have found that to be the invariable result. In that district where I have lived many years, the Moose mountain country, I remember fifteen years ago the people of Manitoba said you could not grow any wheat, because it was too dry, yet there is no finer wheat-growing country in the Territories to-day. Why, in the first few years of grain-growing around Regina, there was more wheat sown than was reaped, and yet there is to-day no finer wheat country than the immense plain around that city. Only ten years ago, if I were asked myself if wheat could be grown in southern Alberta, I would have said no; but what is the case to-day? We have thousands and thousands of acres of the finest wheat-growing there every year. In fact, all over the country you will find that the more you learn about it the better it turns out. There are vast stretches in the new province of Alberta which, a few years ago, were looked upon as suitable only for ranching, but which will be producing good crops of wheat every year within a very short period. In that whole country of Saskatchewan and Alberta there is not an acre, generally speaking, which, if not adapted for wheat-growing, is not good for cattle or the grazing of horses, so that there is practically not a waste acre in all that country.

I should like to say a few words on the financial question. That, I notice, is a matter which has scarcely been touched by hon. members opposite, but which is nevertheless of great importance to us in the Territories. In my opinion, the government has started us out very fairly. In fact, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said that all the other provinces would be knocking at the door of the federal administration because of the good terms we had received. On that point I do not agree with him, because, in my judgment, we are being given pretty much the same terms as were granted the other provinces. Each of our new provinces is to get $50,000 for civil government. The province of Ontario gets $80,000, Quebec $70,000 and the lower provinces, with the exception of Prince Edward Island, get $50,000 each. So that I do not see any

ground for complaint in that respect. We get a debt allowance on our population the same as is given the other provinces, so that there is no ground of complaint there. We get a per capita allowance of 80 cents on our population up to 800,000. There might perhaps be some criticism of that arrangement, because the lower provinces, Manitoba and British Columbia only get a per capita grant up to a population of 400,000, whereas Ontario gets it based on a population of 1,400,000 and Quebec on a population a little less. These two provinces get it on the population they had when they entered confederation. I do not think, however, that there can be any reasonable ground for criticism because our limit of population has been increased to 800,000 while some of the other provinces had theirs left at 400,000. They came into confederation some thirty-seven years ago, and it has taken all these years for them to get up to the limit of population. Nova Scotia is the only province of the three that has passed the limit, and it is only by a narrow margin. So that the limitation of population on which we receive 80c. per capita will be reached in our province in very much less time than thirty-seven years; in fact, we expect that in a few years we shall have reached that population. I, for one, have never been able to understand why this limit has been placed on any of the provinces; I cannot see why that 80c. per capita should not be paid to each of the provinces on their actual population. Every additional inhabitant coming into these provinces pay, roughly speaking, $10 yearly into the revenues of the Dominion government; and I do not know any good reason why 80c. of that should not go back to the province for the carrying on of provincial work, and if, in the future the other provinces shall make a demand on this government to have that per capita grant paid on their actual population, I should think they would be within their rights, and also that the Dominion would be perfectly justified in granting that demand. And I am sure that the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan would take exactly the same view in asking that the per capita grant be made on the actual population of each province. I believe that in this matter there is not much to complain of. Now, as to what we get in lieu of our lands —which, I suppose, is what the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was referring to. I, for one, am perfectly satisfied with the arrangement made. I think it is a better arrangement than to have handed over the lands to the provinces. That was made clear by the hon. member from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), who showed with absolute clearness that the ideas of the two governments, the provincial and the Dominion, would be absolutely different, that if the lands were handed over to the provinces they must use them for the purpose of producing immediate revenue, whereas by keeping the lands in the hands of the Dominion government they would be used rather to fill up the country and not necessarily for the taking of the last dollar out of the lands. But, if the Dominion government should decide to change their policy and dispose of the odd sections, keeping the even sections absolutely for the poor man's homestead, if they should decide to sell the lands for instance, as they sell their school lands, they will eventually accumulate a fund from these lands the interest on which will pay the subsidy they are giving to the provinces in lieu of the lands. So, it appears to me, it is a good arrangement for the province and a good arrangement for the Dominion. It is a particularly good arrangement for the provinces in this respect, that the revenue is a net revenue, the provinces have no expenses in connection with the administration of the lands, and it is a revenue that grows with the increase of population. We only get the full revenue from the lands when we have a population of 1,200,000 in each of these provinces. So, having it in this shape, I think the people of the Northwest can congratulate themselves upon having received fair and handsome treatment at the hands of the Dominion government, and that the Dominion government has also made a bargain that is absolutely justifiable. I am pleased to say that there has been very little criticism in connection with this phase of the matter. One thing I might point out is that there is no danger of the public domain, the source of revenue, being squandered. Now, I would not for a moment allow that the people of the Northwest Territories are not as well able to look after their own affairs as are any other people in the Dominion. But there is this fact that we must all acknowledge—that in the past the different railway companies have managed to get bonuses and guarantees out of practically every province in the Dominion. I cannot say how it is in Prince Edward Island, but I know how it is in every other province in the Dominion. Take, for instance, the province of Manitoba. As I said a little while ago they have gone security for between $19,000,000 and $20,000,000 for one railway company alone. That railway may be all right, but we know what the history of railway companies has been. There is always a chance of that liability being called upon. We know what British Columbia has done in giving away large tracts of land and coal and timber bonuses to railways. We know what the lower provinces and Quebec and Ontario have given in cash or guarantees. And we know that the Northwest Territories have been for years getting hundreds of miles of railways throughout its length and breadth without the cost of a single dollar to the province in any way; and if the people of the Territories will have the sense to stand firm and not give any grants to the railway

companies they will get the railways built just as well and just as quickly and just as nearly where they want them as if they were giving guarantees or cash bonuses to the railway companies. So, these provinces are starting out with everything in their favour, and here I wish to say that the government as conducted in the Northwest Territories for many years past by Mr. Haultain has been in every respect a good and satisfactory government for the Northwest Territories. And I have no doubt that whoever may be called upon to carry on the government in the new provinces will carry it on in the same manner; but, not owning their own lands, they will not have the same temptation, and they will not have these magnates after them every day trying to get bonuses and guarantees as would be the case if the provinces were the owners of the public lands. I notice now that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are very anxious to hand over the lands to the governments of the new provinces. But what has been the record of these hon. gentlemen? When the province of Manitoba asked for its own lands, these gentlemen refused. If they were so anxious to conserve the lands of the Northwest Territories for the people of these Territories, why did they give away to railroads millions and millions of acres of those lands? I do not say so much about the land grant given to the Canadian Pacific Railway, for in those days it was difficult to get a road built through that part of the country, because we did not know it as well as we do now. But, since then, millions of acres of lands in the Northwest have been given away as bonuses for the building of railways in Manitoba. If hon. gentlemen on the other side are so anxious as they appear to be to conserve the lands of the Northwest Territories for the people of those Territories, why did they act in that manner? It comes with a bad grace from hon. gentlemen opposite to talk of handing over the lands to the people of the Northwest when they themselves gave away millions of acres of the choicest of our lands to railway companies. We in the Northwest Territories, in addition, must pay our share of the cash bounties given to railways in every part of the country.

Now, I said when I started that I would be only a short time, and I am going to try and keep my word. I wish now to deal very briefly with the school question. As I said before, I think this question has been given a great deal too much prominence. And I want to say that I believe the reason why we have an agitation of any kind is absolutely from the lack of knowledge on the part of the people in the east of the class of schools which we have in the Northwest Territories.

I believe if every Protestant clergyman in Canada and every newspaper editor knew the class of schools we have to-day in the Northwest Territories, this agitation would cease. We have heard this question discussed week in and week out, I have listened to it hour after hour, and it has all been about separate schools. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am aware that among Protestants we have been accustomed for the past fifteen or twenty years to think of a separate school as something very bad. But whatever the separate schools may be in Ontario, or may have been in the province of Manitoba, or in the Northwest Territories in former days, we are not dealing with that class of schools at the present time. Let us deal with separate schools such as they exist in the Northwest Territories at the present day, and I am satisfied that if their true character were known this agitation would drop at once. But I do not think that is the object of a good many, it is not the object of some hon. members on the other side of this House, their object is to keep up the agitation in order to make some political capital out of it. As one hon. gentleman opposite said to me the other day: You fellows came in on this question before, and we are coming in on it now. And judging by the actions of hon. gentlemen opposite, it looks very much as if he were right.

Mr. SPROULE. If that logic is correct, the government is going to burst up.

Mr. TURRIFF. That is what one of the hon. gentleman's own supporters said.

Mr. SPROULE. And the hon. gentleman says it looks as if he were right.

Mr. TURRIFF. I said it looked as if the hon. member for East Grey and his friends were keeping up the agitation for that purpose—that is what I meant to say.

Mr. SPROULE. I desire to tell the hon. gentleman that there is not one word of truth in that. The hon. member for East Grey stood exactly for the same principle in 1896, and fought in company with gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches to-day for the same principle, and he is standing by it still.

Mr. TURRIFF. I know this, that the hon. member for East Grey has gone out of his way to agitate the people in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not so.

Mr. TURRIFF. I know he has had printed petition forms sent out to the Northwest Territories to be signed and sent back to him, in opposition to separate schools.

Mr. SPROULE. No, not at all.

Mr. TURRIFF. Well, he mentioned separate schools in those petitions.

Mr. SPROULE. Not a word. Allow me to correct the hon. gentleman, there is not a word in them about separate schools.

Mr. TURRIFF. Well, that is exactly what I object to, that the hon. gentlemen

have not the courage to come out and say what they mean, they are hiding behind the rock of the constitution, so that when an election comes on they can go into the province of Quebec and say : We voted against the government because the government was not going far enough, was not giving you the separate schools you were entitled to under the constitution ; then they can go into the province of Ontario and say : We voted against the government because we wanted to leave the new provinces the power to do what they pleased, as the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) said the other day, so that they may wipe out the last vestige of the rights given under the Act of 1875. That is what I object to—these hon. gentlemen have not the courage to come out openly and say what they mean. We, on this side of the House, say what we propose to do, and if we are doing wrong we can be punished for it. But hon. gentlemen opposite don't want to take that position, they want to hide behind the constitution.

Mr. SPROULE. What did his leader say about standing on the constitution ? What was he hiding behind ?

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes, my leader said he was standing on the constitution, the leader of the hon. gentleman said he was standing on the constitution, while the hon. member for Jacques Cartier said the constitution was altogether a different thing from what his leader had described it. Mr. Haultain says the constitution means something else ; and our friends opposite quote Mr. Christopher Robinson's opinion which shows a still further difference. Now, I do not pretend to know anything about constitutional law, and the only difference between myself and the great lawyers on the other side of the House is that while I do not know anything about constitutional law, I am well aware of the fact. Now, Sir, there has not been a single word said by hon. gentlemen opposite about separate schools in the Northwest since this discussion started, and I propose to say something about them. I know what they have been for a long time back. Over twenty years ago I was a member of the Territorial legislature when the first school ordinance was passed in 1884, passed under the Northwest Territories Act of 1875. Previously to 1892 we had a system of separate schools, the same kind of schools they had in the province of Manitoba. Those schools were not satisfactory,; everybody knows that ; they were not even satisfactory to our Roman Catholic friends and ratepayers. They were not satisfied with the class of schools given them, and were as anxious to have them changed as anybody else. In the year 1892 the local legislature, under Mr. Haultain, changed the old system, and from that year up to the present day there has not been one word of protest heard against the schools from the people of the Northwest Territories, no protest has been made either to the local legislature or to this government. If that school system had not been satisfactory, do you think, Mr. Speaker, there would not have been an agitation ? Don't you think the Northwest people would have been appealing to this House ? The people of the Northwest are accustomed at all times to kick vigorously when they think that things are not right.

The people of the Northwest Territories are accustomed to kick very vigorously to the Northwest legislature if things are not right, and I want to say again that since 1892, since the present law was passed, there has never been a word of complaint from Protestants or Catholics or from the Northwest government in any shape or form, or any statement that the law was not a good one. I say that the law as it exists in the Northwest Territories to-day—and it is the only law that we are putting in force—is the most satisfactory law that you can get, because we have proof of it in the fact that it has been in force for thirteen years without ever a complaint having been made. What does that law give them ? As the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) stated the other day, if church schools were what were given to the Roman Catholics in the Northwest Territories by the Act of 1875, there is only a small vestige of them left, and for this reason : That the separate Catholic school in the Northwest, or the public Catholic school—it does not matter much which —is to all intents and purposes a public school. It is exactly the same as a public school. The teachers of the Roman Catholic separate school must attend the same normal school and get the same certificates exactly as the teachers in the public schools. The school has to be inspected before any grant can be paid, by a public school inspector. The only difference is that in the first and second readers the text is a little different, but even these books have to be authorized by the Minister of Education. There is no church or clerical control in any shape, form or manner over the Catholic separate schools of the Northwest Territories to-day. They are all under the control of the local legislature, every one of them, and the only difference—and it is not much of a difference either, because the public schools have the same right if they choose to use it—is that between half-past three o'clock in the afternoon and four, they may impart religious instruction. Now, I am going to ask in this Canada of ours, in this British colony, in this country that is supposed to take its institutions from our mother country, from that mother country where they are liberal and broad-minded, if there is a Protestant amongst us who would say that he would do away with the right of our Roman Catholic friends in their own schools to teach their children and

to give them religious instruction if they so desire for half an hour after half past three o'clock ? I represent a constituency, which, while it is not the largest in area, is one of the most populous districts in the Northwest. In my district they have 234 schools, and I do not believe there is one per cent of the people in that country who will object or ever did object to their Roman Catholic fellow citizens giving half an hour's religious instruction in their own schools if they so desire. When this matter is explained to the people of the Northwest Territories, when they understand that no change is being made, that this is simply carrying into effect and continuing the existing state of affairs that they have brought about by the ordinances that they have themselves passed and that they have worked under for the last thirteen years, when they find out that this is all that is being done, you will not be able to get up an agitation against the continuance of that state of affairs. I want to say here that personally I am not in favour of separate schools. I think it would be better if all the children went to the public schools, but these separate schools in the Northwest Territories are so near public schools that I do not think it is worth while making any trouble over it. It must be remembered that this is not a Catholic country, that it is not a Protestant country, but that it is a country in which Catholics and Protestants live together and in which there are nearly as many Catholics as Protestants, and I say that it would be beneath the generosity, to put it on no other ground, of the Protestant majority, after making the school a good school, a public school in every respect, to turn around and say : Because we have fifty-eight per cent of the population and you have only forty-two per cent we will not allow you even to impart half an hour's religious instruction to your children after half past three, before they go home. A great deal of the argument that has been addressed to the House from the other side has been against separate schools. I do not wish to make very much use of the arguments presented by hon. gentlemen from this side of the House, but I think the point made by my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) is worth emphasizing, and that was that if there was any objection to separate schools by hon. members on the other side of the House, why have they not during the last twenty years come forward and had the Northwest Territories Act of 1875 amended ? It was open to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, but no, they had nothing at all to say about it, they left it exactly as it was, but now, when action is being taken in the Northwest, they come forward with the argument against separate schools, not the schools that exist in the Northwest Territories, because we have no ecclesiastical or clerical schools there, but they bring forward all the arguments that can be to separate schools in other parts of Canada, and they argue as if they applied to the Northwest Territories, and as I said before all for the purpose of trying to get into power in this question and for no other purpose whatever. The schools we have in the Northwest Territories, I will venture to say, are absolutely satisfactory to 95 per cent of the whole population, both Catholic and Protestant. As I stated the other night when my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) was speaking, I held thirty-nine meetings during the campaign. At every one of these meetings the question of provincial autonomy was discussed and a number of these meetings were held in the school-houses and at no meeting from the beginning to the end did any man, Roman Catholic or Protestant, mention the subject of separate schools. Why ? Because they were perfectly satisfied with the school system that exists. Just to show the House that many of the people there are not aware of the fact that there are any separate schools—there are only nine Roman Catholic separate schools in working order in the Northwest Territories today—since the question has been up for discussion I received a letter from a prominent gentleman in my constituency asking me to vote against separate schools and for the continuance of the present satisfactory system of schools that exists in the Northwest Territories. I may say, further, that the only separate school that is in working order in my constituency out of over 200 is almost at this gentleman's door. It is near his own town where he lives. So, you will see that the school system we have in the northwest Territories is absolutely satisfactory to the people there. I know the argument is made : Why not trust the people of the Northwest ? Well, I would be very glad to do that, because I think that they would not change the system we have. Mr. Haultain has stated that if he were a dictator to-morrow he would not change the system. When Mr. Haultain prepared his draft Bill what did he do ? Mr. Haultain proposed in that draft Bill to give the Roman Catholic minority separate schools as they existed under the Act of 1875 and prior to 1892. He put that down in plain black and white in his draft Bill, and no gentleman on the other side of the House can contradict the assertion. After preparing that Bill, Mr. Haultain appealed to the country, and he was returned because the people of the Territories were satisfied with the school system. When Mr. Haultain passed his ordinance in 1892, he was not at all certain, (and other members of the legislature shared his uncertainty) that the passage of the ordinance did not exceed his powers. However, the fact that the law of 1892 has since remained in force

is some evidence that it was not passed in excess of the powers conferred on the legislature. At all events the school law of the Territories as it exists to-day is absolutely a school law that has been given to the people by their own representatives in their own legislature. It has been absolutely satisfactory, and if the people of Canada, especially the people of Ontario, knew just exactly what that school system is, there would be no complaint against it. I ask the people of Ontario to leave it to the people of the Northwest, and if the people of the Northwest, through their local legislature and through their members in this parliament are satisfied with the existing conditions—and I think these conditions are about as nearly right as you can possibly get them—then, what necessity is there for the people of Ontario agitating the question ?

We have heard a good deal about education in the province of Quebec. I was born and brought up and lived in that province until I reached the age of manhood. What education I received in school I received at a public school in a small Scottish settlement surrounded by French Canadians and Roman Catholics for a hundred miles east and west. To that school down there we paid our own taxes, we paid not one cent of taxes to any other school, and the Roman Catholic majority left us absolutely free to do just as we liked. I don't forget that.

Mr. SCOTT. You had autonomy ?

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes, the Protestant minority had full autonomy there. There was the greatest tolerance towards us ; intolerance I never saw in any shape or form in that province. Would it not be very small on the part of us Protestants because we are in the majority in the Northwest Territories, that we should not give some freedom to the Roman Catholic minority. The member for west Assiniboia has pointed out that when the Act of 1875 was passed in this parliament its intention was as much to protect Protestants as to protect Roman Catholics, because at that date nobody knew whether the majority in the Northwest was going to be Protestant or going to be Roman Catholic. And, because the Protestants now happen to be in the majority, are we going to deprive the Roman Catholic minority of the protection which the federal parliament in its wisdom gave to the minority ? Although the Act of 1875 was passed by a Liberal government it was assented to unanimously by every member of the Conservative party then in opposition. I am not well versed in constitutional law, but there is this that cannot be denied : that from 1875 to the present day the Roman Catholic minority have had the right to have separate schools in the Territories. I believe that their rights were diminished by the ordinance of 1892, but at all events the minority have had the right to separate schools from 1875 to the present time. Would it be fair or would it be reasonable on our part ; when we have made these schools practically public schools, when we have eliminated all clerical and church control, when we have made these schools in every respect equal to the public schools, when we know that there our Roman Catholic children will get the same sound education they get in the public schools ; would it be fair, would it be generous to wipe out,—as the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has said—the last shred of the rights of the minority conferred upon them in 1875 ? I claim that it would be neither just nor fair, and in saying this I am voicing the sentiments of my constituents with possibly the exception of an odd man here and there, and that only because during the last month or so efforts have been made to make the people believe that we are now fastening a system of separate schools on them. If I understand the matter aright, what we are doing is fastening a system of public schools on the Territories, and we are making it clear that if the Conservatives come into power ten or fifteen years from now, they will not be able to do to the Territories what they tried to do to the province of Manitoba. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) said that the class of immigrants coming into this country were chiefly noted for ignorance, dirt and filth, I have had something to do with the immigrants coming into Canada for the past few years, and I know whereof I speak. I presume the hon. gentleman did not refer to the immigrants from the British Isles or from the United States, but I can say——

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member (Mr. Turriff) is doing the member for Victoria an injustice. The member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) referred to the immigration coming to the United States for years and years, and he pointed out what the system of schools in that country had accomplished in the fusion of the races.

Mr. TURRIFF. I would be the last man in the House to misrepresent a member, and especially in his absence. As I could not hear the hon. gentleman very well from the seat which I occupied, possibly I may have misunderstood him, so that I shall not speak further on that point. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have taken up more time than I intended, but in conclusion I wish to say that I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite not to push this agitation further. If hon. gentlemen opposite think that we Liberal members from the west do not represent the sentiment of the people of the Northwest Territories though I claim that we do, I make this proposition to them. The Hon. Mr. Haultain is working in unison with them, is trying to help them out in every way, is doing his utmost to make this a party question in the Northwest. Let them get Mr. Haultain to call his legis-

lature together and test the feeling of the people of the Northwest Territories on this question. If he calls the legislature together, either as it stands at present, or with the vacant seats filled, I venture to say that he will not have a majority when he tries to make a party question out of this matter.

Mr. SPROULE. Could not the hon. gentlemen's friends make a better test than that by appointing a Minister of the Interior and sending him back for re-election ?

Mr. TURRIFF. The hon. the First Minister said the other day in my hearing that he would appoint a Minister of the Interior within three months ; and when that time comes, if he chooses one of the members from the Northwest Territories and he goes back for re-election, I promise you that, whoever he may be, he will come back here with a larger majority than he had on the 3rd of November last.

Mr. SPROULE. Let them hold this Bill until that election takes place, and see what the public sentiment is in the west.

Mr. TURRIFF. Do not be a bit alarmed about it ; you will get plenty of it before you are through.

Mr. SPROULE. The storm centre of alarm is further west to-day.

Mr. TURRIFF. We heard a great deal of talk like this in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific. We were told in my constituency that we were not going to be able to save our deposit ; but what was the result ? Seven of the Liberal members on this side of the House from the Northwest have each an average majority of over 1,200 votes.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would ask our hon. friends on the other side of the House to drop this agitation. Come down to common sense, and let us deal with the Bill that is now before parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it not be well to give that advice to the Toronto ' Globe ' ?

Mr. TURRIFF. Let us get on with the work of the country. Let us start these new provinces without hampering them with an agitation such as hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to work up. Instead of that, let us leave them to devote their time and energies to developing the great natural resources that Providence has blessed them with, and in a short time you will see them two of the greatest and most populous, liberal and broad-minded provinces that exist in the Canadian confederacy.

Mr. URIAH WILSON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. FIELDING. In assenting to the motion, I should like to be permitted to make a remark. Although we have had numerous speeches on this question, I am advised that there are still more numerous speeches to follow, a very large number of members desiring to address the House. If that be the fact, we are likely to have a protracted debate even under the best conditions, and I think it will be necessary for us to work a little harder and sit a little later. Therefore, I hope that if a motion like this is hereafter made at this early hour, it may not be pressed, but we may sit a little later and get the debate finished.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, April 5, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 129) to amend an Act respecting certain patents of Wm. A. Damen.—Mr. Campbell.

QUESTIONS.

DREDGING THE MIMINEGASH RIVER.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to have any dredging done on the Miminegash river this coming spring or summer ?
2. If any dredging is to be done, when will the work commence ?

Hon. C. S. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works). The matter is under the consideration of the Public Works Department.

STEAMER 'SEQUIN.'

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Has the Department of Marine and Fisheries purchased the steamer ' Sequin ' ?
2. If so, what is the date of purchase ?
3. What is the name of the vendors ?
4. What was the consideration paid ?

Hon. R. PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). To the first question the answer is no, and the same answer applies to all the other questions.

EXTENSION OF THE BOUNDARIES OF MANITOBA.

On the Orders of the Day being called,

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I beg to lay upon the table of the House a return supplementary to the return which was laid on the table of the House on Monday last with respect to the claims of the government of Manitoba for an extension of the boundaries of that province. At the same time I move that the rules of the House be suspended, and that the return be printed forthwith.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I inquire whether the letter of the 23rd of February, which I observe in the public press, is included in the document brought down ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No ; I shall have to refer to that in a moment. In making this motion, I desire to make a statement. I desire at this moment to call the attention of the House to a statement which was published this morning in the newspapers of the city, and which I understand has been published in all the press of Canada. This statement is made by Mr. Rogers, a member of the Manitoba government, concerning the action taken by myself and by my colleagues upon an application made some time ago by the government of the province of Manitoba, under instructions from the legislature of that province, for an extension of its boundaries. I may say at once that it will be my duty, so far as the action of the government is concerned in this matter, to give the statement a direct, an absolute and a categorical denial. In order that there may be no misunderstanding, I think it is better that I should read to the House, and therefore place upon the records, the statement of Mr. Rogers, as I find it in the 'Citizen.' It is as follows :

On February 13, we received a formal invitation by telegraph from Sir Wilfrid to come to Ottawa as soon as convenient. We left on February 14 and arrived on the afternoon of the 16th, when we received a letter from Sir Wilfrid at the Russell House saying that he would be pleased to meet us at his office at mid-day on Friday, the 17th.

During that interview we presented the claims of the province as urgently and strongly as possible. In reply Sir Wilfrid said that if we would be good enough to remain in Ottawa for three or four days he would again send for us and would then be in a position to give us an answer.

In three days' time, on February 20, a letter was received from Monseigneur Sbarretti, asking for a conference. This invitation was accepted and His Excellency then presented the following memorandum, remarking that if we would place this on the statute-book of our province it would greatly facilitate an early settlement of our mission, the fixing of our boundaries, which would be extended to the shores of Hudson bay. His Excellency further added that our failure to act in the past had prejudiced our claim for extension westward. The following is a copy of His Excellency's memorandum, containing the proposed amendment to the Manitoba School Act:

MGR. SBARRETTI'S MEMORANDUM.

"Add to section 125.—(b).—And when in any city or town there shall be thirty or more Roman Catholic children and also thirty or more non-Roman Catholic children, or in any village more than fifteen of each of such classes, the trustees shall, if requested by a petition of parents or guardians of such number of such classes, provide separate accommodation for each of such classes and employ for them respectively Roman Catholic and non-Roman Catholic teachers.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

"Add to section 49.—(b)—And when in any district there shall be fifteen or more Roman Catholic children and fifteen or more non-Roman Catholic children, the trustees shall, if required by a petition of parents or guardians of such number of either of such classes, provide separate accommodation for each of such classes and employ for them, respectively Roman Catholic and non-Roman Catholic teachers."

DELAYING WITH A PURPOSE.

Notwithstanding Sir Wilfrid's invitation and our interview, followed by his promise of which he was reminded by our letter, strange to say, up to this very hour we have had no reply to ours of February 23. What more natural conclusion can be arrived at than that Sir Wilfrid is simply killing time and making pretexts in order that the polite invitation of Monseigneur Sbarretti could be acted upon by Manitoba.

In this way, of course, Sir Wilfrid thinks he can secure a political advantage for his friends in this province. This is a palpable political trick, which he is quite capable of undertaking, with the view to force the local government to do something which would be resented by the people and by this means he hopes to reinstate his Liberal friends in power here. I, for one, promise to take no chances in allowing Sir Wilfrid or any person else to take advantage of us by any underhanded scheme of this sort. All I ask is that every citizen of the province should have an opportunity of expressing his opinion by his vote as a protest against continued delay. I deny the right of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Monseigneur Sbarretti to undertake to mix up the matter of separate schools with that of the extension of our boundaries, and I am sure that in so doing they do not reflect the wishes of either Roman Catholics or Protestants in the province. It ill-becomes the 'Globe' to make this charge against the government of Manitoba, when the only persons affected are Sir Wilfrid and Monseigneur Sbarretti.

LAURIER'S DOUBLE-DEALING.

We have no desire in Manitoba for double-dealing about this or any other question. This, however, appears to be a favourite course of Sir Wilfrid. For example, in 1896 he signed an official statement declaring himself to be entitled to credit for the final settlement of the Manitoba school question, while immediately following we find from the correspondence brought down in the parliament of Canada the following extract from a letter to Cardinal Rampolla, which he has never denied:

'It is desirable, if not necessary, that the mission of Monseigneur Merry Del Val should be renewed or rather continued, and that he should be present in the midst of us for a more or less prolonged time as the accredited representative of the Holy See.'

It will be remembered that Monseigneur Merry Del Val was appointed Papal delegate by His Holiness the Pope on the petition of Sir Wilfrid and forty odd members of the parliament of Canada. The petition was presented to His Holiness by Mr. Fitzpatrick and further urged by the Canadian legal representative in London, England, Charles Russell, who was afterwards instructed to go to Rome as Sir Wilfrid's representative, and who, on November 26, 1897, addressed the following to Cardinal Rampolla, secretary of state to the Pope.

'I have just arrived at Rome once more at the urgent request of the Catholic members of the government and parliament of Canada. My instructions enjoin me to again renew to Your Eminence the desire which I had already the honour to express to you, that His Holiness will be pleased to nominate a permanent delegate to Canada as representative of His Holiness who would reside on the spot but would be outside all local interests.'

So that by this plain arrangement a delegate was appointed who was regarded as necessary on account of differences of opinion which existed at that time between Sir Wilfrid and certain of his following as to his official signed statement declaring he was a party to the final settlement of the Manitoba school question. Here again, we have the hand of Sir Wilfrid engaged in double-dealing in this matter as is evidenced by his assurance to Cardinal Rampolla through Mr. Russell, the Canadian legal representative, who wrote to His Eminence as follows, presenting Sir Wilfrid's side of the case at Rome:

We do not solicit His Holiness to sanction as perfect the concessions obtained, but that in His wisdom he will be pleased to regard them as a beginning of justice.

Now, this to my mind is conclusive that Sir Wilfrid in combination with Monseigneur Sbarretti had hoped by their present course to carry out the promise given through their accredited representative, Mr. Charles Russell, in this underhand way. In view of the foregoing, I am sure that Sir Wilfrid Laurier owes it to the people of this province to at once give a reason why we are not entitled to immediate consideration and action other than the flimsy excuse which he has already himself created in his invitation to Mr. Whitney to advance a claim to some portion of Keewatin which did not form part of old Canada.

It is certainly idle for any person to assume that Monseigneur Sbarretti, occupying the position he does, would press me to make the suggestion of terms and conditions which he did without the full knowledge and consent of Sir Wilfrid and his colleagues. And on the other hand Sir Wilfrid's attitude carries with it evidence of a full knowledge of arrangement, as is evident by his creation of excuses for delay as well as his failure to give reason or cause for same, and further by his unfairness in bringing down one side of the case and attempting to secure a prejudicement from the people without their having Manitoba's reply to his minute of council of March 21, which was received by this government on March 28 and replied to on March 31.

Can you give us your reply for publication? Mr. Rogers was asked.

No, because it can only be made public through the usual channel, that of being laid on the table of the House and Sir Wilfrid is at perfect liberty and should do this at once.

Before I proceed any further, I may say at once, referring to the whole tenor of this document, that in so far as there is a charge that there was an understanding between Monseigneur Sbarretti and myself to have the school question considered in connection with the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba, there is not a shadow nor a tittle of truth in it. Mr. Rogers uses this language:

It is certainly idle for any person to assume that Monsigneur Sbarretti, occupying the position he does, would presume to make the suggestion of terms and conditions which he did without the full knowledge and consent of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his colleagues.

I assert that if Mr. Rogers states that Monseigneur Sbarretti did press him to make the suggestion of terms and conditions which he says Monseigneur Sbarretti did with my knowledge, he states something which is not in accordance with truth. If that has taken place it has taken place wholly without my knowledge and without my participation, and I never heard of it in any way whatever until last Saturday, when the matter was brought to my notice by a telegram from the Toronto 'Globe.' Then Mr. Rogers goes on to say:

And, on the other hand, Sir Wilfrid's attitude carries with it evidence of a full knowledge of arrangement, as is evident by his creation of excuses for delay, as well as his failure to give reason or cause for same and further by his unfairness in bringing down one side of the case and attempting to secure a prejudgment from the people without their having Manitoba's reply to his minute of council of March 21, which was received by this government on March 28, and replied to on March 31.

On Monday last, which was the 3rd of April, I brought down to this House a return to an address moved for some time ago by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche), asking for copies of all correspondence that had taken place between the government of Manitoba and this government on the subject of the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba. The last paper upon this return was the acknowledgment of the receipt of our reply to the prayer of the Manitoba government. We have received since that time a further rejoinder by Manitoba to our reply. We did not bring it down on Monday with the return, because we had not then received it. It arrived at the Privy Council office only yesterday. I at once gave orders to the clerk of the Privy Council to have it prepared for presentation to the House and I have to-day laid it on the table of the House. In all this there was no evidence of any intention to conceal anything. There was nothing to conceal, this was a public document. Then I see by the correspondence that the order of the Manitoba government was passed on the 31st of March, which was last Friday. It was sent to us on the following day, Saturday, it could not therefore get here until yesterday morning, and as soon as it was received by us, as I said a moment ago, I gave instructions to have it prepared and laid on the table of the House, so as to form part of the correspondence which the people of this country have a right to have before them. Now, I pass to another statement of Mr. Rogers:

In three days' time——

I shall come back to this.

——February 20, a letter was received from His Excellency, Monseigneur Sbarretti, asking for a conference. This invitation was accepted, and His Excellency then presented the following memorandum, remarking that if we would place this on the statute-book of our province that it would greatly facilitate an early settlement of our mission, the fixing of our boundaries, which would be extended to the shores of Hudson bay. His Excellency further added that our failure to act in the past had prejudiced our claim for extension westward.

According to this statement, it appears that Mr. Rogers and Mr. Colin Campbell, who were the delegates of the Manitoba government, had a conference with Monseigneur Sbarretti, the Papal ablegate, There has been a rumour in the press—not in the press, but at all events, about the corridors of this House—that this conference had been brought about by means of one of my colleagues. I have to say to the House, and I have the authority of my colleague for this, that there never was any conference brought about by him between the delegates and Monseigneur Sbarretti, and I have to make the further statement that neither myself nor any of my colleagues were the intermediaries between Monseigneur Sbarretti and the delegates of Manitoba. If there has been such a conference how it came about I cannot say. Perhaps Monseigneur Sbarretti may have had previous communication with these gentlemen; I do not know. Perhaps he knew them and perhaps that is the reason why he called upon them to have a conference. At all events, it is no concern of mine. I know nothing, and I never knew anything of it until this day, nor did the government. What conversation took place between the papal ablegate, Mr. Rogers and Mr. Colin Campbell I do not know. This is a question, perhaps, as to which there may be something later on; I do not know. But, I take the statement as I find it here, and upon this statement I have the right to make some comments which may throw some light, perhaps, on what has taken place. Mr. Rogers says that the ablegate made this remark :

This invitation was accepted and His Excellency then presented the following memorandum, remarking that if we would place this on the statute-book of our province it would greatly facilitate an early settlement of our mission, the fixing of our boundaries, which would be extended to the shores of Hudson bay.

As to that, I have no reason to make any comment, because that is a thing as to which I know nothing. Then Mr. Rogers goes on to say :

His Excellency further added that our failure to act in the past had prejudiced our claim for extension westward.

Well, Sir, I cannot conceive how the papal ablegate, or anybody else, could have stated that the failure of the province of Manitoba to amend the School Act prevented the extension of its boundaries westward and that if such had been done it would have facilitated this extension. I cannot conceive how it is possible that such a statement could have been made, considering the fact that since the month of July, 1896, when we came into office, up to the month of January, 1905, we never received from the government of Manitoba a communication asking for the extension of the boundaries of that province. There may have been resolutions passed by the legislature, asking for the extension of their boundaries; I do not know. I am told that there have been, and I have seen in the press that resolutions were passed in 1901, that resolutions were passed also, as I understand, in 1902, and resolutions were passed, I know, in 1905. In 1905, these resolutions were followed by executive action, they were called to our attention, but neither in 1901 nor in 1902, were these resolutions passed by the legislature of Manitoba, followed by executive action or called to the attention of the government of Canada. This morning, when I read the interview with Mr. Rogers, I asked myself if my memory was at fault, and if there had been any communication sent to us, which, in the multitude of things with which we are called upon to deal, I might have forgotten. I inquired of my colleagues if they had any recollection of any such communication being sent to us, and they all answered me they had no such recollection. I then inquired from the clerk of the Privy Council if there was anything in the archives of the department which would show that any such communication had been received by us, and I received this memorandum from the clerk of the Privy Council.

From June, 1896, to January, 1905, there is no record in the Privy Council office of a claim advanced by the province of Manitoba for the extension of its boundaries. In May, 1902, there was a protest from the Northwest Territories against the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba.

Now, Sir, with these preliminary remarks I shall proceed to give my version of what took place between Mr. Colin Campbell and Mr. Rogers, and us, when they came here as delegates from the government of Manitoba. I shall take in the first place the following statement made by Mr. Rogers :

On February 13th we received a formal invitation by telegraph from Sir Wilfrid Laurier to come to Ottawa as soon as convenient. We left on February 14th and arrived on afternoon of the 16th, when we received a letter from Sir Wilfrid at the Russell House, saying that he would be pleased to meet us at his office at mid-day on Friday the 17th.

In this statement there is nothing which

is not in accordance with the truth, but it is not the whole truth. It leaves the impression that we took the initiative of our own accord to have these gentlemen come from Manitoba to discuss that matter with us, whereas the truth is, that we simply responded to an invitation which came to us from the government of Manitoba. I have brought here the whole correspondence which has taken place upon this subject. I stated a moment ago that from the month of June, 1896 to the month of January, 1905, we had not received a communication from the government of Manitoba asking for the extension of their boundaries, and I repeat the statement. The first communication we received upon this subject is the following:

Department of the Provincial Secretary,
Winnipeg, Man.

January 20th, 1905.

Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, G.C.M.G.,
President of the King's Privy Council for
Canada, Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—The government of Manitoba, on a motion of the legislative assembly, has to-day forwarded to His Excellency the Governor General, a memorial relating to the extension of the boundaries of the province, and I am directed to write you and request that you will be pleased to appoint an early date for receiving a deputation from the government of Manitoba in relation to the matter. It would be appreciated if such a date could be named for the first or second week in February.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
D. H. McFADDEN,
Provincial Secretary.

To this letter I answered in the following terms :

Ottawa, 24th January, 1905.

Dear Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your favour of the 20th instant, informing me that the legislative assembly has forwarded to His Excellency the Governor General in Council, a memorial relating to the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba, and asking to have a date fixed for receiving a deputation from the government of Manitoba in connection with this matter.

The memorial has not yet been received at the office of the Privy Council. I shall bring your request to the attention of the government as soon as possible after its receipt, and will communicate with you again later on.

Yours very sincerely,
WILFRID LAURIER.

Hon. D. H. McFadden,
Manitoba.

In accordance with the promise there made, when we had received the memorial from the government of Manitoba, I brought it to the attention of the Privy Council, and I was authorized to send the following telegram :

Ottawa, 13th February, 1905.

Hon. D. H. McFadden,
Winnipeg, Manitboa.

With reference to your last memorial re extension of limits, will be glad to receive your delegation at any time convenient to you.

WILFRID LAURIER.

That telegram is dated the 13th of February, and on the same day I received the following telegram from Mr. McFadden :

Winnipeg, Man., 13th February, 1905.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier,
Ottawa, Ont.

Replying to your telegram of even date, Hon. Messrs. Rogers and Campbell have been appointed to confer with your government regarding extension of boundaries. They leave here to-morrow, will reach Ottawa Thursday 16th. Kindly notify them at Russell House as to time and place for interview suitable to your own convenience.

D. H. McFADDEN.

In accordance with this last telegram inviting me to fix a time and to inform Mr. Campbell and Mr. Rogers at what time we would be ready to receive them, I caused my secretary in compliance with their desire, on the 16th of February to send the following letter :

Ottawa, 16th February, 1905.

Dear Sir,—Sir Wilfrid Laurier will be glad to receive you to-morrow the 17th instant at 12.30 o'clock in his office, Privy Council.

Yours respectfully,
(Sgd.) RODOLPHE BOUDREAU.
Private Secretary.

That was on the 16th of February, and on the following day accordingly, there took place at my office the interview with the delegates from Manitoba. There had been a subcommittee of the Privy Council appointed to receive the delegates, and the ministers present on that occasion were, the Minister of Justice, the Postmaster General and myself ; I think the Secretary of State was present, but of that I am not quite sure.

I take now the statement of Mr. Rogers as to what took place then. Mr. Rogers says :

During that interview we presented the claim of the province as urgently and strongly as possible. In reply Sir Wilfrid said, that if we would be good enough to remain in Ottawa for three or four days he would again send for us and would then be in a position to give us an answer.

As to the latter statement I am sorry to say that my memory is not in accordance with the memory of Mr. Rogers. I do not want to make any imputation, but I flatter myself that I have a pretty good memory and my memory is corroborated by that of my colleagues. What took place was this : We heard the petition presented to us by the delegates from Manitoba. Mr. Rogers was the spokesman. I do not think Mr. Campbell said anything at all, but if he did he took a very indifferent part in the discussion which was mainly carried on by Mr. Rogers. He presented to us a repetition of all the claims which are advanced in the state paper now on the table of the House. He asked that the

boundaries of the province should be extended westward, northward and eastward—westward, that it should have a part of the new province of Saskatchewan, a part of the districts of Assiniboia and Saskatchewan ; northward, that they should have the territory towards the north, and eastward towards Hudson bay. I may say at once that we discussed this at some length, in fact at considerable length. When Mr. Rogers advanced the claim on behalf of Manitoba, that its boundaries should be extended westward and include part of the present districts of Assiniboia and Saskatchewan, we presented to Mr. Rogers what seemed to be a very strong objection to that. We told Mr. Rogers in fact : that this claim had been considered by the government of Sir John Macdonald in 1884 and had not been granted ; that the reasons which existed in 1884 for refusing the prayer of Manitoba were far stronger to-day than they were then ; that at that time that part of the Territories was in its infancy, but that at present it had a considerable population, as advanced as the population of Manitoba. That there was the objection further: that the elegislature of the Territories had protested against its being annexed to Manitoba, and therefore we did not see how it was possible to grant that part of the prayer of the province of Manitoba. With regard to the northern portion of the district of Saskatchewan, we said to Mr. Rogers and to his colleague, Mr. Campbell : we do not know that there is any objection to granting you the upper portion of the district of Saskatchewan ; it is true that we understand there is an objection raised, but it is a question which can be discussed later on ; at all events, we do not intend to introduce this part of the territory of Saskatchewan into the new provinces and we had better leave it for further discussion.

When it came to a discussion on the extension of the boundary eastward, towards Hudson bay, my colleague the Postmaster General, who was with me then, at once took strong objections to that claim of Manitoba. He stated that in his opinion it would not be fair to the province of Ontario that that claim should be considered unless the province of Ontario had an opportunity to discuss it with the province of Manitoba. That was on the 17th of February. I do not remember that I said to Mr. Rogers and Mr. Campbell that if they were to wait for some days we would again send for them and be in a position to give them an answer. What I distinctly remember stating, as it was my duty to do, was that their representations would be brought to the attention of the Council, and that probably they would get an answer at an early date. More than this I do not remember stating, and I do not think I did. The two Bills for the creation of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta were introduced on the following Tuesday, the 21st of February. Both Mr. Rogers and Mr. Campbell were present on the floor of this House and heard the statement I then made. That statement was that I had the authority of my colleagues to say that we could not see our way to extend the boundaries of the province of Manitoba westward, for the reasons which I have just given, that we had reserved the northern portion of the district of Saskatchewan for future action, and that with regard to extending the boundaries of Manitoba to Hudson bay we were of opinion that the province of Ontario and the province of Quebec should be consulted. Mr. Rogers heard this statement, and, therefore, knew what was the policy of the government on that question.

This shows one thing, that this policy of ours was settled then and there, without interference from anybody, without participation by anybody. We settled our own business according to our lights. We told the province of Manitoba that we could not extend its boundaries westward for the reasons we gave, and on that decision we took our stand before this House and maintained it. But we stated we were prepared to consider the claim of the province of Manitoba for extension northward towards Hudson bay in connection with the claims of the new province of Saskatchewan and the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Since that time we have embodied these views in a Minute of Council, which has been communicated to the Manitoba government. There is no difference between the Minute of Council and the statement I made on the floor of this House on the 21st of February except this, that in the Minute of Council, after having given the matter due consideration, we take the view that there is no reason for calling the province of Quebec to that conference, because it is not sufficiently interested in the matter; but we declare our readiness, immediately after the creation of the new provinces, to have a conference, in which the provinces of Saskatchewan, Ontario and Manitoba will be represented. That is the position in which the matter now stands.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition has called my attention to a letter of Mr. Rogers of the 23rd of February. That letter is not in the interview as reported in the 'Citizen,' but I found it in another paper, the Toronto 'Star' of yesterday, and is as follows:

Russell House, Ottawa, February 23, 1905.

Sir,—As we find it necessary to leave Ottawa to-morrow, we desire to refer to our interview of Friday, the 17th, respecting Manitoba's claim for extension of her boundaries westward and northward, when you were good enough to suggest that if we would come here for two or three days you would be in a position to give us an answer respecting same. Up to the present, however, we have heard nothing further from you, excepting your statement in parlia-

ment on Tuesday last, when introducing your Autonomy Bills, which we presume represents your fixed and final decision as to westward boundary.

In view of Manitoba's very strong claims, as presented to you in the memorial unanimously passed by our legislature, and supported and supplemented in our interview, we must enter, on behalf of the province, our firm protest against your decision in refusing to grant the prayer of our request, extension of our boundaries westward, and exceedingly regret that apparently local considerations have deprived Manitoba of what she rightfully regards as a most just claim.

Respecting extension northward, we most respectfully urge it on you that this should engage your consideration and attention during the present session.

We, of course, most emphatically deny the right of Quebec and Ontario having further to say in respect to the extension of our boundaries north to James bay, or that they could advance any claim worthy of consideration that would necessitate delay in attaching this territory immediately to Manitoba.

We regard this as exclusively a matter for settlement between our government and Manitoba. We sincerely trust that upon further consideration you may see your way clear to grant the request we make on behalf of a united province.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) R. ROGERS.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition asked me a moment ago why this letter was not included in the correspondence that has been brought down. The answer is, that I have not received that letter. It is not of very great consequence in view of the facts. It is simply a letter of protest; it adds nothing at all to the facts; but I did not receive it. This morning I asked my secretary to search and see whether or not it had been received. I have no remembrance of having received it and it is not on file. I have brought everything that there is on file on this question. Moreover, I do not think it matters very much whether Mr. Rogers wrote or did not write that letter, in view of the interview he gave and which was published in the 'Citizen' of the 20th of February last upon this very point. In that interview Mr. Rogers stated to the reporter:

Mr. Campbell and myself have been appointed to come here to plead for what is considered by Manitoba to be her just claims, before the government who are the tribunal in the case, and whose decision must be final.

When do you expect a decision?

I presume that when the Bill which is promised for Tuesday next is brought down, it will represent the government's decision in the matter.

Mr. Rogers was present on the floor of this House on the 21st of February and heard me state the decision of the government, and therefore there was not much occasion for him to write two days later asking for a decision. But this point is of no consequence. I mention it simply as a reason why the letter was not included in the correspondence.

I have only one word more to say about the extraordinary interview of Mr. Rogers. I will read again a statement of Mr. Rogers which appears in the 'Citizen' under the heading 'Laurier's Double Dealing.' Mr. Rogers says:

We have no desire in Manitoba for double dealing about this or any other question. This, however, appears to be a favourite course of Sir Wilfrid. For example, in 1896 he signed an official statement declaring himself to be entitled to credit for the final settlement of the Manitoba school question, while immediately following we find from the correspondence brought down in the parliament of Canada the following extract from a letter to Cardinal Rampolla, which he has never denied.

I have only two observations to make on this. I do not know to what Mr. Rogers refers when he says that I signed an official statement declaring myself to be entitled to credit for the final settlement of the Manitoba school question. It is not of any consequence, but I do not know what Mr. Rogers means when he says that. In the statement immediately following, the impression is conveyed that the Canadian government brought down correspondence between the government of Canada and Cardinal Rampolla. There is no such thing in fact. The government of Canada never had any correspondence with Cardinal Rampolla and never brought down any correspondence, because there was none to bring down. What is true is that in 1896 my self and several of my co-religionists, having some difficulties in our own church, appealed to the authorities of our own church to settle them. There was nothing more than that. We did it, not as a government, but simply as men belonging to the Roman Catholic church. We had trouble over matters of ecclesiastical policy, and we appealed to the supreme arbiter in our church to determine these matters. There was nothing more or less. On this occasion I have nothing more to say, but I thought that under the circumstances I owed it to myself and the House simply to make a statement of the facts as they are.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I simply wish to supplement briefly some of the remarks that have fallen from my right hon. leader. The communication from Mr. Rogers contains a statement to the effect that at the invitation of His Excellency Monseigneur Sbarretti, he waited upon him, and that on that occasion the Papal ablegate said that if they would make some concessions, the mission of the Manitoba representatives would likely be successful. That mission was for the purpose of having the boundaries of that province extended to the shores of Hudson bay. It was suggested that the difficulty in the way of Manitoba securing the extension could, in some way or other be removed if some concessions were made by

the Manitoba government on the school question. To that point I wish to address myself for a moment. I was requested by the First Minister to attend the meeting of the 17th of February at which were present the gentlemen named by him. I did not know before going the object of the meeting. I was aware that the Manitoba government had sent to this administration a memorial requesting, among other things, the extension of its boundaries northward to Hudson bay. The words of the memorial are literally 'northward to Hudson bay.' I attended that meeting and there were present Mr. Colin Campbell, Mr. Rogers, the premier and perhaps the Minister of Justice.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The Minister of Justice was not present, so far as my recollection goes, during the time I was there. A few minutes after I arrived Mr. Rogers,—who was the only minister from Manitoba who spoke—explained that his government desired the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba easterly to the Hudson bay and northerly. The memorial said northerly, and when he explained that they desired an extension easterly to Hudson bay, so as to include territory at the mouth of the Churchill river and the Nelson river, I at once observed that he was asking to extend the territory of Manitoba easterly in a direction which would perhaps interest the province of Ontario as well. Up to that moment, when it was only proposed, so far as the memorial went, to extend Manitoba northerly,—although they may have intended north easterly to come out at Hudson bay—it did not occur to me that the desire was to go to the mouths of those two rivers. Therefore so soon as that object was known to me, I said that the province of Ontario would have the right to be heard before we could adjudicate upon that point or form any opinion upon it. Mr. Rogers took the ground that the province of Ontario had no right or claim to any territory lying north of that province and adjacent to Manitoba's easterly limit, and therefore had no right to be heard. I controverted that view and explained that I could not agree to it. He said if you will allow me I can satisfy you that Ontario has no right to be heard. I replied that it would be a waste of time to try and convert me on that point and that, speaking as a minister from the province of Ontario, I must insist upon that province being heard before this question is gone into.

I did not succeed in influencing the Manitoba representatives and I turned to the premier and informed him that, as a minister coming from Ontario, I was not prepared to discuss these questions affecting the rights of Ontario until the government of that province was present and could submit its case. Upon that statement I withdrew from the meeting, and I am told that the claim for extension to Hudson bay then and there ceased for the time being. I take the ground to-day, as a minister from Ontario, without expressing any opinion as to how the territory should be divided, that our province is entitled to an opportunity to present its case before the parliament of Canada deals with it. In my opinion it is quite possible to make a fair distribution, so that Ontario may be able to acquire a deep sea harbour and Manitoba be similarly equipped on the Hudson bay. Our territory extends to James bay but I believe James bay is shallow and not suitable for ocean navigation, whereas when you go to the west coast of Hudson bay, you have two possible ports, one at the mouth of the Nelson river, which with dredging may be made a very good sea harbour, and it might be regarded by the two provinces as a fair division of territory if Manitoba were given a harbour at mouth of the Churchill river and Ontario at Nelson river. That was the idea that went through my mind when I heard of this claim ; and so far as the Papal Ablegate is concerned, the statement made in this newspaper is the first intimation I have that he took any part in the adjustment of the boundaries of Ontario. Long before the interview in question, I had given, so far as a minister from Ontario could do so, a decision as to the attitude I assumed on that question, and that was that until the province of Ontario could be heard, no conclusion could be come to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) I have very little to say in respect of what has fallen from the Prime Minister. I am glad to know that the Prime Minister to-day has not adhered to that reticence which has characterized him on similar occasions in the immediate past, and I suppose that it might be fair to assume, that if he had as good a case with respect to the ignoring of his Minister of the Interior and his Minister of Finance in regard to important measures as that which he has made to-day, with regard to the matter with which he has dealt, he would have given us an explanation that has not yet been made with reference to the introduction of this Bill without even consultation with these two gentlemen. It is gratifying to know that although two members of his own government could not be consulted with regard to the provisions of this Bill, the Postmaster General has been so strenuous in his advocacy of the rights of his province of Ontario that the ministers of that province had to be consulted. However, there is an old proverb that charity well understood begins at home, and possibly the rights of ministers to be heard with regard to important matters to be dealt with by parliament may be extended not only to the provincial ministers of Ontario, but to ministers of this very administration.

I do not know anything about the letter of the 23rd of February which has been referred to to-day except that I received a telegram only this morning from the attorney general of Manitoba, who evidently had observed that this letter had not been included in the documents brought down, and he asked me to mention the matter to the Prime Minister and to see that it was brought down with the other documents. That is the only knowledge I have with regard to it and it is quite evident that Mr. Rogers and Mr. Campbell were thoroughly under the impression that that letter had not only been sent, but had been received by the Prime Minister. Assuming that that letter was written and should have been received it seems to bear out very strongly the view which Mr. Rogers had expressed in the interview alluded to by the Prime Minister. He says :

Sir, as we find it necessary to leave Ottawa to-morrow, we desire to refer to our interview of Friday, the 17th, respecting Manitoba's claim for extension of her boundaries westward and northward, when you were good enough to suggest that if we would come here for two or three days you would be in a position to give us an answer respecting same.

They remained here not only two or three days, but as the letter shows until the 23rd of February, and they departed without receiving any answer or any intimation beyond that. But they received an intimation from His Excellency Monseigneur Sbarretti which has been dealt with by the Prime Minister and by Mr. Rogers in his interview. As to that I have nothing to say to-day nor have I anything to say with regard to the whole situation, although it may afford an opportunity for a little more debate later on. It seems to me that the explanation of the Prime Minister which has been made in consequence of the interview with Mr. Rogers might well have been made at some earlier date. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is surely not unaware that in two very important journals, one of which at least is in very close touch with the administration and is supposed to have been controlled up to a day or two ago by a very prominent member of this administration, this very reason has been put forward. I would think that when a distinct rumour of that kind is heralded throughout the length and breadth of this country it might have been well for the Prime Minister at an earlier date to take an opportunity of contradicting that which he has so strongly contradicted to-day. He knows that every prominent journal in Canada has published words which are to be found in the Northwest 'Review,' in the later part of February or early in March and which are as follows :

Two days after the 'Telegram' had trumpeted abroad the Hon. Robert Rogers' great hopes for the western extension of Manitoba, the same wise and prophetic journal deplores the fact that there will be no such extension in any direction. But it omits to give the reason thereof. The only obstacle to the territorial expansion of our province is its iniquitous and cruel school system. Not even the wildest corner of any unorganized territory will consent to saddle itself with such a tyranny. Manitoba must be content to remain small and mean so long as it maintains its small and mean school policy.

That is a pretty direct statement. In so many words it says that until Manitoba alters its schools policy it shall not have its boundaries extended in any direction. That or a similar statement in the press was brought to the attention of the House and my right hon. friend paid some attention to it then, but did not pay attention to it in this connection. I have observed his words carefully. He said there was no intention on the part of this administration to attempt any remedial legislation with respect to schools in Manitoba, but I did not observe in my right hon. friend's remarks on that occasion any suggestion that the statement I have read was absolutely without foundation, may I observe to the right hon. gentleman that it might have been better in the interests of the whole country that some such utterance as that which he has made to-day should have been made in consequence of the statement in the press to which I have referred ? In a journal, controlled as it is said—I know not with what truth—by a member of the administration until within the last two or three days, the same statement is made in very specific language, and it is right to observe also that this journal claims to be the special mouthpiece of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). He has disclaimed that and I accept his disclaimer to the full. He says he is not interested in that journal, but the journal itself declares that it is the organ of the Liberal party, and that it is under the direction and absolute control of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. That journal has said :

The school legislation of the little province——

That is the province of Manitoba.

——is not of a nature to attract immigrants who people the districts. The Northwest has its separate schools, Manitoba has abolished them.

Every good act has its reward, every bad act its chastisement.

Manitoba will remain lowest with her pretentious law.

A little before that the same paper says :

In proportion to her big sisters Manitoba will count as little more than a large county.

In view of these suggestions, they are more than suggestions, in view of these direct statements, one of them made by a journal supposed to be under the control of a very prominent member of the administration, and claiming for itself to be under the absolute direction and control of the

right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in view of all this, might I not respectfully inquire whether it would not have been well for the right hon. gentleman on an earlier occasion than that which he has selected to have made to the country the statement which he has made to-day.

I have nothing to say with regard to the position which is said to have been assumed by His Excellency Monseigneur Sbarretti. He is not in any sense responsible to this parliament, he is responsible only to his ecclesiastical superiors in authority. The only persons who are in any way responsible to this parliament are the government of this country, and I thought that my right hon. friend to-day might have gone a little further than he did go. He knows as well as any of the rest of us, that it has been rumoured throughout this country, not only rumoured but stated in the public press that there were negotiations with His Excellency with regard to education in the Northwest Territories if not in Manitoba. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) did not see fit to touch that question at all to-day and I suppose when he thinks a proper occasion arises he will deal with it, but in the meantime I may call his attention to the fact that the statements to that effect are being made in the press of the country; upon what authority I do not know. All I do know is this, that when statements made in a very much less direct manner, and on very slight foundation were current in 1895 and 1896, with regard to the Conservative administration of those days my hon. friend was always ready to come forward and ask for ministerial explanations and if necessary to move the adjournment of the House in order that they might be discussed.

In view of the attitude which he saw fit to adopt ten years ago, we might have expected that he would have gone a little further to-day when he called the attention of the House to these circumstances. As I said before, the matter may perhaps require to be discussed a little further. I was not aware that the right hon. gentleman intended to bring it up to-day in this somewhat extended form. If necessary, it may be brought up and discussed on a future occasion.

Mr. W. D. STAPLES (Macdonald). I want to call attention for a moment to that mysterious letter of the 23rd of February. I think I can bring testimony to show where this letter went, and I think I can trace it to the right hon. the First Minister's own residence. Now, on the 23rd of February the Hon. Mr. Rogers, after writing this letter, asked me to see that it got over to the hon. the First Minister. I rang the bell from room No. 6, and there came a messenger named Julius Beaulieu, I gave the letter to him, and he said he would deliver it. He says now there is no doubt but that he did deliver the letter. Surely we are living in a mysterious age, mysterious things are taking place every day, and this is one of them. I wish to call the right hon. gentleman's attention to another statement he made. He told us to-day that his memory is as fresh now as it was in his younger days. He stated that the Hon. Colin Campbell was on the floor of the House on the 22nd day of February when these Bills were introduced, which is not the case. I may add regarding that letter that I have been down and consulted the records in the messengers department in this building, which show that this wonderful letter went from room No. 6, and that it was delivered to the messenger at about the time that the messenger states, it was carried to the right hon. gentleman's residence on that particular day, and they show that it went from that particular room.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I want to correct my hon. friend. I stated that Mr. Rogers was here on the 21st of February, and I am sure of that; and I stated that Mr. Campbell was here also, but I was not so sure of that and that is what I said. In regard to the letter that was sent to my House, I think that if it was sent to my house it must have gone astray somewhere, because I have never seen it. I really did not suppose that anybody would suspect that I would make an inaccurate statement in regard to that.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). I intend for a few moments to refer to and comment upon the statement made here to-day. On February 27th I brought to the attention of this House the very question referred to just now by the leader of the opposition, when I read a declaration of the French newspaper called 'Le Soleil,' saying it was the organ of the government, and I also read its editorial, which declared that Manitoba wes being punished by a denial of extension of her western or other boundaries because of her school laws. The right hon. gentleman repudiated all that. He said there was no intention of punishing Manitoba, and he made light of the statements I made. But since then it has come out that that newspaper was his newspaper, at least it has never been denied, and a colleague of his, according to a statement in the papers, transferred the other day a large portion of the shares he held in that paper to a senator who is a supporter of the right hon. gentleman. It has been shown by other quotations from papers supporting the government that little Manitoba was being punished for her iniquitious school legislation, there is no doubt about that. Now comes the Hon. Mr. Rogers, and his statement has been read here to-day and remains undenied in a great many respects so far as the Prime Minister is concerned. Mr. Rogers says that he received a letter from the Archbishop of Ephesus, Monseigneur Sbarretti, and there

is no denial of that ; there is no denial of the fact that he waited upon the Apostolic delegate at his residence. There is another statement that the Papal ablegate presented to him these amendments which he desired to be put in the school law of Manitoba, and that is the question before the people of Canada to-day. Did this Archbishop of Ephesus, the delegate Apostolic to Canada, this delegate of the Pope—did he present these amendments to one of the ministers of the province of Manitoba ? And what were they ? They were in the shape of a command that members of the government of Manitoba should stultify themselves by making provision in the law in Manitoba for a separate school establishment, after it had been refused by the legislature and by the people of that country, and after the right hon. gentleman had refused to pass remedial legislation or to take any hand in securing remedial legislation for the Catholic minority of that province. Well, that much has been proved. What more has been proved ? What more has not been denied here to-day ? What is singular is that which has not been denied. Probably the right hon. gentleman is in no position to deny it. Mr. Rogers says :

This invitation was accepted and His Excellency then presented the following memorandum, remarking that if we would place this on the statute-book of our province it would greatly facilitate an early settlement of our mission, the fixing of our boundaries, which would be extended to the shores of Hudson bay. His Excellency further added that our failure to act in the past had prejudiced our claim for extension westward.

Now is that true or is it not ? Is it true that the delegate of the Pope told this member of the Manitoba government that their failure to act in the past had prevented an extension of their western boundary, and that if they would give him this remedial legislation now—for it is remedial legislation that he was seeking—they would get their request for an extension to the north. The people of Canada want to know to-day if that statement was really made. There has been no denial of it to-day. The Prime Minister says he cannot deny it, but the people of Canada want to know if it is true before any such Bill as that now before the House is passed. What more took place ? There has been no denial to another statement of Mr. Rogers, namely, that this office of Papal delegate to Canada was created by the hon. gentlemen opposite, or rather was created at their request—there is no denial of that. It is known now to all the people of this country that we have a Papal delegate here at the request of hon. gentlemen opposite and that is proved in this very document.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is entirely misstating the facts if he means by 'hon. gentlemen opposite' the government.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I did not say that, I said gentlemen sitting on the opposite side of the House are responsible for this Papal delegate being here.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I suppose the hon. gentleman would feel at liberty to attend to his own church without the permission of parliament ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Let me read what Mr. Rogers says. The following extract has not been denied :

It is desirable, if not necessary, that the mission of Monseigneur Merry Del Val should be or rather continued, and that he should be present in the midst of us for a more or less prolonged time as the accredited representative of the Holy See.

The hon. Minister of Justice, as Mr. Chas. Fitzpatrick, and the right hon. Prime Minister, as Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and forty other colleagues of theirs in this House made the representation to the Holy See and the hon. the Minister of Justice, though acting as Mr. Chas. Fitzpatrick, asked that this delegate should be sent to Canada. The statement is here and it is not denied.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman can read the petition. The petition of the Catholic members was read in this House.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I know and it proves that statement.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. And then, the legal agent of this government in London was used as a missionary to go to Rome to have this appointment confirmed.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How much did it cost ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I do not know. This is an extract from the letter that Mr. Russell presented in Rome :

I have just arrived at Rome once more at the urgent request of the Catholic members of the government and parliament of Canada. My instructions enjoin me to again renew to Your Eminence the desire which I had already the honour to express to you, that His Holiness will be pleased to nominate a permanent delegate to Canada as a representative of His Holiness, who would reside on the spot, but would be outside all local interests.

That is not denied. Then, what else follows ? Mr. Russell, the Canadian legal representative, wrote to His Eminence as follows :

We do not solicit His Holiness to sanction as perfect the concessions obtained, but that in his wisdom he will be pleased to regard them as a beginning of justice.

Now, that is a very important statement. The beginning of justice took place in 1896. The completion of justice is taking place in 1905, when the west is to be fettered in

regard to her school freedom. In addition I wish to refer to another thing. Does not the right hon. gentleman, in the view of responsible government, in the full conception we have of responsible government in this country and in England, consider that he is responsible for that delegate being here and responsible for his conduct in this country just as much as if he were one of his own administration, or one of his own civil service ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The right hon. gentleman and his colleagues laugh, but they brought that high dignitary here. He came at their request and for all the things that he does in connection with the politics and education of this country the right hon. gentleman will find that he is held responsible, and as a matter of fact he is responsible, within the full meaning of the British constitution.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He has not denied his responsibility.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Now, we have had it very clearly pointed out in this debate so far that the ablegate is here at the request of the government.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is not correct. He is not here at the request of the government.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. He is here at the request of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Some gentlemen.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. He is here, according to Mr. Russell's statement, which has never been denied, at the request of members of the government of Canada and at the request of members of the parliament of Canada, and I say, and I say it in the hearing of the people of Canada, that the government of the day are responsible because all the members of the government are responsible for the acts of the individual members of the government and every member who sits behind them and supports the government is responsible for the conduct of the government in this matter. We referred to Russian rule the other day. They have the procurator general of the Holy Synod in Russia, and it looks now to me as if the Papal ablegate in this country occupies the same position as a member of this government. Any way the evidence of that is not denied ; it has not been denied to-day. The Papal ablegate has had an oppourtunity day after day of denying it. For some reason he has not seen fit to deny it and unless he does deny it, it will be taken as true that he did have that conversation with Mr. Rogers, that he did press the acceptance of these two amendments upon them, that he did tell them that if they did accept them they would find that their boundaries would be extended to the north, and that the reason that their boundaries had not been extended to the west was because of their school legislation. This is something that the people want an explanation of. It is something of which no explanation has been given here to-day and if the right hon. leader of the government thinks that this is to pass off with the explanation made here to-day he greatly misunderstands the situation of this country. There is a political crisis in this country, there is a feeling of unrest that hon. gentlemen opposite pretend to ignore but it is here, it must be dealt with and there is nothing that confirms it so much as the timidity of hon. gentlemen opposite. They are afraid to do anything. They cannot fill the vacancies in their cabinet. They cannot send the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) back for the endorsation of his constituents, they are doing everything that men who have done wrong and fear public censure could do, but they are not discharging their duty as they ought to discharge it.

I do not know that the right hon. leader of the government made it clear whether any of his colleagues had been in consultation with the Papal ablegate or not, but let us recall what took place. It is well to bear in mind that there are two faiths in this country ; there is the Roman Catholic faith and there is the Protestant faith, and there is such a thing as keeping faith between the two faiths in this country. How did this Bill come before parliament as far as we know from the discussion which has taken place here ? The right hon. leader of the government, the hon. Minister of Justice, and the hon. the Secretary of State, three co-religionists, one with the other drew up this Bill.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Order.

Mr. BRODEUR. Shame.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Now let me make my statement. The hon. Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) and the hon. the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), who are supposed to represent Ontario opinion, as far as we know, were not present when it was drawn up. Then, we have the further statement that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), both men who were supposed to represent the Protestant faith in the government,—I suppose there has been some recognition of religion in the formation of the cabinet—were not consulted. But, on the contrary, by some process of stealth, it was got past them. There is no accounting for that, but the fact remains that legislation was actually introduced by three members of the government, and I am not saying anything as reflecting on their religion in any way whatsoever, but they happen to be of one religion, and they did not consult with their colleagues before the Bill was introduced.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is quite untrue.

Mr. FISHER. Absolutely untrue.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Well, it has not been denied.

Mr. FISHER. It is denied now.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It has been denied over and over again by the premier.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It has been admitted that the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior knew nothing about it and the hon. Minister of Finance says he knew nothing about it and they both have said in the House that practically that Bill was introduced by stealth.

Mr. FISHER. Not so.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. They have not.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I will leave it to the hon. gentleman to explain.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. You need not lie about it.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Then, another thing; by stealth it was taken past the members of the west, by stealth it was taken past the representatives of the government in the Northwest Territories, and by stealth it was taken past the caucus of hon. gentlemen opposite, so that, as far as we know, this Bill got into this House under the circumstances which I have stated here to-day. Now then, there is another thing and I want to deal with these questions as they have been stated here and as they are. I take the full responsibility for every thing I say. There is evidence now in this country that the right hon. gentleman is paying his political debts at the expense of the civil and educational rights of the people of this country.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. That is an imputation that the hon. member should not make.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I don't think, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that is an offensive imputation which the hon. gentleman should not make.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I will modify it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Withdraw it.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Which statement?

Mr. SPEAKER. As I understand, when you are out of order and I have directed you to do so, you will withdraw the statement which is out of order.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What statement do you object to? I said the right hon. gentleman is paying his political debts——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. My ruling must not be discussed; if I am wrong the hon. gentleman has his remedy.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Will you please tell me the statement to which you object?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to call your judgment in question, but if the point you make is that the hon. member for South York is out of order in saying that the right hon. the Prime Minister is paying his political debts, it seems to me that is straining the rule.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. White), as I understand it, misconceives what the hon. member (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has said. As I understood him, he said that the Prime Minister was attempting to pay his political debts by sacrificing the civil rights of the people.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. And the educational rights of the people.

Mr. SPEAKER. In my judgment and under my ruling, that is an offensive statement in reference to the Prime Minister, which the hon. gentleman must withdraw. If I am wrong in that, he has his remedy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I must bow and withdraw, and I will have an opportunity elsewhere of saying what my opinion is. And now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this, that we have government in this country——

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Don't let them bluff you Billy.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, please; or I will be obliged to name you (Mr. Sam. Hughes).

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I will not be——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order; you must sit down.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Expel him.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am again in the judgment of the House, when I call a gentleman to order who says to another member who is speaking, directing his reference to the Speaker: Don't let him bluff you.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I rise to a point of order. I rise to take the full responsibility in this House for what I have said. I say that the member for South York ought not to be bluffed by any authority in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I assume the full responsibility for it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, or I will be obliged to name you.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Do all the naming you like.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Pshaw.

Mr. FOSTER. What will happen if you are named? Will he call out: 'Colonel Sam. Hughes'?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. My opinion is, and I take the full responsibility for saying it, and I intend to say it from one end of this country to the other, that the government of this country is to-day due to two things. The government of this country is to-day due to a combination between a solid Quebec and a corporation interest in this country, which is centred in Toronto. And what happened here the other night in regard to the municipal rights of the city of Ottawa is one instance of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes, it is one instance where the municipal rights——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Nonsense.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes; the municipal rights of the people of Ontario were in question here the other night, and there was a vote of eighty against them, and forty-one of that eighty came from the province of Quebec. And this legislation which is brought here to-day, this proposal to put fetters on the people of the west in regard to their educational authority, is a contribution to the demand from a solid Quebec that the people of the Northwest shall be deprived of their educational rights. The people of the Northwest are here asking for educational freedom, and I do not believe they will get three or five votes from the province of Quebec. It is evident that the province of Quebec is going out of its way——

Mr. BELCOURT. Nonsense.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It is evident that the province of Quebec is going out of its way to put fetters on and manacle the people of the west and deprive them of their rights under the constitution.

Mr. BELCOURT. Why don't you march on Quebec right off?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Just let me bring out an instance that shows it. The province of Manitoba has been denied an extension of her boundaries at the instigation of the province of Quebec.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

An hon. MEMBER. Prove it.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I will prove it in this way: that a solid Quebec within two or three members will vote for this iniquitous proposition in regard to the autonomy of the Northwest.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. SPEAKER.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to put a question to him? Speaking of the demand of the province of Manitoba to extend its boundary easterly to Hudson bay, does he say, or does he not, that the province of Ontario should be heard before such a request is conceded?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I will not deny that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. And when the Postmaster General said that the province of Ontario ought to be consulted in regard to a few waste acres, what about the people of the west, and the minister from the west, and the government of the west, not being consulted in regard to their civil and educational liberties? What is a bit of land to a man's educational rights? What is a bit of land to a man's freedom and religious liberty? Coming back to the other issue. When the little province of Manitoba asked for an extension to the west, 'Le Soleil' of Quebec denied that request, and gave as a reason——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Let me give you another reason which also comes from the province of Quebec. If Manitoba were allowed to extend her boundaries to the west, that portion of the new territory brought into Manitoba would have no separate schools and that portion of the Territories which remained in the new provinces would have the right to separate schools under this legislation.

Mr. TURRIFF. I beg leave to ask a question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TURRIFF. The province of Quebec has not the first thing to do, one way or the other, with the extension of Manitoba to the west——

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood the hon. gentleman to say he wanted to ask a question.

Mr. TURRIFF. I want to ask what evidence he has that the province of Quebec would prevent the extension of Manitoba to the west? It is the people of the Territories who object to the extension of Manitoba westward.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The province of Quebec made the statement here through one of its members that they helped to pay for that land in the west, and they have as much to say about it as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff).

Mr. INGRAM. Which land?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I am not going to discuss private ownership of land in this House. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have made it clear——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh ; where ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The hon. gentlemen opposite like to throw out their gibes and their flounts, but it is clear that if the province of Manitoba had been extended westward, even if it were only one meridian, it would have knocked the constitutional argument of the Prime Minister into a cocked hat. And if Manitoba were extended westward, that portion included in it would be free from this separate school clause. Now, then, I want to deal with the solid Quebec and what they are doing in regard to this school question. This is a question that never should have come into this House. It is a local question which could be settled in a local way, and which should not be spread out in the Dominion parliament as a federal issue. It should have been settled in the province ; it should have been left to the west.

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I do not think the hon. gentleman should discuss the Bill which is now engaging the attention of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that is the rule.

Mr. BENNETT. Take it up to Centre Toronto.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Then I have this to say, that this Bill which is the subject of discussion here to-day——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If hon. gentlemen will have it that way, I will leave it with them ; but I have this to say in conclusion, that any legislation which is attempted in this House in regard to this matter will receive whatever opposition I can command, and the opposition of a considerable number of the members from Ontario. The right hon. gentleman is near the exhaustion of his supplies, and, so far as I am concerned, I wish to tell him now that no legislation of the character that he has introduced without consulting the people of the west will be allowed to go through committee or any other stage as long as I am able to oppose it, with some others who will be associated with me in that work. This legislation is not in the interest of the people of Canada. There will be meetings held in this country from one end to the other.

An hon. MEMBER. Hold them now.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. All right. Hon. gentlemen may make these statements here ; but let them come out on the platform with me, and see who will get a hearing. Let the right hon. gentleman open a constituency in the west if he dare. Let him put up his candidate in Centre Toronto to justify the statements made here to-day. Let the Postmaster General dare to face a meeting in the city of Toronto. He dare not go even into his own constituency of North York and discuss this Bill. I will go into North York and discuss it before his own electors. I challenge him now to name the day and the place in North York where he will discuss this measure with me. Or I will resign my seat if he will resign his seat, and I will run against him in North York. Mr. Speaker, I repeat that I will resign my seat in South York and run against the Postmaster General in North York where he had a majority of nearly one thousand. And I challenge the member for London (Mr. Hyman) to resign his seat, and I will go and run against him there. I challenge my hon. friend from Centre York (Mr. Campbell) to do the same. That hon. gentleman would have been to-day in the cabinet but for this legislation ; but because of this legislation his career is absolutely wound up, and he dare not resign his seat. But if he does, I will resign mine and run against him in Centre York. Yes, I will go further : I will resign my seat, and I will run in Oxford if the government care to make a vacancy there, and I will make only the one issue, the abandonment of provincial rights by this government, which at one time professed to be the champion of provincial rights. Later on I intend to expand much more fully on this question, when I suppose I shall be more in order than I am to-day. But I do now challenge the Prime Minister and those who sit alongside of him. Where is the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) who is implicated in these statements, and who ought to be here to-day ? I expect hon. gentlemen opposite to make a statement on this matter to-morrow. I expect them to go to the Papal ablegate, who is here at their request, and get from him a statement which will clear them of the charge made to-day. The denial which has been made is no denial. It is not even an explanation to the country, which to-day is demanding that an answer be made to the statement made in that letter of Mr. Rogers and no answer is forthcoming. The people want to know if those two propositions were submitted to the Minister of Public Works of Manitoba. The people want to know if there was a reference in that interview to the question of the Manitoba boundaries ; and, if it is true, they want to know what the government of Canada intend to do. We know what President Cleveland did with the British ambassador. The moment he was trapped into making a statement which he should not have made, President Cleveland gave him his passport. I say that the right hon. gentleman, as a member of the Dominion government, and the forty members of parliament who were associated with him, are bound to send Mr. Russell to Rome, even at the expense of the Dominion, to ask for the recall of this Italian priest who has had the temerity to interfere with

the government of this country. Hon. gentlemen may laugh; but we all know what King John said—and let me tell these hon. gentlemen that this is my sentiment—that 'no Italian priest shall tithe or toll in our dominions.' Now, there is a proposal to toll and tithe in our dominions by an outside influence. The Prime Minister knows that his statement was not in accordance with the facts when he said that there was no intention to interfere with the Dominion school lands. There is practically an intention to interfere with the Dominion school lands, and there is a proposition to toll and tithe in our domains by an outside influence. I leave hon. gentlemen to explain this matter before the country. They have not explained it to-day; I do not believe they can explain it. I challenge them to attempt to explain it before this House. I challenge them to come out on the public platform and try to explain the statements that have been made here to-day.

Mr. H. H. MILLER. The hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has to-day quoted Shakespeare. I would like to remind him of another quotation, the words of one Shakespearian character to another:

Get thee glass eyes, and, like a scurvy politician,
Seem to see the things thou dost not.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker: I rise to a point of order. I thought, when you were so earnest in the discharge of your duty to protect the good name of members of this House, that the same earnestness would have characterized your conduct towards the hon. gentleman who has referred to me.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman had heard distinctly, he would have heard me call that hon. gentleman to order also.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Then I must ask the hon. the Speaker to call on the hon. member to withdraw the statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. SPEAKER. I call on the hon. member who applied the term 'scurvy politician' to the hon. member for South York to withdraw the term.

Mr. MILLER. I beg to explain that I made no accusation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. MILLER. I beg to withdraw the quotation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of following the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) through the rambling speech which we have just heard. I desire simply to ask hon. gentlemen opposite if they really intend to fasten on the parliament of Canada such a reputation that in any civilized country we would be looked upon as not worthy of enjoying liberty of speech and representative institutions. In Russia where there is no such thing as representative government, no sane, no decent man would think of getting up before any audience of peasants, deprived of the most primary education, and make such an onslaught on the representative of His Holiness the Pope as has been made in this House. Why, all the civilized nations of the world entertain relations with the head of the Catholic church. The Protestant government of England entertains direct and official relations with the Pope. The Protestant government of Germany, the Orthodox government of Russia—in fact all the governments of the world, including the government of Washington, entertain official relations with the Pope, and no citizen of any one of these countries would think for a moment that it was any discredit to his country that it should hold relations with the highest moral authority acknowledged by the greatest number of men in this world at present. The hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has challenged the Postmaster General and other members of this government and of parliament to go and make an election in their respective counties and to meet him on the public platform. But on what ground, Sir, does he invite them to make the election? On the ground of provincial rights. He had not even the courage to say what really was the ground on which he wanted to make the contest. If he had stated the true grounds on which he would care to run an election, he would have stated grounds which might have been of some use in England 300 years ago but would not be tolerated in any civilized country to-day—the ground of no popery and no romish domination. That is the cry the hon. gentleman would like to raise. And that is the kind of cry, as things have been going, the past few weeks, which the leader of the opposition will be charged with encouraging. That is the cry which the leader of a once respected party in the Dominion is lending himself to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am charged with that perhaps by the hon. gentleman but I absolutely deny that anything of the kind can be taken from any word I have spoken.

Mr. BOURASSA. The leader of the opposition has got into this unfortunate position that he is not even capable of either standing for or against anything which is going on in his party. He will not be charged with being the direct author or promoter of all the offensive and silly things which are being stated in the organs of his party and by some members of his party, but he will be charged with not having the courage and the manliness of standing up

and denouncing such an infamous policy. And at a moment like this, when such appeals are being made to the worst passions of the people, the leaders of great parties who have not the courage to stand up against this current of opinion and check the fanaticism of their partisans, are as responsible as if they were the authors of them. Let the hon. the leader of the opposition consult some of his best and most enlightened friends. Let him have a conversation upon this question—I will not say with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) or the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), who have shown by their speeches that they had the courage to separate from their party upon a question like this and stand for truth and justice and fair-play—but I will say to the leader of the opposition : let him consult the most enlightened Protestant members of his party, those men who have been educated in the political school of the late Sir John Macdonald, and ask them if the Conservative party is following a wise and a good course in allowing itself to be dragged down to such depths of political infamy, as it is being dragged into by the Toronto 'News' and the Toronto 'World,' and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the member for South York and the member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes). These gentlemen may meet with some success for a little while ; but as a French Canadian, who has gone time and again into the province of Ontario, I have too much respect for the good people of that province to think that even if they may get excited a little while by such wild appeals, they will stand for any such policy. The member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has defied any member of the government to go and meet him on the public platform in the province of Ontario. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am ready to accept that challenge. I am ready to meet the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) or the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) or even the hon. and gallant member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) even with his man Turpin behind him—I am ready to go and discuss the issue with these gentlemen before any audience in the province of Ontario. I do not say that I would gather votes ; but I say that if any man in this House, whether French or English-speaking, Protestant or Catholic, Liberal or Conservative, would go and appeal to the common sense and spirit of fair-play of the people of Ontario he would, if not gain votes, at least get a good hearing. And I do not hesitate to say that in the long run, when the heat of passion had subsided, he might even ask for some votes on such a ground.

As regards the propriety and the advisability of the presence of a Papal delegate in this country, I need not speak at length. I need only mention, as I have done, that all governments of civilized nations entertain direct official relations with the Pope. My hon. friend the Postmaster General has said that this government had nothing to do with the appointment of the Papal delegate. As a matter of fact that is perfectly true. But even if the government of Canada had requested the Pope to send a delegate to this country, would that be a greater sin than is committed by other governments at Washington, Berlin, St. Petersburg, Vienna ? Even the present anti-clerical French government at Paris, though the official relations have been broken off, keep relations with an unofficial representative of the Holy See.

An hon. MEMBER. And in London.

Mr. BOURASSA. No, I do not think there is an official ablegate in London. But I understand there is an accredited representative of His Holiness there who keeps up relations between the British government and the head of the church. But the talents of the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) have been wasted. He should have gone to the old country some years ago, when, through the representative of the British government in Rome—not the representative accredited to the King of Italy but the representative accredited to the Pope—the British government entered into negotiations with His Holiness in order to bring about a better understanding between the Irish party and the government of England. Even in that small section of the British empire from which, if I know anything of their origin, my hon. friends from South York and Victoria and Haliburton come, there arose no cry of dissent to that proceeding. Even the Ulster Orangemen were not prepared to find any fault if, through the pacifying influence of His Holiness, the Irish people could be brought to a better understanding with the King of England. My hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) at the beginning of the session made a plea for greater autonomy for Canada. Sir, the people of Canada would not be worthy of greater autonomy if one great political party of this country, which once held the reins of the government for years and which may again occupy office, has no better understanding of what constitutes the dignity of a nation, no better appreciation of the feelings of two millions of their fellow-citizens, and no better sense of the manner in which a respectable government should conduct the business of a self-reliant and self-respecting people, especially in their relations with foreign powers. And if the government of the Pope was for a time a foreign government from a temporal point of view, it is to-day no longer a temporal government but only a high moral government, guiding the spiritual affairs of 300,000,000 of human beings, among which are 12,000,000 respectable, law-abiding British subjects, including 2,000,000 Canadians of different origins. It is unworthy of mem-

bers of this House, of representatives of a great party, and representatives of a great province such as the province of Ontario, to come here and by means of innuendoes and insinuations and accusations which they have not the courage to make openly from their seats in parliament, to try and excite religious strife. I say they dare not make these openly because when you pin them down to the crucial point, they say: Oh yes, you are ruled by the Pope, and you are under French domination, but what we are ready to discuss in this House is provincial rights and constitutional principles. They are prepared to lead the people of Ontario to vote for provincial rights, but to do so animated by anti-Popish, anti-French feelings.

With reference to the request made by the Catholic members of the Liberal party to the Pope for the nomination of a Papal ablegate, I have no shame in saying that I have taken my share in that action; I have signed the document, and I have no shame either as a French Canadian, a Catholic, a British subject, or a member of this House, for so doing. Sir, knowing and appreciating as I do the liberty I enjoy as a British subject, under the British Crown, I was proud to ask the highest moral authority of the church to which I belong to send here a Papal ablegate who would see that good and proper relations existed between the clergy and laity of Quebec, to see that relations between the clergy and laity would be such that there would not be any cause of misunderstanding such as those which occurred at certain times in the past. The cause which induced the Liberal Catholic members of this House to seek the appointment of an ablegate here was that we could not see eye to eye with a certain part of our clergy as to the right way of dealing with certain political questions. And, Sir, in that respect I want to remind the House of the words of one of the greatest Protestant writers and philosophers of the nineteenth century, who has said that the Catholic church was a great school of respect. Appealing to the head of the church, we found justice, enlightenment, breadth of view and respect for the rights of the people. At one time or another there was trouble between the clergy and people of Quebec. Hon. gentlemen opposite are always talking about the priest-ridden people of Quebec, about the clerical domination under which the poor habitant is resting; but, Sir, do you know that we never stood from our clergy the kind of sermons and political interference that has been going on for the last month in Ontario? For what reason did we ask the Pope to send an ablegate out here? Exactly to prevent what is going on now in the province of Ontario. And this was not the first time that an ablegate was sent to Canada. The same thing was done in 1876 and later on in the 80's. But how was it in those days? The arch-defenders of British citizenship and of loyalty to Protestantism never raised their voices against the relations which existed between the Catholics of the province of Quebec and the Pope. Why? Because of political reasons; because in those days the people of Quebec and the majority of the Catholic people kept them in the fats of office. Sir, I am sorry to see that a question which is put on this high ground of national feeling and fidelity to religious principle must after all be brought to that very low placed feeling of a thirst for office. These gentlemen, having found that their fiscal policy was of no influence with the people, that the country had no confidence in them, thought that there was in this country a sufficient number of people who would still believe in the old tales about the Gunpowder Plot, the Guy Fawkes conspiracy, and other matters that were taught 150 years ago, but which the poorest schoolmaster in England would be ashamed of mentioning, except possibly as the remnant of a legend which existed in the times of credulity in that country. That may appear to be exaggerated. But not later than a few days ago I read in a newspaper that proposes to enlighten the people of Canada, a statement to the effect that the same conspiracy, the same dark and sinister organization and the same powerful people who are now trying to shackle the people of the west, that same power of the province of Quebec, headed by the hierarchy that was trying to prevent the free people of the west from enjoying their liberty, could be related to the same man, to the same power and the same influences that brought about the Gunpowder conspiracy! I have seen that statement printed in the columns of either the 'News' or the 'World,' because these two papers constitute a pair, and I cannot say which is the silliest. But, Sir, even when I read such things, printed in the twentieth century, in leading newspapers, published in a city like Toronto, and in a province like Ontario, I refuse to believe that you would find a majority of the people of Ontario who would believe such silly talk. I cannot believe it, and I must say that the member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), in the allusions he has made to-day, just as in the cartoons which are published every day in his newspaper, is simply putting on his province the greatest slur that could be cast on it by any man. Sir, if I would stand up in this House and say that the province of Ontario is filled with a population of ignorant people, with a drown-trodden people under the control of the Methodist ministers, by which you could organize any kind of conspiracy to deprive the Catholic church of their power, to unthrone the Pope and prevent the priests of the province of Quebec from saying mass, I would not be saying more silly things than you read every day in three or four columns of the 'World'

or the 'News.' These newspapers are trying to create outside of Ontario the impression that Ontario is one of the most ignorant places on earth. I refuse to believe that. I refuse to believe that a majority of the people of Ontario can be carried by such an appeal. If any constituency in Ontario should be opened, I would be prepared to enter it, and unless the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), and the hon. member for Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes), with his man Turpin and the seventeen men who took General de Villiers and let him skip off the next morning—unless these two gentlemen would come together and throw stones at me, I do not think I would be prevented from speaking in Ontario, standing for the rights of my people, for the rights of justice in this country; standing for the good reputation of our country, and saying that it is just as legitimate for the Catholics to have here a representative of the highest spiritual authority on earth, as it is legitimate for the government of any civilized country to have a representative of the Pope, to have an ablegate to look after what? Not to look after political questions, but to look after the interests of the church. And what are the interests of the church in any country? The interests of the church include everything which looks to the development of the religion to which that church belongs and all such things must be looked after by that Papal ablegate.

I know nothing of what may have occurred between Monseigneur Sbarretti and Mr. Rogers, and I think it is most absurd to come into this House and ask any member of the federal House to give an account of what may have occurred between the Papal ablegate and a member of the Manitoba cabinet. If the hon. member for South York was so excited over the liberties of the people of Canada, he should have had some friend in the Manitoba house to raise the question and put Mr. Rogers on trial in Manitoba, before the people of that province, to whom he is responsible. If, Sir, it is such a nasty thing for the Catholics to have called for an ablegate to come into this country to look after their own affairs, after their own interests as Catholics, how is it that the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has nothing to say against Mr. Rogers, a Protestant statesman, who comes here and entertains relations with Monseigneur Sbarretti? If it was a sin, and a sin for which any man in this House should be arraigned before the people of Canada, if it was a sin for Sir Wilfrid Laurier, for Mr. Brodeur, for Mr. Lemieux, for Mr. Bourassa, or any other hon. gentleman in this House to ask the Pope to send a representative to look after their own affairs, then what a crime has been committed by a member of the Manitoba government and of the legislative assembly of Manitoba, by a Protestant statesman, in having an interview with Monseigneur Sbarretti? I do not suppose that Mr. Rogers was troubled in his conscience and wanted to get absolution for his sins. So I presume that he visited His Excellency, acting in his official and political capacity. Therefore, if anybody must be denounced before the Protestantism of this country, if anybody must be denounced before the crowds of the county of South York, and must be burned or brought to the scaffold, it is Mr. Rogers, member of the Manitoba government. But, Sir, no, I would never think of making that kind of appeal; I acknowledge Mr. Rogers' right to go and meet Monseigneur Sbarretti and have a conversation with him. If the member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) and the member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam Hughes), would go and see Monseigneur Sbarretti and talk with him, I think it would do them a great deal of good—if any improvement is possible for those gentlemen—I am sure it would do them good. As for the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), I do not think any improvement is possible with him, because I think he is desperately sincere.

But, coming back to our action in having a Papal ablegate to be appointed, we did it because we thought it was our duty to do it. Monseigneur Sbarretti has succeeded Monseigneur Falconio in the same capacity that Monseigneur Martinelli exercised at Washington where he has been succeeded by Monseigneur Falconio transferred from Ottawa. These prelates have been here representing the church, to look after the interests of the Roman Catholics of Canada. As I have said, I know nothing of what passed between Mr. Rogers and Monseigneur Sbarretti, and I would advise the hon. member for South York to call on them if he wants to know what transpired between them. But suppose that Monseigneur Sbarretti did discuss with Mr. Rogers the rights of the Catholics of Manitoba, suppose he did ask Mr. Rogers to do something for the Catholics of Manitoba, where in the name of justice and common sense is there anything wrong in that? Here is a dignitary of the Roman Catholic Church, sent here to look after the interests of the people belonging to his church, and what harm is there in his meeting another gentleman and asking him if something could not be done for the interests of his people? Now, we have in this city a consul from the United States, he is here to look after the interests of the American people living in this country and the interests of American citizens who may be trading in this country; suppose he finds something in our tariff which he thinks is prejudicial to their interests, would it be a great sin for that gentleman to meet the Minister of Trade and Commerce and ask if some change could not be made? Sir, it is about time that we should look at these questions from a common sense point of

view, and with greater breadth of mind. Monseigneur Sbarretti, in discussing with Mr. Rogers the interests of the Catholics of Manitoba, was not only acting within his rights, but was fulfilling his duty. As I said, I have not the slightest knowledge of what took place between them; but the idea of hon. gentlemen getting up in this House and talking about a conspiracy of the hierarchy, about the dark and sinister designs of the church, because a member of the local legislature of Manitoba has thought fit to hold an interview with the representative of the highest spiritual power in our church, I say that it is entirely unworthy of the dignity of a member of this House and the representative of a free people.

Hon. PETER WHITE (North Renfrew). I am sure that if the object of my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) was to raise this discussion out of the rut into which he says it has fallen, the region of race and religion he has signally failed in doing so; because during all the long years in which I have sat in parliament I do not think I ever listened to a more inflammatory speech than that to which the hon. member for Labelle has just treated this House. For my own part, speaking as a Protestant and as a representative of an Ontario constituency, I have to say, and I think the House will agree with me, that I have not the slightest objection to the bringing of a Papal delegate here to superintend the religious affairs of the Church of Rome. For my own part I have a great admiration for the moral teaching of the Church of Rome, although I do not believe in its tenets. But I do say as a citizen of this country that when the allegation is made that the Papal delegate, who comes here properly enough to fulfil the purpose for which he was brought—though the manner in which he was brought might not be acceptable to many of us who sit on this side of the House—though he came here properly enough to supervise the affairs of the church of which he is a distinguished dignitary; but I say that when it is alleged by the newspapers and by a leading member of the government of Manitoba, that that gentleman has interfered in a matter that does not belong to the domain of the Church of Rome at all, then I say that the people of this country, and at all events those of us who sit on this side of the House, have a right to complain. Now, Sir, what are the facts in relation to this matter? I am not here to relate the facts, because I do not know them. I accept to the fullest extent the statement made by the right hon. leader of the government that he had no knowledge of these negotiations going on between the Papal delegate and the representatives of the province of Manitoba; but I say that if these negotiations did go on according to the allegation that has been made, then Monseigneur Sbarretti ought not to remain in this country a single hour longer than those gentlemen who secured his presence here can manage to effect his recall by communicating with his superior in Rome. I think it is their duty, it is the duty of those forty members of this parliament who secured his presence here, and especially is it the duty of the leader of the government, at the earliest possible moment, at once to communicate with the head of the church in Rome and secure the recall of that gentleman—if, I say, it be proven that these allegations made with regard to him are true.

Now, Sir, I want to say one word with reference to a statement made by the hon. member for Labelle respecting the hon. leader of the opposition. The hon. member for Labelle said that the hon. leader of the opposition had no opinions of his own, that his opinions were simply moulded by those who were following him in this House. I think, Sir, it ill becomes any supporter of the right hon. leader of this government to make a statement of that kind with regard to the leader of the opposition, when we know as a matter of fact, from the mouth of the right hon. gentleman the leader of the government himself, that his policy with regard to those important Bills which are now under discussion, was changed and modified to a material degree by the pressure of his followers in this House. Sir, I am sorry that I have been obliged to rise upon a question of this kind. But I thought it my duty to do so, and I consider I hold moderate views both political and religious. I have no objection to any man's political or religious views, but I do think that it is an unfortunate thing that an hon. gentleman like the hon. member for Labelle should take the course which he has taken here to-day and that he should accuse hon. gentlemen on this side of the House of endeavouring to inflame the public mind in this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. WHITE. I hear some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House laugh. What was the object which my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) had in making the proposition that he made to hon. gentlemen opposite? He had a right to call in question the conditions that exist upon the other side of the House. He had a right to express his opinion that the failure of the right hon. the leader of the government in filling the vacancy in the portfolio of the Interior and in filling the position which has practically been vacant in the Public Works Department and he had the right to assume that the failure of the right hon. the leader of the government to fill these positions was because he feared public opinion in the country. It was, I assume, because he took the ground that the right hon. the leader of the government fears to open any constituency in the province of Ontario, or in any of the English speaking provinces at the present time,

that my hon. friend made the challenge that he did make to hon. members on the other side of the House. As I stated a moment ago, I am loth to discuss a question of this kind. I have no desire whatever to discuss a question which raises distinctions of creed or nationality. I think we ought to be as one people throughout this country and I may say this for the province of Ontario to which I belong that whatever may be the opinions of our hon. friends from the province of Quebec they will find as much liberality and toleration in Ontario as can be found in any part of the world.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to say anything on this subject just now, but for the frequent references to myself by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). They were very pointed. Whether he considered them offensive or not, to my judgment, they were offensive, and they were uncalled for and nothing on my part, as far as my judgment enables me to determine, would justify the references which the hon. gentleman made to me. He started out by asking a very significent question : Are we like the serfs of Russia that we have not freedom of speech in this House ? Are we ? The exhibition we had for the following twenty minutes is the best answer I can give to that question, because, if there ever was in any civilized country in the world, a desire to restrict freedom of speech the tirades to which he has treated this House, ought to have induced this House not to have listened to him. Now, the hon. gentleman went on to say that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and his party are opposing the Pope. What justification had he for that statement ? What word was ever said from this side of the House that would justify that statement ? Not a single word that I have heard and none that I am aware of. But, he says that we are opposing his church. Was there anything said in the shape of abuse of his church ? There is no desire or intention to abuse his church, but our desire is to give that church its rights the same as every other church in the country and to respect its rights as much as we respect the rights of every other church. Then, the hon. gentleman said : Has not every civilized government in the world its Papal representative, its ambassador ? He asks the question which I can answer by telling him that there is not one in France to-day. Diplomatic relations have been broken off. Then, why should the hon. member for Labell stand up and say that we are worse than France, that we are worse than England and that we are worse than other countries ? I could point to many countries, even Italy itself, in which diplomatic relations do not exist between the Pope and the government. Do they exist in the United States ? Not at all. There is, it is true, a Papal representative, but to deal with the church, not to negotiate with the state, and he has no relationship with the government of the United States and does not pretend to exercise any authority over, or to assume the right to dictate or to negotiate with the government in regard to matters of state. So that, in no civilized country that he has mentioned is there a condition known to exist which the hon. gentleman claims is all right in this country. There are a few questions which I think you might reasonably ask. We know that there is a Papal delegate here. That is a self evident fact, but we might ask the question : Who brought him here ? Some one has stated that it was the present government. Well, I think that was too wide ; I would say that the Reform party brought him here. The right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) does not deny that he was one of the forty who sent an application to the Pope to send a delegate here. We are not objecting to it and do not object to it if he confines his duties to the work that the right hon. gentleman told us was the work for which he was brought here. What was he brought here for ? What did he come for ? The right hon. gentleman has told us what he came for. There was a difference between us and the bishops of our church and it was to settle disputes between the Roman Catholic people and their clergy. If he confines his operations to that I say we have no reasonable ground for complaint. He has a right to be here and remain in this country just as long as he likes and so far as he can succeed in readjusting the differences between the Roman Catholic people and their bishops it is nothing that concerns us and we do not desire to interfere with him in any way. Has he confined his operations to that line ? This is the first time in the history of Canada that we have had such an ablegate. Commencing with Monseigneur Mery Del Val, the hon. member for Labelle stated that we have had several of them before. I believe there was one away back in the eighties but it was scarcely found out he was in the country until he was out of the country. The hon. member for Labelle does not wait to hear any criticism that may be made of his remarks or to answer any questions that may be asked of him. We know that he is a remarkably valiant man and that he displays a great deal of that peculiar grace which is indicative of courage. But he seems always to exemplify the old saying that :

He who fights and runs away
May live to fight another day,

for every time he finishes speaking he gets up and clears from the House. He has not the moral courage to sit there and listen to the replies to his tirades or answer the questions that may be asked him. Therefore, he ought to be the last one to talk about a lack of courage. But, what are the

duties of this Papal delegate? We were told that his duties were to settle differences between the Roman Catholic people and the church and as long as he confines himself to those duties we have no complaint to make. It is a fact well known in this country that in 1896 there was a difference between the present Reform party, or at least one portion of that party, the Roman Catholic element of the party, and the bishops in regard to the school question and it was said that the Papal delegate was brought here for the purpose of settling that difficulty. So long as he attempted to settle that difficulty you heard no complaint from any Protestant in this country as to what he was doing and no complaint that he was here. But, is he confining himself to the interests of the church? The hon. member for Labelle says that he has a perfect right in the interests of his church and of his co-religionists to take part in anything which is going on and in which that church is directly interested. In my judgment he has no right to go the distance that it is alleged he has gone. Now, it is said sometimes, and I think correctly said, that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

The history of the ages has taught that lesson over and over again, and the maxim is as true to-day as when it was first announced. The complete separation of church and state is another principle recognized in the history of the English parliament long ago. That principle was adopted in constitutional government, and we are trying to live up to it and we desire to carry it out to the fullest extent. When we took the clergy reserve lands from the church and distributed them for the benefit of the state we asserted that principle because we desired there should be no semblance of connection between church and state. We declared that every church should stand on its own footing and we have lived up to that according to the best of our judgment. But as I said, eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and when we see any encroachment on that principle we are bound to draw attention to it in the interests of our constitutional rights and in the interest of our constituents. That is what we are doing to-day. Since the settlement of the clergy reserve lands we have not had that question up until to-day, when it comes forward again in a different way in connection with the presence of the Papal ablegate here. We fought against the contention of the church in 1896, because we believed it was the church that was making the fight against the rights of the people of Manitoba. The Prime Minister and his friends joined with us in that fight, and I stood up here day after day and night after night to defend the rights of the people against improper interference. I am glad to know I had the assistance and support of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his friends in that fight. With his sunny ways and his diplomatic ability he succeeded in arranging that trouble and bringing about conciliation and harmony where they did not exist before. But it was out of that incident that grew the troubles which induced him to bring this Papal delegate here. Is there not to-day interference by the church with the rights of the state? Can we believe what appears in the newspapers of this city from day to day, that every time there has been a crisis in connection with this Bill the Prime Minister has visited that Papal delegate and every change that has been made has been made with his knowledge and on his advice. We are told that the Bill was submitted to him and that the Bill was satisfactory to him or otherwise it would not have been introduced into this House. Then there is the strange coincidence that on the 13th of February, the Manitoba delegates were invited down here to consider the question of extending the boundaries of Manitoba; on the 16th they reached here; on the 17th they had a conference with the Prime Minister who asked them to remain four or five days when they would get an intimation as to the position of the government. They remained in obedience to that request and though he said he denied certain statements categorically and in toto he did not as a matter of fact deny some of them categorically. He does not deny that he asked Mr. Rogers to remain here. And what happened. On the 17th of February they had a conference, on the 20th they were invited by the Papal delegate to visit him, and on the 21st the Bill was introduced. I noticed the Minister of Agriculture coaching the member for Labelle to draw attention to the fact that Mr. Robert Rogers and Mr. Colin Campbell were with the Papal delegate trying to negotiate with him. But, Sir, they were there in answer to a respectful invitation to visit him. Did they not show respect for the high position he occupied? Did they not show the ordinary courtesy which one man would show to another when they accepted that invitation and went there not knowing the purpose for which they were invited. He told them that if they would amend their law and give separate schools to Manitoba, they could have the boundary question settled at once, but they would not agree to that and the Bill was introduced the very next day. The Prime Minister said nothing about the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba when he introduced the Bill, except to say that it could not be done, and he did not deign the courtesy of a reply to the Manitoba delegates. The Prime Minister has told us that he did not remember receiving a letter from the Manitoba delegates written on the 23rd of February asking for a reply, and it turns out that that letter was sent to the Prime Minister's house. I will not say that his letter reached the hands of the Prime Minister because it may never have reached his hands, but at all events it verifies the state-

ment made by Mr. Robert Rogers, that from that day to this they have never received the reply they believed they were entitled to. Was that the way to treat the accredited representatives of the Manitoba government? Is that complimentary to the dignity of the Prime Minister of this federal parliament of his ministers. It is not. I assume that the statements made in the newspaper is correct because the First Minister did not deny it, and the next step was that there was an invitation to the premier of Ontario to set up a claim for a portion of that territory.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I deny it now. I never wrote to Mr. Whitney.

Mr. SPROULE. I inferred from what appeared in the paper that by some means or other there was an intimation conveyed to Mr. Whitney that it was desired that he should put up some claim. At all events the suggestion was made in the speech of the Prime Minister, and I have no doubt he had friends enough to bring that to the attention of Mr. Whitney. At all events, Ontario set up a claim and this government took advantage of that to say: We cannot settle the boundary of Manitoba because Ontario has set up a claim to that territory. Why did the First Minister say that a settlement could only be reached after a conference between Quebec, Ontario and Manitoba? What interest had Quebec in it; it did not touch the boundaries of that province in any way. However, the Prime Minister since abandoned that contention. We do find however, that according to the statement of Mr. Robert Rogers, the boundaries of Manitoba are not extended because Manitoba will not grant separate schools; and we find that the provisions of the Bill which were submitted to that ablegate—if we can believe what appears in the press, fasten separate schools on these new provinces for all time to come. That Bill was only accepted by the members from the west when some amendments were proposed, which amendments were submitted to the Papal delegate and approved of by him before they were submitted to parliament.

Then I ask is this Papal ablegate going beyond his duty? Is he interfering with the rights of the state? In my judgment he is. So long as he confines himself to the rights of his church, we have not a word to say against him; but we respectfully deny the right of any dignitary representing that church, for which we have the greatest respect, or representing any other church, to come here and interfere with the rights of the state. In the name of this country we protest against it; in the name of constitutional government, which we represent, we protest against it. Who has been responsible for this unprecedented act? The present government and their friends of the Reform party. They brought him here, and they have not put a single check upon him, so far as we know. I need not go into the history of his being here; but I want to ask one very important question. When all these negotiations were going on with regard to this Bill and when the knowledge that the Papal ablegate was taking a particular interest in it was so apparent, where were the Protestant members of the cabinet? Where was the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) who took such an interest in the subject the other night? Where was the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who made such a pitiable excuse for the Bill, and declared that government could not be carried on in this country if it were defeated, because there would have to be a Protestant government formed? Where was the lynx-eyed Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock), the only Protestant representative on that subcommittee to which the Bill was submitted? Where is there any evidence that he lodged any protest against the improper interference of the Papal ablegate? Where was the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright)? And, lastly, where was the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), who fought so vigorously before against interference with the rights of Manitoba? It is true, he lodged his protest against the government and went out as a rebuke to them for their improper conduct; but to day he is silenced, he is chloroformed. And the other ministers seem to be chloroformed, for we have not a word from them. Who among them represents the great Protestant element of this country? You can speak freely on behalf of the other side; but if you raise your voice as a Protestant, it would seem as if you were almost a fugitive from justice. That is the kind of toleration that we are treated to in this House. It is toleration all on one side, with no evidence of any on the other side. Let us have a little more of it on that side. Let charity begin at home. Let our Roman Catholic friends show some charity and tolerance towards those opposed to them, and then they will have very much less trouble in this country. I do not wish to continue this discussion longer, but I did wish to say, and I repeat it, that we are to-day as firmly opposed to church interference with the state as we ever were in this country. It must come to an end, and it must come to an end now. What is the logical sequence of all this? It is admitted, and the circumstances justify the conclusion, that Manitoba's boundary is not extended because of the interference of the Papal ablegate. There is no doubt about it whatever. Then, let the government say that as a protest against that interference they will extend the boundary of Manitoba, and hereby show that the state is the supreme arbiter in this country, and the province of Manitoba will get its rights. Until that is done, there will be a lingering suspicion in the minds of the Canadian people that the

Papal ablegate did interfere, not only with that question, but with the other important question that is engaging the attention of parliament at the present time, the question of granting autonomy to the new provinces in the Northwest, and the educational clauses in connection therewith.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I rise on a personal matter. The hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) was this afternoon called to order on a certain point. After some hesitation, he obeyed the ruling of the chair and proceeded with the discussion, when the hon. gentlemen behind the First Minister, who are a little too prone to make unseemly interruptions, not only to the hon. member for South York but to other members of this House interrupted the hon. gentleman. He paused, when I said to him: 'Don't let them bluff you,' I take the responsibility of the words I used, and I was justified in saying what I did. My remark had no reference to the Speaker, and I protest against being called to order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The words as I distinctly heard them were: 'Don't let him bluff you.' If the hon. member now says that his reference was not to the Speaker, I accept his statement; but at the time it was perfectly clear to me that the reference was to myself. I desire also to say that interruptions are becoming a little too frequent, not only from the side referred to by the hon. gentleman, but also from the hon. gentleman's own side, and from himself.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The only interruption I made to-day was perfectly legitimate and within my right, and therefore I must protest against being called to order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have accepted the hon. gentleman's statement. The only point is that the hon. gentleman should have called the attention of the House to that at the moment.

Motion agreed to.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 45) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada—Mr. Macdonald.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). There will appear on the order paper to-morrow a Bill to amend the General Railway Act and enable the government to take running rights over the Canada Atlantic from Parry Sound to Coteau—in fact over the lines controlled by the Canada Atlantic to-day, and known as the Canada Atlantic system, and also over the Grand Trunk Railway from Coteau to its terminus at Montreal. The compensation is to be fixed by the Railway Commission and also the regulations for running the Intercolonial Railway trains. It is proposed that the rates between Montreal and Parry Sound will be subject to the control of that Commission, but that Commission will not control the rates over the Intercolonial Railway from Montreal east. The right to use the terminals and also construct its own terminals at Parry Sound will be given to the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Might I ask the hon. minister if it is the intention to have the Intercolonial Railway compete with the other railways and accept freight at Georgian bay ports?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Intercolonial will have running rights and control its own trains, subject to the order and direction of the Railway Commission.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is it the policy of the government to go into the transportation business by means of the Intercolonial Railway and accept freight at the Georgian bay terminal of the Canada Atlantic?

Mr. EMMERSON. It will be the policy of the government to use this portion of the line together with the present system, taking freight from the lakes to Canadian seaboard at Montreal, Quebec, Halifax, St. John and possibly Sydney.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is it the policy of of the government to take similar rights for the Canadian Northern over the Canada Atlantic portion of the Grand Trunk Railway?

Mr. EMMERSON. This Bill has nothing to do with the Canadian Northern.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What are the terms upon which the hon. gentleman proposes to acquire the running rights?

Mr. EMMERSON. The compensation is to be fixed by the Railway Commission. The tariff from Parry Sound to Montreal will be subject to the Railway Commission, but it is not proposed to place the present system of the Intercolonial Railway under the control of that commission.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it the intention to operate a through line from Parry Sound to Halifax or St. John, as the case may be?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, to run Intercolonial trains right through.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the Railway Act is to apply to the portion between Parry Sound and Montreal, how are through rates to be fixed from Parry Sound to Halifax and St. John?

Mr. EMMERSON. The through rates will not be subject to the Railway Commission but be regulated as the rates on the Intercolonial Railway are at present. The Railway Commission will only have control over the rates from Parry Sound to Montreal. We give the Railway Commission control over that portion because it comes into competition with other lines running over the same system.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, I suppose there is competition from Montreal to Halifax and St. John at the present time between the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. Not over the same track.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Between the same termini; and I do not see that their using the same track really affects the principle.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think it does.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can make that clear to us, but for the moment I cannot understand it. If you have one route from Montreal which reaches St. John by the Intercolonial Railway and another route which reaches from St. John to Montreal by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and they are competing; and if it is a good principle where there is competition with the government road that the Railway Commission should have jurisdiction, I would think that it would logically follow, necessarily follow, that the Railway Commission should have jurisdiction over the Intercolonial Railway. I should think that would be an exact deduction from the hon. gentleman's premises, not only a logical deduction, but a necessary deduction. That is a matter for some discussion perhaps. What I do not understand in the hon. gentleman's statement is this: How can we operate from Parry Sound to Halifax or St. John as a through line—and apparently it is only with through traffic we are dealing; the hon. gentleman has not explained that we are to do local business on the line between Montreal and Parry Sound—I am dealing now only with through rates, and I do not yet understand, notwithstanding the hon. gentleman's explanation, how it is that for a portion of that through route the Railway Commission, under the Railway Act, shall have jurisdiction and over the rest of the line it shall not have jurisdiction. Of course, I quite understand that so far as the operation of trains is concerned, there might be jurisdiction of the Railway Commission over one part and not over another part, but it is not over trains and over the operation of the road alone that the Railway Commission exercises its jurisdiction. It also exercises jurisdiction as to rates and as to a great many other matters. What I am trying to ascertain from my hon. friend is how the Railway Commission is to act in the fixing of a through rate from Parry Sound to Halifax or St. John, when it has jurisdiction only over a part of the line. The hon. gentleman will, of course, remember that the Railway Commission has not only the right to fix a maximum rate, but has a right also to fix a minimum rate. The hon. gentleman says that the government will fix the rate. Well, if the government fixes the rate the Railway Commission cannot. There would be two inconsistent jurisdictions. Suppose, for example, the Railway Commission fixes a minimum rate from Parry Sound to Halifax or St. John over some other route, or from some point on the Georgian bay, which may be fairly compared with Parry Sound, to Halifax or St. John. How is the Railway Commission to deal with the situation if it has jurisdiction, so far as the Intercolonial is concerned, only from Parry Sound to Montreal?

Mr. EMMERSON. It would be a very anomalous position to have two railways running over the same track, one subject to the Railway Commission as to rates and the other not so subject. The through rate is now regulated to the sea-board by the Railway Commission and it is proportionate, in accordance with the mileage. It will be safe, and I think in all interests, to have the road as between the Georgian bay and Montreal regulated by the commission in the same way as other railways are regulated. The government, which controls the railway from Montreal to Halifax, St. John and maritime points, always has had in its own hands the regulation of that rate, so that the other railways in seeking the sea-board could not take any advantage; and there would seem, to me at least, to be no good reason why we should depart from the principle which has heretofore been followed with respect to the Intercolonial Railway, that is, leaving that matter to the control of the government.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I must confess that my hon. friend has not yet made himself very clear. The Intercolonial Railway for a part of the distance between Montreal and Halifax already runs over a leased line; it is true it is only a few miles—thirty-five or forty—over the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is subject to an agreement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is under a lease.

Mr. EMMERSON. I say that is subject to a certain agreement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I know.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is on a different basis.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This will be subject to a certain agreement also, which is to be made between the government and the Canada Atlantic Railway. My hon. friend seeks to differentiate the case on this new ground.

I point out to him that where the Intercolonial Railway is running over that leased line, it is not subject to the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission, and therefore the analogy which he seeks to establish does not seem to hold good. I still do not understand how the Railway Commission is to exercise jurisdiction over the through rates from Parry Sound to Halifax or St. John, and yet have jurisdiction, according to the hon. gentleman's statement, only over that portion of the line from Parry Sound to Montreal. My hon. friend says that the reason why the government proposes to make this leased line—because it is in effect a leased line from Montreal to Parry Sound —subject to the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission, so far as it is operated by the Intercolonial Railway, is because there is competition over the same line by a private company, a railway company which owns that line. I pointed out to him, and I do not think he has answered it, that the question of competition does not depend upon running over the same line of rails. There is as much competition, and as strong competition, perhaps, if you have the competing line operating over different rails; so there does not seem to be any good reason, on that ground for adopting the course which he says the government is about to pursue. I must confess that it seems to me that the government proposals at the present time are in an exceedingly crude condition, or else my hon. friend has not taken the trouble to explain them very carefully to the committee.

Mr. EMMERSON. It may be my fault or it may be the hon. gentleman's fault if there is a misunderstanding. The position of the line from Ste. Rosalie junction to Montreal is very different from the one now proposed; there it is fixed in advance. The rates are apportioned under an agreement, the running of trains is all fixed, and all these things are arranged in a more definite way than could be done if it were left to the future. There is a certain fixed rental paid. The proposal with respect to the line from Montreal to Georgian bay is very different. There the two lines will come in competition, and the question of running on the tracks will be determined by the commission. That is already determined with respect to the Grand Trunk from Montreal to Ste. Rosalie. The rates should be uniform, they should be apportioned uniformly, and the Intercolonial can fix its proportion between Montreal and the sea-board without regard to the commission, and in that way it seems to me that a greater protection is given to the export trade of Canada than would be given if you left it in the other way. The object is to secure traffic for the Canadian seaport. We try to get a portion of it at least, and that can only be accomplished satisfactorily, in my judgment, by the course proposed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the Railway Commission, or the government, fix the through rate from Parry Sound to St. John?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is fixed by the Railway Commission, that is uniform over all lines connecting with our Canadian seaboard. It is only with respect to the apportionment that would go to the Grand Trunk, in so far as it went over the rails of the Grand Trunk between Parry Sound and Montreal, that the commission will deal. Beyond that it is the subject matter for determination by the government which operates the Intercolonial.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do I understand then that the Grand Trunk Railway is to be paid by the government for the operation of the line from Parry Sound to Montreal, by an apportionment of the rates?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is to be determined by the Railway Commission; it may be in one form or another. But my hon. friend must have realized that there is always a difficulty between railways as respects apportionments, and in order to have this uniform between montreal and the lake ports it is necessary to place all railways connecting those two points under the control of the Railway Commission. Beyond that it is a matter which it seems to me should be left to the determination of the government itself, because the two will only be operated together in order to protect the tariff rates as between the seaboard and the lake ports.

Mr. STOCKTON. I understand the minister to say that by this legislation he is taking running rights over the irons of the Grand Trunk Railway from Parry Sound to Montreal. I also understood the minister to say that the through rate from Parry Sound to the Atlantic ports would be fixed by the Railway Commission. I understood the minister to say previously to that, that the freight rate from Parry Sound to Montreal would be fixed by the Railway Commission. Now would the minister tell us which is the correct statement? If it is to be fixed by the Railway Commission from Parry Sound to Montreal, then the government must adjust its charges from Montreal to the Atlantic sea-board according to the adjustment of the Railway Commission from Parry Sound to Montreal.

Mr. EMMERSON. Both statements made by me were correct, and they are not inconsistent. The object of this legislation is to secure this traffic for the maritime seaports and for the St. Lawrence in summer. Now in order to do that it is necessary to have some uniformity with respect to rates between Parry Sound and the St. Lawrence; beyond that the government has complete control and can regulate the rates and regulate the apportionment. If we were to

place the Intercolonial as respects these rates under the Railway Commission, that would affect the government of the Intercolonial as it now stands, and would affect the local rates as well.

Mr. STOCKTON. Would the minister say how it could possibly affect the local rates when the object is to secure through freight from Parry Sound to the Atlantic ports ?

Mr. EMMERSON. If you put it under the control of the Railway Commission, as has been suggested by some hon. gentlemen, then you would affect the local rates over the present portion of the Intercolonial.

Mr. INGRAM. Making them higher ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not going to say, I do not know ; they may be affected either way. But at any rate, whatever government is controlling the Intercolonial is supposed to run the road in the interest of the people.

Mr. INGRAM. Is that the objection the hon. gentleman has to allowing the commission to control the rates on the Intercolonial, because the commission might increase the rates ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That question does not arise.

Mr. INGRAM. The question does arise. The hon. gentleman talks about pro rata rates as between Parry Sound and Montreal, and says they will be entitled to pro rata rates between those points, as the government would be entitled to them over the Intercolonial on a long haul. I venture to make this statement in the House now, that the government will not receive pro rata rates on their portion of the line, they will not get the same rates as they will over that portion from Montreal to Parry Sound controlled by the commission. When the test comes the hon. gentleman will find my statement to be correct.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Might I ask the minister what the mileage is, roughly, of the Canada Atlantic Railway over which he proposes to take running rights ? Would he also say, when he announced it as the intention of the government to have their own terminals, whether that would include the erection of elevators on the Georgian bay ports ?

Mr. EMMERSON. When the Bill is introduced and I have occasion to explain the details, I will have the information the hon. gentleman asks for.

Mr. BENNETT. While I do not propose to object to the Bill, I wish to call the minister's attention to the plan that was formulated a few years ago by the government, and which I regret was not carried into effect, with regard to certain railway rights in that portion of the country. What I refer to is this : The Grand Trunk Railway Company are owners of a line of railway running from Midland to Peterborough, and when the Hon. Mr. Tarte was Minister of Public Works, he visited the town of Midland and announced that it was then the policy of the government, acting conjointly with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk, to acquire certain rights over that line from Peterborough to Midland. That would place both the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk in touch with the Georgian bay. The hon. gentleman may recall the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway runs directly from Montreal, passing Peterborough on to Toronto. Any grain that may be carried by the Canadian Pacific Railway to their port at Owen Sound, is thus carried to Toronto, then to Peterborough and on eastward to Montreal. The Grand Trunk has several towns on the Georgian bay which are fed by the grain trade, namely, Meaford, Collingwood and Midland, and lines running through those points carry grain to Peterborough and thence on to the main line of the Grand Trunk. Now, the minister has not stated, and of course it is not fair that the House should expect him to state, what remuneration or profit he expects will be paid by the government for running rights over these lines commonly known as the Booth system. From Parry Sound to Ottawa the distance is 263 miles. While I do not wish to say anything disparaging of the Canada Atlantic Railway system, I think it will be conceded that the line is not now up to the standard for the carriage of heavy trains, and of necessity a large amount of money will have to be spent by the Grand Trunk, acting conjointly with the government, in order to bring this road up to the standard.

That mileage will be 263 miles and a large amount of money would have of necessity to be expended in that behalf. If the government—and I am only throwing this out at the present time as a suggestion for their consideration—would acquire running rights over the branch of the Grand Trunk Railway from Midland to Peterborough they would then have to pay a portion of the cost of improving that road. The mileage of that road, I think, is somewhere near 100 miles, so that only 100 miles of railway would have to be improved at the cost of the Grand Trunk and the Dominion as against 263 miles from Parry Sound to Ottawa. Let me point this out to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that between Ottawa and Parry Sound there is practically an unbroken waste of country. There is not a town on the whole system, although there are villages of considerable importance, whereas, between Midland and Peterborough there are large towns. There are the towns of Orillia, Peterborough and

Lindsay, all towns doing a large amount of business and there are also numerous villages to which I need not particularly refer. If it is going to be the policy of the government to pay to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and they must of necessity pay to the Grand Trunk Railway Company a large sum of money in this connection, it means that Canada is going to assist to the extent of improving 263 miles a railway which is not to-day up to the same standard of excellence as the line between Peterborough and Midland and which is 170 odd miles longer. Whether the Canada Atlantic Railway or the Midland division is utilized, the Grand Trunk will be benefited, but the Canadian Pacific Railway will have a more beneficial interest in the government adopting the Midland division because instead of carrying grain from Owen Sound to Toronto and from Toronto to Peterborough, a distance of some 225 miles, they will carry it by the short haul from Midland to Peterborough and then strike their main line at that point. The matter is of great interest to all those counties through which this division of the Grand Trunk Railway runs—Simcoe, Victoria and Peterborough. My hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) also suggests the county of Northumberland for the reason that there is a line from Peterborough to Belleville and by reason of that fact it will also interest the county of Hastings with the considerable city of Belleville. There is a branch line of the Grand Trunk from Peterborough to Belleville and the bulk of the grain carried by the Grand Trunk Railway from Georgian Bay ports is carried to Peterborough and is then in turn carried to Belleville over this road which is known, I believe, as the Grand Junction Railway. But, there are other advantages in the government utilizing the Midland division of the Grand Trunk Railway, a noticeable feature of which would be the very desirable harbour they would become possessed of. I do not know whether the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has been at Depot Harbour, the terminus of the Canada Atlantic Railway, but if he has he will bear me out in saying that it is a harbour that has accommodation of the most limited nature. The bay is hardly over a quarter of a mile in length, and the amount of dockage for boats is of the most limited character, while at Midland, owing to the fact that the Grand Trunk Railway, with foresight, have practically possessed themselves of the bulk of the water frontage, there is to-day dockage not only for the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Intercolonial Railway, but probably for half a dozen other lines. A line of elevators could be erected at that point probably with a frontage of nearly three-quarters of a mile with the necessary water depth sufficient to make the harbour accessible to the largest vessel on the lake. There is another advantage to be had too it is approachable at all times, and that there are no rocks or shoals outlying. If the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals happened to be in the House the other evening, and he in all probability was, when the estimates of the Department of Marine and Fisheries were being passed in respect to the buoy service, he will know that it costs some $2,500 a year to properly light and buoy the vessels coming into Depot Harbour. Again, let me point out that if you utilize the port of Depot Harbour, you do not improve the facilities, or advance the interests of any other harbour on the Georgian bay. It is confined strictly and solely to Depot Harbour, but, if, on the other hand, you should adopt the policy of government control, or government interference, or whatever you may term it, in reference to the Midland division of the Grand Trunk, just as soon as that line leaves Midland on its way to Peterborough you interest not only the town of Midland but the towns of Collingwood and Meaford, and I want to call the attention of the minister and the members of the House to the fact that these are towns of considerable importance. The town of Collingwood has a large established trade, it has a large passenger trade with well established lines of steamers which have been running for a number of years. The government has expended a large amount of money and a large amount of money has also been expended at Meaford. These two harbours are greatly to be benefited by the trade of the Grand Trunk Pacific which, if everything turns out as has been prophesied, will be very considerable. We all hope it will grow into millions and millions and it cannot with any great advantage be all carried by way of Depot Harbour, while on the other hand, by the government acquiring or being interested in the Midland division of the Grand Trunk Railway, you will then have accessible harbours at Collingwood, Meaford and Midland, all three, as against this single harbour. I hope the hon. minister will lay the view which I have submitted to the committee before his colleagues and when the matter does come up in the House again I will endeavour to place my views before the House, and I trust that hon. gentlemen representing districts along the line of the Midland division of the Grand Trunk Railway and those interested in different points on the Georgian bay will press strongly for the adoption of the scheme of utilizing the Midland division of the Grand Trunk between Peterborough and Midland rather than spending a large sum of money on this 263 miles of railway between Depot Harbour and Ottawa. I may say to the hon. minister that the country through which the Canada Atlantic Railway passes is practically a barren country ; it is not an agricultural country. You never can expect to have any local trade along that railway. That is patent to-day owing to the fact that

no towns have been formed. Some lumbering has been carried on but this is almost at an end and the lumbering operations will soon cease. The Canada Atlantic Railway will therefore only be used mainly as a through grain carrying route. But as a grain carrying route it will be more desirable to utilize the line of communication between Midland and Peterborough from a point which is common to the Canadian Pacific Railway and to the Grand Trunk Railway, utilizing all the ports of the Georgian bay which have had large expenditures of money made upon them and at which there are towns of very considerable importance.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it proposed that the government shall engage in local business on the line between Montreal and Parry Sound ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think I have fulfilled my promise in making a general announcement to the House as to the policy of the government. On Friday, when the Bill is introduced, I will explain all the details and give my hon. friend the information which he asks.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can answer one or two other matters—just as he sees fit—if he is not prepared to answer now he can give us the information on Friday.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would prefer to do it on Friday.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the hon. gentleman were ready to furnish the information now we could digest it a little better by Friday. The question of whether or not the government should do local business or only purely through business ought to be one of the first things to engage attention before entering upon a project of this kind. The hon. gentleman says that the terms of every description are to be left to the Railway Commission.

Mr. EMMERSON. The running arrangements ; the same as respects other roads.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the scheme exactly ? Is it that the government will run its own trains over the line from Montreal to Parry Sound ; is that the idea ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That would be the idea.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it proposed to establish divisional points and keep train crews at different places, and operate the road to all intents and purposes as if it were a government road ?

Mr. EMMERSON. So far as the Intercolonial Railway trains are concerned.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then you will have to do pretty much everything you would have to do if you had bought the line outright and were operating it.

Mr EMMERSON. I would prefer to answer these questions later. The regulations are fixed as to the working of trains in respect of other roads, and it would not necessarily be that the Intercolonial Railway would keep certain officials along the line. It may be that the Grand Trunk Railway will operate it in so far as the despatching of the trains is concerned. I do not think there will necessarily be two sets of officials, but that is all left to the commission.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not see how everything can be left to the commission because the commission cannot make a bargain for the two parties without knowing what the ideas of the parties are. You cannot transfer all the responsibility to the Railway Commission ; there must be some basis of an agreement for them to go on. I would suppose that these matters must have engaged the attention of the government before they decided upon a policy of this kind. As I gather from the hon. gentleman, it will be necessary to establish divisional points and to operate the road as if it were actually a railway leased to or owned by the government. What special advantage is there in an arrangement of this kind under which we must divide rates between Montreal and Parry Sound ? What is the special advantage of such an arrangement, over an arrangement by which the government would acquire the line from Parry Sound to Halifax and operate it as its own line ? We were told by the Prime Minister when he spoke in Toronto, that the objection to the government acquiring this very line was that the whole system of the operation of government railways is a vicious one. Are we to adopt that vicious system between Montreal and Parry Sound, or, does the Minister of Railways suggest that we are to adopt some system which does not merit the appelation conferred on it by the Prime Minister when he was justifying the refusal of his government to extend the present system of government railways. The right hon. gentleman assigned another reason—and it concerns a matter which must certainly have engaged the attention of the government before entering upon this policy—that reason was, that if the Intercolonial Railway were extended to Parry Sound it would be necessary to employ an army of canvassers to gather traffic in the west. The arrangement which the Minister of Railways now proposes is, to operate the Intercolonial Railway from Parry Sound to Halifax in competition with the Grand Trunk Railway. The Grand Trunk Railway will have its connections in the west and it will have a great many officials canvassing for traffic for that railway, a work into which the Prime Minister thought the government could not very well enter. What expectation has the government of any considerable traffic coming over this line if it does not send into the west men to canvass

for traffic in opposition to the canvassers for the Grand Trunk Railway. The Prime Minister also took the ground last session, that it would be necessary to have steamers on the lakes if the railway were to be made successful. Does the government now propose to engage in the operation of steamers upon the lakes—a proposal which was laughed to scorn by the Prime Minister, by the Postmaster General, and by very many other gentlemen on that side of the House. Surely the government is not leaping haphazard into this matter without considering some of the difficulties which the Prime Minister and his colleagues were so certain about last session, when there was a proposal that the government should acquire and operate the Canada Atlantic from Montreal to Parry Sound. Has the Minister of Railways any report from his engineer as to whether or not these things are necessary? Has the hon. gentleman any report from his engineer or from any expert in the department, which would indicate whether or not the proposed operation of this line will be profitable and will tend to reduce the deficits which have prevailed in the past on the Intercolonial Railway? Has the hon. gentleman any information which would indicate to the House whether the operation of that line will reduce these deficits or will on the contrary increase the margin between receipts and expenditure? Surely it cannot be possible that the government have entered upon a policy of this kind without taking these things into consideration. Although the minister does purpose making an explanation later on, I would suppose that at the present time it would not be out of place for him to give a few words of explanation on the points which I have mentioned.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems the minister does not deign to reply. Is it possible that he does not think it worth while to answer? This Bill has stood several times in the absence of the minister, on the understanding that when it was reached he would announce the policy of the government with regard to these railways.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And why that policy was adopted.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman has give us practically ni information and he wishes to delay doing so until some other Bill is presented to the House.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is nine o'clock.

Mr. SPROULE. I am quite willing to sit down and allow the minister to give the information if he will do so; but I want to draw his attention to another matter. I think it was no answer to the remarks of my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) to say that the road would require to be improved. I inferred from the tenor of the remarks of the hon. minister that the government were going to share in the cost of the improvements. Is that so, or does the Grand Trunk make all the required improvements itself, and then allow the Intercolonial to use the improved road? If the government are going to share in the cost of the improvements, are they going to bring the Intercolonial under the operation of the Railway Act? I understood that the Railway Act did not apply to the Intercolonial. The hon. minister tells us that under the arrangement that is to be made, the Grand Trunk Railway will be subject to the Railway Commission, and the Railway Commission will act under the authority given to them by the Railway Act. If the Railway Act does not apply to the Intercolonial Railway, how can it as one of the contracting parties carry on negotiations? Will the hon. minister be good enough to tells us that?

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to call the attention of the minister to this fact, that the mileage by the Canada Atlantic from Depot Harbour to Montreal is practically the same as the mileage by the Grand Trunk system from Montreal to Midland; and when it is considered that you will have to act in co-operation with the Grand Trunk over a distance of 170 miles more of railway than if you utilized the Midland division, you can imagine what will be the amount of that increased cost. Let me also call the attention of the minister to this fact, that the Canadian Northern Railway Company is building a line approaching the town of Orillia, so that if the Midland division of the Grand Trunk, which I suggested should be utilized by the government in co-operation with the Grand Trunk, is utilized, the Canadian Northern would also have access to the city of Toronto from the Georgian bay by running over thirty miles of the Midland railway.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to say, before the Chairman leaves the chair, that if this is the treatment that is going to be meted out to this side of the House by the Minister of Railways, we had better understand it at once. If we ask questions which we have a perfect right to ask and which it is the duty of the minister to answer, and if he does not deign to answer them, then I think we had better know it and govern ourselves accordingly.

Mr. EMMERSON. I want to say in reply to my hon. friend that I explained simply the general policy of the government, and I said that when the Bill was introduced I would then be in a position to furnish answers to all reasonable questions that might be put to me. If it were not nine o'clock and my hon. friend's questions had had come a little earlier, perhaps he would not have attacked me as he has done for not answering. I think I pay proper courtesy to all the hon. gentlemen opposite; I

answer their questions if it is in my power to do so; but it seemed to me that we should not discuss this Bill now, and that when the Bill of which I have given notice comes up we could then fully discuss that.

Mr. SPROULE. I asked two questions, which I respectfully submit were fair: was the government prepared to share in the expense of the betterment of the road and would these come under the Railway Commission, and, if so, how could the Railway Act be made to apply to a railway to which it was not intended to apply. Were not these questions entitled to an answer, and how long would it take to answer them? I say I was not treated with courtesy.

The hour for private bills having expired the Speaker took the chair.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Wilfried Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 69), to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta, and the amendment of Mr. R. L. Borden thereto.

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox and Addington). Mr. Speaker, the Bill now under discussion is one of the most important measures that have come before this House since I have had the honour of a seat in it, and I feel that it is my duty to have somethings to say upon it, representing as I do one of the old rural constituencies of the province of Ontario. For many years no Bill has attracted so much public attention as this Bill, perhaps more especially because of the school clause contained in it. But before I come to the school clause, I want to say a few words about the division of the Territory that has been made by the government. In the first place, I think the government, before the last general election, fully intended to divide the Northwest Territories and give them provincial autonomy, and it seems to me that it was their duty to have said something to the public on the subject, so that the public would have had some understanding of the measure, instead of having to go it blind, as they did on that occasion. I am quite sure that if the details of the Bill had been known to the people, there are a good many constituencies both in the province of Ontario and in the western country that would have been very differently represented in this House from what they are now. There was some correspondence, I believe, with Mr. Haultain, the Prime Minister of the Territories, but, so far as I have been able to learn, there was not one word in that correspondence with reference to the details of the Bill, although there was a promise that at this session of parliament a Bill would be introduced granting autonomy to the Northwest provinces. I am not at all disposed to agree with the government in the division they have made, creating two provinces out of the Northwest Territories and leaving Manitoba with its present area. I think that it is most unfair to the province of Manitoba, which, if left as it is at present, will be crippled for all time to come. Manitoba being the oldest province of that western country ought to exercise its full proportion of influence in the Dominion, which it can never do if it is, as it were, simply a postage stamp on the map of Canada. I have heard accusations made against the government—and I do not like to say harsh things unless I am positive they are true; but a good deal has been said about the course pursued by Manitoba with regard to separate schools having something to do with her not being able to get her territory enlarged. There is no doubt that the province of Manitoba should be enlarged and very greatly enlarged. If the government had considered Manitoba and the Northwest Territories together, and had formed them into two provinces instead of three, it would have been a far better arrangement.

Not only that, but they would not have been unduly large if we had made two provinces of what are now three, or will be after the 1st July, should these Bills carry. The two new provinces contain 500,000 miles, and if we added to them the 73,000 miles that Manitoba contains, that would simply make 573,000 miles altogether. Divide that by two, and you would have two provinces, each with 286,500 miles, as compared with British Columbia, which has 372,620 miles, Quebec, which has 351,873, and Ontario, 260,862 miles. You can easily see, therefore, that if the government had taken into consideration the desirability of having only two provinces instead of three, neither of the two would have been unduly large. Then consider what an amount of money would have been saved by this means. In fact, the complaint in this country for a great many years has been that we have too much government and that our people are paying too much for government. I think it is pretty generally conceded that it would be to the advantage of the maritime provinces to have only one local government instead of three. If that were the case, they would be quite as strong, or even stronger in this House, than they are now, as three separate provinces each with its own administration. When dealing with the Northwest Territories, the government should have had a view to the future and have taken warning by the experience of the maritime provinces. Instead of having the small province of Manitoba and two other large provinces, we could then have two fairly large provinces. But in consequence of the policy of the government, the province of Manitoba will always be inferior to the others.

I have no particular fault to find with the $50,000 given for the support of the government and legislature in each of the new provinces, or the 80 cents per head on the estimated population of 250,000. I think perhaps that these grants are fairly reasonable, and I do not suppose there is a man in this House who would want to deal by these provinces in any oher way than fairly and squarely and with the view of assisting them in every possible manner. But I am entirely opposed to the policy of the government with reference to the lands. The lands naturally belong to the provinces. In agreeing to pay each of the provinces a certain amount for its lands, we really concede that they belong to them. The only plea I have heard why the lands are not given to the provinces is that that would interfere with our immigration policy. With that view I entirely disagree. I have taken pains to find out what arrangements were made with the older provinces with regard to immigration, and I find that there has been no difficulty experienced in bringing immigrants to this country and locating them wherever the government thought best. Is it likely that the new provinces, which will be deeply interested in attracting settlers, would not be as much alive to the necessity of getting in population as possibly can be the Dominion government? It seems to me that the provinces could administer their own public lands better than we can and would be more interested in securing a good class of settlers. I have had occasion to speak several times with reference to the immigration into Canada, and the fault I have found is not that we are getting too many immigrants, but too many of an inferior class. Only the other day, the Ontario inspector of asylums said that in the Brockville Lunatic Asylum, out of the six hundred lunatics, sixty were immigrants, or ten per cent of the whole, which is entirely out of proportion to the number of immigrants located in that section of the country. It is not necessary for me to go into the details of the amounts that have been realized by the Dominion government from time to time on the sale of public lands, but I will content myself with saying that I am entirely opposed to the policy of the Dominion keeping these lands. I think it would be better to at once hand them over to the provinces and let the provinces administer them as they see fit. Let me give here the figures showing what we have received from the sale of lands, and I take those which were given by my hon. friend from Western Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) the other day. They will be found in his speech on page 3607 of 'Hansard.' From 1870 to 1880, the administration of Crown lands in Manitoba and the Northwest cost $1,244,499.34 in excess of receipts. In the years 1881 to 1890 the accounts show $753,576.53 in excess of revenue. In the years from 1891 to 1900 there was again an excess of expenditure amounting to $184,398.95. In the years from 1901 to 1904, there was an excess of expenditure over receipts of $11,733.49. Taking the whole period from 1870 up to date, therefore, the administration of lands in the Northwest has cost this Dominion $687,055.25 in excess of receipts, to which must be added refunds amounting to $329,950, making a total of $1,017,005.25 of deficit. I fail to see how the government arrived at the amount they could give as a payment for these lands. They claim that there are twenty-five millions of acres of land to each province, which are worth $37,500,000, and on which of course they pay interest from time to time until it reaches a certain amount. I do not see why the government took it into their heads to keep these lands when it costs more to administer them than we are getting out of them. I hope that the government will reconsider this question, but I can quite understand why the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) should have declared that he was perfectly willing to accept this arrangement provided the government kept the lands for the settlers. We can quite understand that position. The province gets the benefit of the lands inasmuch as it gets the people who settle on them, and it gets the money besides, while we are giving away our lands from time to time, but continuing for all time to pay that subsidy.

There is another point. The right hon. the First Minister based his whole argument for submitting this legislation to the House, especially clause 16 dealing with separate schools, on constitutional grounds. If I understood him rightly, he claimed that he had to do this because the constitution demanded it. That is not the way, Sir, that I understand the constitution, and I do not think that is the way this House understands it. Not only that but I think he used synonymously the names 'province' and 'territory.' He used the words 'province' and 'territory' as if they were synonyms. I can quite understand that if these had been provinces it might have been that we would have had to give these rights but as they are territories I think it is quite different. We have been trying for a good while to induce Newfoundland to come into the Dominion. We have been anxious at times for this and I think we would be glad at any time to have her come in because that would round off the Dominion, and it is a province which we very much desire to have. If it had been a territory we would not have had to ask their consent; we would simply have brought them in under the constitution. That is what we are doing, as I understand, with the provinces in the west. We are not obliged to ask their consent to bring them in; we simply pass an Act and they come in of necessity and we give them such terms as the constitution provides unless we see fit

to give them extra terms by the legislation of this House. The thing that is important in this matter is that whatever Act we pass now, so far as I have understood the debate will be permanent so far as this parliament is concerned, and any change that is made will have to be made by the imperial parliament. It is important, therefore, that we should go slowly ; and it is very important that this should be debated from every standpoint, because if we make a mistake now it will be a lasting mistake. The Prime Minister when he brought this Bill down said that there were four subjects which dominated all the others. The first was :

How many provinces should be admitted into the confederation coming from the Northwest Territories—one, or two or more ?

They have decided on two, and have apparently decided to leave Manitoba as it is, so far as any extension west is concerned. Then the next question was :

In whom should be vested the ownership of the public lands ?

They decided that they would keep the land. The only advantage I can see in their keeping the lands is that they will be able to use them for political influence. It will not be any advantage to us from a financial or any other standpoint.

What should be the financial terms to be granted to these new provinces ?

They have been liberal, but I certainly would not have complained of that if they had not kept the lands and then the premier said :

And the fourth and not the least important by any means was the question of the school system which would be introduced—not introduced because it was introduced long ago, but should be continued in the Territories.

That I think is where the premier made a mistake ; that is where he talks of these Territories as though they were provinces and as though we were bound to retain these Acts with reference to separate schools in the Territories just as if they had been provinces. If I understood the legal arguments which have been advanced in this House at all, I think that does not apply. Then, Sir, we had a speech from the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) on the constitutional side of the question, and I think that every one who heard that speech and every one who has read it will concede that he really put the Prime Minister out of business so far as the constitutional aspect of the case is concerned. I fully expected that when our leader had finished speaking they would have put up the Minister of Justice to answer him and certainly they would have done so if the contention of the First Minister had been right because then the Minister of Justice would have been able to down our leader, but he is not easily downed. To my great surprise they put up the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and I was further surprised by the admissions he made. He differed entirely from the very beginning with his leader. He said :

My right hon. friend the First Minister has not declared that it is not within the power of this parliament to make a change. He has not declared that there is any legal or binding obligation resting on the parliament of Canada to re-enact the clauses of the Act of 1875.

I think that is exactly opposed to what the leader of the government contended for, and I think that if the leader of the government had felt that he was strong in his position after he had heard the speech of the hon. member for Carleton who leads the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) he certainly would have answered him in like manner, that is, he would have appointed a legal gentleman to answer the opposition leader. I find also that the Minister of Finance is not in favour of separate schools. He said that if he had his way personally, speaking for himself he would not go in for separate schools, he would leave that word 'separate' out of all schools. Then he went on to tell us that they had no separate schools by law in Nova Scotia, and he said that this was owing to the good fellowship that existed between the people there, because they divided up. Where there was a strong minority they had their schools, they had their teachers, I believe with the same examination as those for public schools, but although they had not a separate school by-law they had by the consent of the majority in that province. I am strongly of opinion that this Bill which has been introduced will not tend to make it easier to have separate schools in the western provinces than it would have been to have them without it. My own impression is that when you try to force a man to do something he does not want to do you will have a good deal of difficulty in making him do it. I understood the hon. gentlemen who have spoken to tell us that they have had no difficulty in the last few years with reference to separate schools. If that is the case I do not see why they want this enactment. The separate schools do not appear to have been a great success in that country anyway. I believe there are only about a dozen of them all told, nine Roman Catholic and two or three Protestant. These Protestant schools are as much separate schools, I presume, as the others.

I took some notes of what was said by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) and I was astonished at the state of things existing in that country. I was especially surprised at his construing of the Act now before the House.

We are proposing to make these people fully responsible for their own self-government in the important matters of education, public works and all affairs of internal development.

The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) seemed to think that there was

no difference between the public schools of that country and the separate schools. Well there seems to be a difference according to the gentleman who spoke last night, a slight difference at least. The hon. member (Mr. Scott) found a good deal of fault with the headlines that are published in some newspapers in Ontario. For instance :

A free west, a common school, provincial rights and religious equality.

He did not seem to think that was a good thing to publish in any part of this country. I think they are sentiments that even he might endorse although he may support this Bill, if he does I am of opinion that he will not be voting for all these sentiments. He seems to differ with me. He says :

Articles and inflammatory cartoons under that motto have led the innocent citizens to believe that the proposals of the government are entirely in the teeth of this motto. I say that every item proposed by the government is in strict observance of these principles. . . . . A common school—that is just what we are asked to vote for in this proposition ; a non-sectarian school, absolutely under state control. A free west—that is a reasonably free west ; just as free as Ontario.

Now, if it is no freer than Ontario, it has to have separate schools, because by the constitution which we have we are bound to maintain separate schools, but we do not maintain them in every part of the country. I am proud to say that I live in a town where we do not have any separate schools. We had a separate school a good many years ago, but the people got tired of it, and away back in 1875, before the law compelled us to put a Roman Catholic on the high school board, by common consent the town council, of which I had the honour of being a member, asked the Roman Catholics to name a man to represent them on the high school board. He was put on, and I think he has been a member of the school board ever since. We employ a certain number of Roman Catholic teachers in our schools, and we have had no trouble whatever, we have lived in peace and harmony, which is the kind of thing I would like to see all over this country. I think when our boys and girls grow up and attend school together, they come to know one another, and they forget for the time being what particular sect each one may belong to. They grow up to respect one another, and to live together as Christian people ought to live, in my judgment. A free common school under state control is what my hon. friend calls it. Then the hon. member for Beauharnois asked the question :

Mr. BERGERON. What is the difference between the two schools then ?

Mr. SCOTT. Not any difference, only the one I have mentioned.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is the separate school then ?

Mr. SCOTT. It is certainly a separate school, though it is not a religious school.

Mr. BERGERON. It may be in a different building, but it is the same school.

Mr. SCOTT. It is the same class of school.

Now the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) spoke last night, and he said :

The only difference is that in the first and second readers the text is a little different, but even these books have to be authorized by the Minister of Education. There is no church or clerical control in any shape, form or manner over the Catholic schools in the Northwest Territories to-day.

Now we have one gentleman saying there is no difference whatever, and another gentleman admitting that there is a difference in the two first books that the children use. And there may be others. Then the hon. gentleman quoted some things, and I have not been able to understand why he quoted them, unless it was to obtain the good opinion of his leader ; because there is a vacancy in the cabinet, we have no Minister of the Interior at the present time, and as a matter of course they will have to take a man from the west. I do not object to the hon. gentleman if he can get the position, but I fear he will have a good deal of trouble in getting elected. Now he said :

I have a communication from an important body, the Baptist convention of Manitoba and the Territories, the third clause of which is as follows :

This is a scheme which will promote discord and defeat one of the main purposes of public school education, which is the unification of all classes. A confederation cannot be sound in which the elements lack the first essential of harmony.

Now, why he should quote that communication as a reason for voting for the Bill, I cannot understand, because if I had a communication like that sent to me I would think that they wanted me to vote the other way. But I noticed that after he got through his leader went up and shook hands with him, and I wondered whether it was on account of the amount of scrap book material he used, or on account of his independence of the people he represented. Again he said :

Another petition very largely signed contains the following :

We, the undersigned citizens, respectfully urge you to use all influence you may have against the separate school clause in the Bill now before parliament.

That is another reason why he should vote for that Bill.

In a petition dated March 7th, from the Ministerial Association of Winnipeg, the second clause reads as follows :

Whereas the rights of the minority are sufficiently protected by the British North America Act in any particular case.

That is another reason he gave for supporting the Bill. For myself I do not see anything in any of these petitions that would induce any member of this House to support the Bill before parliament at the present time ; I think the very reverse is the case. I said in the beginning that this Bill had caused more contention than any other Bill that has been before this House since I have had the honour of a seat in it, and I think that is true. We had notice to-day from a gentleman in this House that there was going to be a large number of public meetings all over this country in the near future. There was a large public meeting in Toronto a few days ago, a good many speakers took part, and I judge from what I see reported that they were all Liberals except one, and he was an independent, I suppose, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. L. G. McCarthy). He said he was an independent, and I am bound to take his word for it. The gentleman who occupied the chair at that meeting is a Liberal, I think no person who lives in Toronto and knows anything about the public men there will dispute that he is a Liberal of the Liberals. I refer to Mr. Stapleton Caldecott. He said himself before the meeting was over that as Paul called himself, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, so he, Mr. Caldecott, was a Grit of the Grits. He is reported to have said :

We must make no mistake, and if we pass the clause as brought before us by Sir Wilfrid Laurier we should make a most tremendous mistake. (Hear, hear). What he proposes is open to most serious objection, and for myself, with my previous admiration for this man, giving him my hearty service as a model statesman, for the moment I have lost my respect for his judgment. (Hear, hear). He has sought, almost in an indecent manner, to thrust upon this people a piece of legislation they will never submit to. What have our Ontario cabinet ministers been doing in the meanwhile ? (Hear, hear). What is the reason for their silence ? Are we to take it that they are in favour of the proposal ?

Well, Sir, the Minister of Customs took a fling at that gentleman, he said he did not think the First Minister would suffer much because he had lost the respect of that gentleman, but he did not respect Mr. Caldecott's judgment because, he said, a man who knew anything about parliamentary practice would know that if a minister stays in a government he must agree with the doings of that government. Well, there was another gentleman who spoke at that meeting, the hon. member for North Simcoe, (Mr. Leighton McCarthy) and let me read what he said :

Since the date of the introduction of these Bills, there has arisen a huge wave of public opinion, and would you believe it ? It has reached as far as Ottawa, it was wafted there in some particular way, it has caused much excitement—acute situations, resignations have taken place, and rumors of more.

Now, Mr. Speaker, under that state of things, Mr. Caldecott must not be blamed much if he did not know exactly where the Ontario ministers were of the opinion that they did not know themselves exactly where they were at first. After this Bill was introduced, any person looking over on to the other side of the House could see that there was pretty general confusion everywhere, and I think if a vote had been taken then, we would have had no Liberal government at the present time. But when the shepherd got back, you know, and when they changed the wording of the clause without changing the meaning, as a matter of course they had an excuse to come back. That is all it amounted to.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Are you not sorry that you did not have to vote then ?

Mr. U. WILSON. I know, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Centre York will be glad at the next election if there are a good many men in this riding who will not have votes. You may fool them once or twice, but you cannot fool them all the time. You remember that the hon. gentleman got in once on higher duties on vegetables. Then he got out of that by saying that he could not induce the government to do what he wanted them to do. I do not know what he will do the next time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. He is here any way.

Mr. WILSON. That is about as good an argument as the right hon. First Minister once gave us when he said : We are here, and you are there ; what are you going to do about it ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. What did you do about it ?

Mr. U. WILSON. We ran again and got beaten. There was another gentleman at that meeting, Dr. Goggin, who made a very strong speech. Some say he is a Tory and some say he is a Liberal. I do not know what he was or what he is, but I will read an extract from what he said, as follows :

I take it that we meet here to-night as a body of Liberals, intent upon setting before our party our views on this subject, whether they be right or wrong. This I believe is one of the qualifications of a good party man. We are not here as a body of Conservatives intent upon making capital for ourselves. We are not here as a body of Orangemen trying to arrest Romanism.

It is most unfortunate that the question was ever raised. The responsibility for the state of the public opinion now existing in the west does not rest upon the people of Ontario, or of any other province, but upon that fraction of the cabinet at Ottawa who manufactured those educational clauses for the people of the Dominion without the knowledge of those members of the cabinet most concerned therewith.

I ought to have said, perhaps, earlier in my speech that I am strongly of the opinion that had the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) been here we certainly would not have seen the Bill we have seen introduced into this House. I think we never would have seen these educational clauses in it. It seems to me that if the right hon. First Minister had been well advised, and I am afraid he was not, these clauses would have been left out and the constitution that the British North America Act provides for these provinces would have gone into operation without any let or hindrance from this parliament. It does seem to me that that would have been the fairest thing to do. We would have saved all this discussion and all this bad feeling. We would not have seen what we are seeing every day here—a debate on a question that we really ought to have nothing to do with because we ought to be willing to give our fellow subjects the same rights as we claim for ourselves. I notice that the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior, the hon. Finance Minister and even some hon. gentlemen from the Northwest have stated that if the decision were left to them whether there should be separate schools or not they would not have them, but rather than have this government go out of office, rather than have the possibility of a Liberal Conservative administration they would bury their principles, have three, or four, or five years in parliament and take the chance of the people forgetting what they have done. It seems to me from the speech made by the hon. Finance Minister in this House that those were the tactics which were pursued in the caucus. When this was brought before the members in caucus they said to them : If you vote us out there will be a general election, you will have all the odium of this Bill and the Tories will beat you ; you had better vote for it and stay in.

Now, there was a pretty strong resolution passed at this meeting. I have not heard it read in the House up to this time. It appeared in the Toronto 'News' on the 21st March, 1905. I do not suppose I dare mention that name in this House.

At the mass meeting held in the Massey Hall last evening to protest against the school clause of the Autonomy Bill the following resolution was moved by Mr. D. E. Thomson, seconded by Rev. Dr. Milligan, and carried unanimously :

I do not suppose that any one will accuse Dr. Thomson or Dr. Milligan of being Tories. I have the pleasure of an acquaintance with Dr. Milligan and I regard him as a very fine man, but a great Liberal and I am informed that D. E. Thomson is quite as strong a Liberal as Dr. Milligan.

Whereas it is of vital importance to Canada that the new provinces about to be established shall be left free to shape their own educational policy in accordance with the needs of the future, as these shall develop ;

Be it therefore resolved, that this meeting emphatically protests against the enactment of section 16 of the present Autonomy Bills, or any other provisions inconsistent with their constitutional freedom in this regard ;

Be it further resolved, that, since the electors have had no opportunity to pass upon the principle embodied in the school clauses of the Bills now before parliament, the government should :

(a) Abandon the clauses, or

(b) Appeal to the country on the measure, or

(c) Defer action entirely until after the next general election.

And be it ordered that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Honourable the Prime Minister and to the city members of the House.

That is, in my judgment, a pretty strong resolution to be passed at a public meeting by reformers. I do not care whether they were reformers or not, they were citizens of this country, but the men who moved and seconded this resolution were reformers beyond all doubt. Then, there was Mr. Willison, the editor of the 'News,' a great admirer in other days of the present Prime Minister. He wrote his life and, I have no doubt, he gave him as favourable a character as could well be given. I do not wish to detract from it but if he writes another volume it will be a very different volume from those which he has written. I have here quite a number of extracts. I have an extract from a statement of the Hon. David Mills, who was the great constitutional authority of this House at one time and who afterwards occupied a seat on the Supreme Court bench. I have another from a statement by Sir Louis Davies, once a prominent member of the Liberal party in this House, and who has also been elevated to the Supreme Court bench. Both of these gentlemen tell us that when the time comes to create provinces in our great Northwest that will be the time for them as provinces to initiate their own school system. I will not detain the House by reading all of these quotations, but there are one or two that I cannot refrain from giving. My time is about up and I do not intend, as the speeches have generally been long, to follow the bad example that has been set on both sides of the House. This is a comment by the Toronto 'News' of 11th March, 1905 :

The remedial legislation of 1896 had some warrant in the constitution ; the present legislation has none. It is a gratuitous seeking for trouble which could easily be avoided.

That the antagonism to forcing separate schools on the west should come from Liberal sources can easily be understood. The Liberal party is threatened with a far greater disaster than loss of power. It is threatened with the loss of the principles to which it owes its vitality.

The measures now before the people were not in issue in the general election, and parliament has no popular mandate to place them on the statute-book.

I daresay this was written by the gentleman who wrote the life of the Rt. Hon. Sir

Wilfrid Laurier, Prime Minister of Canada. I shall not quote extracts from papers which have been opposed to the Liberal party heretofore; I am reading from the newspapers which have always supported the Liberal party, and if I had time I could read a good many extracts from the 'Globe'—I was going to say I could read the whole 'Globe'—denouncing the policy of the government on this question. The 'Globe,' in its turn, has been denounced by hon. gentlemen opposite, but their denunciation is because the 'Globe' stood by Liberal principles which the Liberal party have recanted. Take the Toronto 'Saturday Night'; Mr. Sheppard has been for many years a great admirer of the present Liberal leader, and he has said a good many kind things of that right hon. gentleman, but on the 11th of March, 1905, Mr. Sheppard wrote thus:

> No legislation is too wild, unpatriotic or indefensible to be regarded as a possibility under a government which repudiates its most solemn professions, and deliberately plots to force upon the people the thing which it came into power pledged to oppose.
>
> Any man who places the will of the priest of his church above the will of the people who made him what he is, can not be trusted. And the hierarchy demands and exacts implicit obedience from its subjects.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have placed before the House some of the views I entertain on this subject. Personally I am strongly opposed to separate schools and have always been. I left my party in 1896, and voted with the present Prime Minister for six months hoist of the Remedial Bill, and I did that against the strong remonstrance of my leader.

An hon. MEMBER. You got into bad company.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. No; the Prime Minister was all right in 1896, but the trouble is that he has changed his principles since, and I can no longer follow him in endeavouring to maintain provincial rights. In 1895, I stood for provincial rights, and I stand for provincial rights to-day. Ever since I was a boy, I have heard the Liberal party fighting for provincial rights, but the Liberal party no longer has that plank in its platform. We all remember the difficulties between Upper and Lower Canada before confederation, when one province wanted representation by population, and the other did not. We remember the difficulties that arose until the crisis came that we could not govern the country properly, and a solution was sought in confederation. Was not the understanding at confederation that every province should be left to do its own business and that the federal parliament should only do the general business of the country. Why is there a change made in that compact now? I say Sir, that as honourable men we are bound to carry out the compact of confederation and to pursue the policy which the fathers of confederation have laid down as the principles of the constitution of our country.

Mr. H. S. BELAND (Beauce). Mr. Speaker, I feel satisfied that however long may be my public career in this parliament, I shall never be called upon to address the House of Commons of Canada on a question of greater importance than this. Let me say at the outset of my remarks, which I hope will be brief, that having but slight experience as a debater, having no legal training whatever, I being a physician, and having but a very imperfect command of the English language, I feel that I must crave the indulgence of the House. This subject is one which should be approached with a deep sentiment of patriotism, and with the spirit which animated the illustrious fathers of confederation when they met to endeavour to devise a scheme under which the people of the British possessions in North America might live together in union, happiness and prosperity. It should be gratifying to every true Canadian that in the evolution of our national history we are in this Canadian parliament to-day discussing a measure to create two new provinces in our splendid Northwest domain. The Northwest Territories were discovered long ago by French settlers and French adventurers chiefly. Thirty years ago these Territories had a population of only 500 white people, and it is claimed to-day (and the claim is well founded) that these Territories are now settled by 500,000 frugal, sturdy and industrious people, who are asking to be admitted into confederation and to enjoy the full privileges of statehood and self-government. The years of 1903 and 1905 will go down in Canadian history as memorable years, because they are identified with the introduction into the Canadian parliament of two enactments, the most important in the history of our country—I refer to the creation of provinces in the Northwest Territories with their untold and unimagined possibilities, and the measure providing for the building of the National Transcontinental Railway. When our children and our childrens' children read the history of these years, they will feel that the venerated statesman who leads the Liberal party, who leads this House, and I make bold to say, who leads this country, has associated his name with two epoch marking events, they will feel Sir, that these measures mark an era in the progress of our country, and that entitle the great statesman who fathered them to rank amongst the foremost patriots of this country of ours.

Now, Sir, many important questions are involved in this Autonomy Bill. And while the question as to the number of provinces to be created, the financial aid to be given them, and the location of the capital, have met with very little criticism, the land and educational clauses of the Bill have excited

much comment; although in my opinion they have received, and are receiving the warmest support of the majority of the people of Canada. Nevertheless the land clause, and especially the educational clause, have encountered very bitter opposition from some quarters.

With regard to the lands, it has been stated by the hon. leader of the opposition, in that very able statement which he presented to us the other day, that it was important and in accordance with the principles of the constitution that the lands of the Northwest Territories should be handed over to the new provinces. Mr. Speaker, I have to take exception to that view of the question, because I believe that it is the part of wisdom for this government to retain control of the lands, apart from the consideration which was offered to us the other day by the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), that, from the point of view of an effective immigration policy, it was not wise to have two or more governments dealing with it. There is another consideration, and that is the following: The moment you hand over to the new provinces the control of their lands, you leave them face to face with two propositions, which, I believe, are contrary to each other —the creating of a revenue and the maintaining of an efficient immigration policy. The new provinces, if possessed of the lands, would naturally be deprived of the financial aid extended to them by this government in lieu of the lands. They would have to create their revenue from those lands; and the moment you increase the price of land you hamper immigration, while if you want to promote immigration you have to decrease the price of land.

I have heard some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House say that the provinces of Ontario and Quebec have the control of their lands. Very true, Mr. Speaker; but the provinces of Ontario and Quebec should not be considered from the same point of view as the Northwest provinces, and I will tell you why. Because there are in those two provinces immense timber limits, from which they derive a very large revenue. In the province of Quebec, during the last year, I think the revenue accruing from the Crown lands amounted to $600,000—not from the sale of lands, but from the stumpage only. The situation is not the same in the Northwest Territories.

There is another point of view from which I think we should withhold the lands from the new provinces, that is the national point of view. In stating this opinion, I may be taxed by some hon. gentlemen with being a Utopist; I may be told that I am dreaming; but let me say frankly what I think. It is obvious to every one who observes the Northwest Territories to-day that the loyal sentiment which prevails there is pure, deep and large, as the stately rivers which run over the endless prairies. But who knows what will be the immigration of to-morrow? There are to-day half a million people in the Northwest Territories; how many will you find in twenty or thirty years from now? Who can tell? Perhaps two million, perhaps three million, perhaps five million, perhaps ten or twelve million; and as we know that the largest foreign immigration to-day is from the United States, who can assure this House and this country that the control of the legislatures in the two new provinces thirty years from now will not be in the hands of people having a greater interest in the country to the south of the boundary line? And, Mr. Speaker, we shall have, in the control of the lands and in the control of immigration, perhaps not a complete remedy, but certainly a palliative. Hon. gentlemen opposite say to us: Hands off the twins; let them enjoy the greatest liberty; give them all their lands and the largest possible autonomy. Well, I can assure my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), whom I am glad to see in his seat, that in that future time, if he wishes, in order to maintain a loyal sentiment in the Northwest Territories, the services of that Roman Catholic clergy, whom he does not appear to like very much, they will be found as usual ready to support, day and night, through weeks and months and years, the British flag.

Mr. SPROULE. I may tell my hon. friend that, contrary to his opinion or belief, I do not dislike them by any means. I have no feeling of dislike against them.

Mr. BELAND. I am very glad to hear it. Coming to what is known in the country as the educational clause of this Bill, it is a very burning question and a question of very great importance. The agitation which has been aroused over that clause is immense, and we all regret it. That agitation is so intense that we are told that the provincial government of Manitoba, now on its last legs, is seeking to get a new lease of office out of it. Well, the educational clauses of this measure have already been discussed a good deal in this country. They have encountered very bitter opposition from the newspapers, especially in that enlightened city of Toronto, where even men who used to be ranked amongst the foremost Liberals have been outspoken in their opposition to those clauses, and they have also enjoyed the distinction of being made the subject of the censorious tongues of those who adorn the pulpits of this country. There are many points of view from which this important question may be considered. There is the constitutional point of view, there is the provincial autonomy point of view; but whatever may be the reasons invoked in this debate, the main object of those who are making to-day a solid opposition to these educational clauses is nothing else but political capital. Before proceeding further, I must say that I was very much surprised the other night when I heard the eloquent member for West As-

siniboia (Mr. Scott) state in this House that amongst the Protestant population of this country the opinion prevailed that the privileges of the Catholic minority had been called for by them. Nothing could be further from the truth. The educational privileges of the minorities in this country were called for, not by Catholics, but by Protestants. They were called for by Mr. Galt, and I will go further. I will say that the man who had every authority to represent the Catholic population of this country, John Sandfield Macdonald, moved a resolution in the parliament of United Canada asking that the Catholic minority be left in the hands of the Protestants of this country, as they could rely on the good faith of the Protestants—and what was the fate of that motion? It was defeated by a vote of 95 to 8.

You have heard, Sir, on this question constitutional authorities; you have heard men of great legal training; you have had the opportunity of hearing men who are professors in our most reputable universities; and you have also heard men whose profession it is to read themselves in national and international problems. We have had in this House on the constitutional question the spectacle of the right hon. gentleman who leads the government differing with one or two of his ministers, while they all adopted the same course. We have had on the other side of the House the spectacle of the leader of the opposition differing in toto from his first lieutenant, the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I will refrain from going any further into the divergencies we have witnessed in this House regarding the constitutional aspects of the question, and will present on that aspect the point of view of a layman. There are two alternatives, I believe, which confront every member of parliament on this matter. Are these Territories entering confederation to-day or did they enter the union in the year 1870? You may take whichever view you prefer, but you must adopt the one or the other. Either they entered the union in 1870 or they are going into it to-day. If they are going into it to-day, article 93 is very plain:

> Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the union.

Well, if we take the alternative that the Northwest Territories are going into the union to-day, it seems to me that this clause should apply, but some hon. gentlemen, I think among them the leader of the opposition, contend that the Territories entered the union in 1870. If they did, what is our position to-day? Legislation was passed by this parliament in 1875, in the full exercise of its powers, creating in the Northwest Teritories a system of separate schools by which the minorities were to enjoy certain privileges. In pursuance of that law, ordinances were passed in the Territories by which this system of schools was amended over and over again. What then is our position to-day? Are we going to adopt the views of those who enacted that law of 1875 or are we going to repudiate them? I think that when we know that this parliament in 1875 passed a law conferring upon the Catholic minority certain privileges, and that that law has been amended by the legislature of the Territories in the exercise of its power—and we must admit that it was in the exercise of its power so long as these ordinances have not been repealed by this parliament—I submit that when we know that, our paramount duty is to confirm the legislation passed both by this parliament and the legislature of the Northwest Territories. This is the layman's point of view. By adopting this course we put an end to interminable judicial disputes; and if only the hon. leader of the opposition had adopted that view, as he seemed to be about to adopt it when the Bill was first introduced into this House, if he had left aside those elements of his party who are opposed to any privilege being given the Catholic minority, if he had said: I will stand with the right hon. gentleman in upholding legislation that this parliament has passed, that men like Sir Alexander McKenzie, Sir John Macdonald, Sir Alexander Campbell, have supported—had he adopted the view of those eminent statesmen, what would be the position to-day? There would have been no agitation of any importance in this country, we would have buried for ever the old feuds which I say have been a curse to the nation in the past.

There are three systems of schools; first there is the system of separate schools with two boards, each board having the supervision of its schools, the qualification of teachers, text books, inspection and so on. The type of these schools is to be found in the province of Quebec. There is a second system of schools which you call neutral or godless schools. The best illustration of that system of schools is, I believe, to be found in the United States of America. There is a third system of schools which may be called either separate or public schools, which are under one single board, and in which religious instruction is allowed, according to the wishes of the parents. This system, I believe, is the one which is in force in the Northwest at the present moment. The argument of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) the other day was fairly conducted all along the lines that church influence in the schools was prejudicial to their efficiency. He went so far as to say that information which he has gathered permitted him to state that church influence, clerical

schools, in France, for instance, had produced a people of illiterates and atheists. He will likely be disposed to recognize that he has been led into error. In France there are very few atheists; there are a good many free-thinkers——

Mr. SPROULE. I was not expressing an opinion on that at all. I referred to what a French gentleman had told me was the result of that system. I was using his language, not my own, because I am not competent to express an opinion of that kind, never having visited the country and knowing little about it.

Mr. BELAND. That is exactly what I say, that the hon. gentleman had been led into error.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that I had said that of France.

Mr. BELAND. No, Mr. Speaker, I said that by some information he had gathered the hon. gentleman had been led into error when he stated that in France there was a large number of atheists. For my part, Mr. Speaker, I am not discussing this question from the point of view of an advocate of separate schools, nor from the point of view of an advocate of public schools. We are not called upon in this House to say whether we favour the one or the other. We are discussing a Bill which provides for religious instruction in the schools in the Northwest, a system which has been adopted by the Northwest and which is in force now. Our country is a British country, our institutions are modelled after the institutions of Great Britain, and I am very sorry, I deeply regret—I say it sincerely—that the great lines, the illuminated paths which have been set for us in the mother country, are in this debate willingly ignored. Unshakable attachment to all things British, be they military, be they political, be they social, has been boasted of here, especially by hon. gentlemen opposite. It is but a few days since the echoes of this chamber were disturbed by the imperialistic eloquence of my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes). In his footsteps we have seen the hon. member from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) and the hon. member from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), earnestly and honestly, we believe, preaching the rapproachement, closer relations between England and Canada. It is their contention that British institutions are the climax of perfection for a constitutional country. Why in the name of common sense was the British school system not good enough for them? The French Canadian is very devoted to British institutions, and I make bold to say here that if my countrymen, my compatriots in the province of Quebec, were offered to-day the opportunity to sever their connection from Great Britain, if they were offered independence, if they were offered annexation, if they were offered French allegiance, I have not the slightest hesitancy to say they would squarely refuse and remain faithful to Great Britain. And why, Mr. Speaker? Because as was said so eloquently by one of the hon. gentlemen opposite in a debate a few years ago, Great Britain has distinguished herself at home and abroad for that broad spirit of good faith and toleration, for those sacred principles of religious equality and self-government. In England an education Act was recently introduced providing for religious instruction in the schools, according to the wishes of the parents. By whom was it introduced? By men like Chamberlain, by men like Balfour, and that legislation was assailed, and I think encountered as bitter an opposition as this legislation is encountering to-day. Ministers of the gospel went as far as to say that the state was in danger, that the primary and elementary rights were threatened, that the birth right of the British citizen was at stake, that it was a battle for life. The Solicitor General (Hon. Mr. Lemieux) the other night, in the course of a very able speech, read to this House quotations from speeches that have been delivered in England by Mr. Chamberlain and by Mr. Balfour. I shall not trouble the House by reading any more of those speeches. I think the House will permit me to make an allusion to a reverend gentleman in England, a minister of the Presbyterian denomination, Rev. Archibald Lamont, of St. Paul's Presbyterian Chapel. Here is what that gentleman said:

> I have high hopes for education and for Presbyterianism and for future Christianity as the result of the advent of this imperfect, but substantially good, Education Bill, and, in spite of an unreasoning and undignified agitation against it, an agitation to which, as I deeply deplore, my own beloved church has thoughtlessly, but I hope temporarily, committed herself. I fear that in most of our Protestant churches, eloquence of speech is often more a hindrance than help to the practical solution of far-reaching and complex questions. It often puts men unwittingly in a false pre-eminence, so that the rank and file—the common people—are misled and become martyrs by mistake.

This should be read to some of the reverend gentlemen of Ottawa and Toronto who have thought it proper to speak from the pulpit against the educational clauses of this Bill. But, Mr. Speaker, this Bill has been adopted in England, and has been in force for a couple of years, and it has given entire satisfaction. The impression that must prevail in the end is that some people want more religious instruction and some people want less religious instruction than this Bill provides; but, Mr. Speaker, standing here as a representative in parliament of a country of 43,000 souls, I think it is my duty to uphold the constitution, and by it to confirm the privileges, be they large or be they

small, that the majority enjoy in the Northwest Territories. There are some hon. gentlemen on the other side of this House, the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) the hon member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) and the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) who profess to believe that religious instruction should be done away with in the schools. But, Mr. Speaker, though I have great respect for their opinions, I must say without hesitation that if those three gentlemen were put on one side, and on the other side you were to show me statesmen like Mr. Chamberlain, like Mr. Gladstone, like Mr. Balfour, like Mr. Guizot, I would have to throw in my lot with the great Englishmen. Now, Sir, the claim has been made in this House and out of it that the Liberal party has trampled upon provincial rights and provincial autonomy, that it has abandoned its principles of 1896, and that now the Liberal party is invading provincial rights and provincial autonomy. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me refer for a moment to what took place in 1896. What was the position of the right hon. the Prime Minister in 1896, when he moved the six months hoist of the Remedial Bill? He said: This parliament has a right to interfere; the remedy lies with us, but I think that remedy should not be applied until all conciliatory methods have been exhausted. Now, Sir, in 1896 we stood for conciliation. What are we doing today? We are still standing for conciliation, we stand for compromise on an honourabe basis.

Mr. BERGERON. Would my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question? Did the solution of 1896 settle the Manitoba school question to the satisfaction of the minority?

Mr. BELAND. It did settle it to a certain extent which appears to be satisfactory to the minority. It may not be satisfactory to my hon. friend, who is known to be an ardent and devoted supporter of the Catholic church. But to my mind, and as a means establishing peace and harmony in this country between the different elements, it is satisfactory.

Mr. BERGERON. I hope I am not troubling my hon. friend. But how does he explain this trip of Mr. Rogers and Mr. Campbell down here to secure a more favourable settlement for the minority of Manitoba?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Was that what Mr. Rogers and Mr. Campbell came for?

Mr. BERGERON. That is what we were told this afternoon.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I am glad to know it.

Mr. BELAND. I think I can satisfy the hon gentleman on that point. Mr. Rogers is fond of notoriety, he desires to make himself and his party some political capital in Manitoba, and he came to meet Monseigneur Sbarretti for the purpose, in my opinion, of procuring some arrangement by which he hoped to capture the Catholic vote of Manitoba. I think that the object of Mr. Rogers, in my estimation, and I think in the estimation of my hon. friend also, was to make political capital. Now, Sir, who is making a claim for provincial rights to-day? The hon, the leader of the opposition is making, from the rock of the constitution, as he said, a fight for provincial rights. We had an instance the other day of how hon. gentlemen will stand sometimes for provincial rights when the leader of the opposition criticised the Bill that was introduced a few days ago by the right hon. gentleman, and when he was asked whether the land should be left with the provinces or with the federal government, he was of the opinion that the land should go to the provinces. But then he bethought himself, I suppose, of the strong objection, for it was an objection, that I quoted a minute ago, that it would perhaps interfere with an effective immigration policy. But I will quote his own words:

> May I not further suggest that even if there were any danger—and I do not think there is—it would be the task of good statesmanship to have inserted, if necessary, a provision in this Bill with regard to free homesteads and the price of these lands, and obtain to it the consent of the people of the Northwest Territories.

It is no more difficult than that.

Provincial rights, provincial autonomy as long as it serves his purpose! But, as soon as it does not serve his purpose, let us invade provincial rights and send a postcard,—I suppose that is the system in vogue in Toronto now—to every member and to every citizen in the Northwest Territories saying: Do you approve of that? If he says he does, all right, and if he says he does not, well, where will he be?

We, of the province of Quebec, we, the Catholic minority of this Dominion, are bound to change our mind as to the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L Borden). We had always thought that he was a broad minded Englishman, we had always thought that he was animated by that spirit of fair dealing and kindly forbearance that have distinguished English institutions for the last fifty years. The other day he pronounced upon us a beautiful eulogy. He said that he had traversed the province of Quebec from one end to the other and that every man he had met there was well read, intelligent and sociable and a moment afterwards he moved the amendment which is now before the House. The hon. gentleman, I am afraid, has missed his vocation. He has missed his profession. He should have been a surgeon because he would have made a very skilful one. When I listened to him I could not refrain from thinking that when he pronounced that eulogy, when he uttered

those words in praise of the French Canadian people he was doing the work of a surgeon before the operation—injecting into the tissues an analgesic before he used the scalpel. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) says that because we have tried to invade provincial rights we have become a disrupted and disbanded party. But, for a moment or two let us examine what has happened on the other side. The moment the hon. leader of the opposition has placed his constitutional gun in position and the moment he has fired that gun it has been found to be a slate gun. It splits to pieces. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) mortally wounded ; the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) not quite so badly wounded. The list of wounded grows every day. The hon. member for North Toronto says that the weakness of the Czar of Russia is that he does not consult his people. Then, I might retort : What is the weakness of the hon. leader of the opposition ? If it is a mistake for the Czar of Russia not to consult his people how much greater a mistake must it be for that hon. gentleman to turn his gun against his own lieutenants and his own regiment ? But, we have not heard so far in this House from the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean). He will be coming some day and making a plea such as he made to-day in favour of provincial rights. That hon. gentleman succeeded in the not very remote past in making himself plainly understood on the question of provincial rights. It was in March, 1902. What did the hon. member for South York say ? He was speaking in this House and he said :

> Speaking of the provinces, I have not a moment's hesitation in saying that the result of provincial government in Canada has been detrimental to the progress of the country. I say that the interpretation of the law that has been given by the English Privy Council in regard to the distribution of rights as between the provinces and the federal power, has been against the interests of the country as a whole. That I regret. I agree with the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) that some day we will have the whole jurisdiction in this parliament, and in some way we will work it out, and in some way we will increase the federal power and wipe out gradually the provincial power.

Who would believe that after what the hon. gentleman told us this afternoon ? But, that is not all. He said something else. Here is what he said :

> Yet we are told that there is no hope of progress, that the main thing is to uphold local rights. That is the doctrine of the Minister of Justice of Canada. I take issue with him there. The thing which the Conservative party of this country committed itself to was to build up a nation, with a unification of laws, if that was possible, and that this country should in some way try to recover the federal power which has been lost to the provinces in the past few years.

I ask my hon. friend frankly if he approves of that ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. All of it.

Mr. BELAND. Well, if the hon. gentleman says he approves of that, I have nothing more to say. The hon. member for North Toronto did not pose as the champion of provincial rights in 1896. He assumed a different position then, but when he made his speech he said he would not do it again, and why ? Because the will of the people and particularly the expression of the popular will in Quebec prevented him from doing it. Do you not see, Mr. Speaker, the skill and adroitness of that argument ? If the hon. gentleman had only said that at the general election in 1896 the people of the province of Quebec went against his position, while we know better, we could have understood it, but he mentioned also the general elections of 1900 and 1904 as giving an expression of the people against the stand he took in this House on the question of provincial rights. He sought to escape the condemnation which was placed upon the Conservative party for their bad administration prior to that day. He affects to believe that in 1896, 1900 and 1904 the people voted for the upholding of provincial rights. He counts for nothing his own disastrous financial administration. He counts for nothing the scandals of his party during the 18 years of their regime. He counts for nothing the stagnation of affairs, the ineffective immigration policy and especially that in the general elections in 1900 and 1904 the people gave expression to the contentment which they felt under the progressive policy that our great leader has introduced into this country and which he has maintained.

The plea for provincial rights is a myth in this debate, cold political calculation is behind it. Men like the leader of the opposition, men like the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) should rise to a higher level, for no one doubts in his heart that they do not know this plea is unfounded. Intended as it is to appeal strongly to the highest principles of autonomy, of liberty, and of equality ; it will utterly fail in its results when the sound reasoning of the plain people of this country is applied to it. I have spoken longer than I expected, but I ask the House to bear with me a few moments longer. There have been very strong appeals made to religious and racial prejudices in this country. I will not refer to the circular sent broadcast by the member for East Grey ; I will not refer to his speech in this House, though he uttered some very regrettable words, but I will deal for a moment and a moment only with the Huntingdon 'Gleaner' which he quoted. The Huntingdon 'Gleaner' I may say is a paper of minor importance in the province of Quebec; it is a purely local paper, and from the extracts that the member for East Grey read to the

House one would be led to believe that the Protestant people in the province of Quebec are being ill-treated. Well, here is the answer I have to give to the Huntingdon 'Gleaner'; I shall quote the words of the Hon. Mr. Weir, a man of high standing in the province of Quebec, and a representative of the Protestant people in the Quebec cabinet. Mr. Weir spoke at a public meeting in Montreal; he spoke when he was not asked to deal with the question, when he was not solicited to say a word in reference to it. and here is what Mr. Weir said:

I, being the son of a Scotch father and a Scotch mother. I, a Protestant, have always in this province seen not only our rights but our remotest wishes respected. I challenge any Protestant to say, that he has ever been ill-treated. And therefore, when in the province of Ontario we see politicians and bigots appealing to racial and religious prejudices in order to deprive the minority of the rights to which they are constitutionally and logically entitled, it is our imperious duty to cry shame, and to stigmatize them.

Let me refer for a moment or two to some of what I shall call, the exaggerations of language in the newspapers of Ontario, and Quebec also—for there are bigots in both provinces. Here is what the Toronto 'News' writes:

It is not conceivable that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, much less the Protestant members of his cabinet believe they are acting in accordance with the spirit of the constitution. That they have submitted themselves to the will of the hierarchy of Quebec is the only reasonable explanation of their conduct.

I will give you the answer to that from 'L'Evénement' of Quebec, an organ of the Conservative party; the leading organ of the Conservative party in the district of Quebec. 'L'Evénement' writes:

No, no. It is not the free denominational schools that Sir Wilfrid Laurier guaranteed to the Catholic and French minority of the Territories; it is the neutral schools which are slaves of the state. This is the truth, the cruel truth, the truth undeniable and manifest.

The Toronto 'World,' the organ of my right hon. friend—not my right hon. friend, but my hon. friend from South York, I shall quote from it. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I had great trouble in finding a clipping from the Toronto 'World' that I could, with any sense of decency, quote to the House, when that paper writes against the province of Quebec. I have been looking through its columns for some time and hardly could I put my finger upon a few lines which would be quotable in this House, but few as they are I will read them. The Toronto 'World' says:

The new provinces are to be stripped of their public lands and compelled to submit to an educational system modelled under the artistic direction of the Quebec hierarchy.

Let me give my hon. friend from South York the answer from 'L'Evénement,' that same Conservative newspaper in Quebec, which writing of Sir Wilfrid Laurier says:

When one has seventy of a majority, he does his duty or he falls on the field of honour. He does not need to betray to remain in power.

And when 'L'Evénement' talks of betraying, it does not talk of betraying Protestants; it is surely talking of Sir Wilfrid Laurier betraying Catholics. But there is something more serious than all that. This afternoon I heard the member for East Grey say very plainly: it is about time that we should have some proof of that toleration in the province of Quebec which is so much talked of. Well, I will try to give the hon. gentleman a few proofs of that toleration of ours. The hon. gentleman will admit that in the province of Quebec——

An hon. MEMBER. He will not admit it.

Mr. BELAND. My hon. friend who sits beside me says that he will not admit it, but the member for East Grey is fair, and that being so I am sure that when he hears what I have to say he will stand up and declare that he was mistaken—honestly mistaken, but mistaken just the same. Let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) listen. In this House we have twelve Protestant members from the province of Quebec. We have one from Argenteuil, a county in which the Protestant population is 7,800 and the Catholic population 8,100. The division of Montreal, St. Antoine, represented by my good friend Mr. Bickerdike——

An hon. MEMBER. Mr. Ames.

Mr. BELAND. Yes, represented by Mr. Ames, and I can still call him my good friend I hope. In Montreal, St. Antoine, the Protestant population is 22,000 and the Catholic population is 24,000. The county of Chateauguay, represented here by my good friend Mr. Brown, has a Protestant population of 3,000 and a Catholic population of 12,500. The county of Compton, represented here by my good friend Mr. Hunt, has a Protestant population of 10,500 and a Catholic population of 15,000. The county of Huntingdon, the very county in which that newspaper which has been quoted by my hon. friend from East Grey is published, has a Protestant population of 6,620, and a Catholic population of 7,200, and the Catholic majority sends a Protestant representative to this House in the person of my hon. friend Mr. Walsh. But this is not all. I want to make the proof of our toleration so convincing that my hon. friend will feel obliged to stand up and admit it if he wants to be fair. The county of Missisquoi, with a Protestant population of 8,000 and a Catholic population of 10,000, sends

as its representative to this House, our good friend Mr. Meigs. Montreal, St. Lawrence division, which is represented by my good friend Mr. Bickerdike, has a Protestant population of 10,000 and a Catholic population of 30,000. The county of Pontiac, which is represented by Mr. Brabazon, has a Protestant population of 6,400 and a Catholic population of 16,000. Sherbrooke, which is represented here by my good friend Dr. Worthington, has a Protestant population of 7,000 and a Catholic populaton of 11,000. Stanstead, which is represented by Mr. Lovell, has a Protestant population of 9,000 and a Catholic population of 9,500. Shefford, which is represented by our eminent friend Mr. Parmelee, has a Protestant population of 5,000 and a Catholic population of 18,000, and I do not blame them at all for electing that gentleman.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman allow me ? We will agree that that is the standing of the two religious parties in the several constituencies; but when it comes to the vote, all the good Protestants will vote for this Bill.

Mr. FIELDING. Let us hope so.

Mr. BELAND. I am not concerned with that at all. They may vote as they please, and I am sure the French Canadian people will never go back on them on that account. Out of the twelve counties in the province of Quebec which are represented in this House by Protestants, there is only one county where the majority is Protestant, and that is the county of Brome, represented here by my hon. friend, the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher).

Now, this may not be exactly fair; it may indicate that we are more tolerant than we are in reality. I will take another point of view—that of the whole population of the province. According to the whole population of the province of Quebec, the Protestants would be entitled in this parliament to eight representatives ; but they have twelve. What does my hon. friend from East Grey think of that ? The 'Evening Telegram,' of Toronto, which makes a specialty of dealing with the question of the tolerance of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, has the following :

> Ontario's tolerance is illustrated in the tendency of every Roman Catholic who represents a Protestant constituency to vote as a liegeman of his church rather than as the citizen of his country, upon questions affecting the aims of the church.
>
> The intolerance of Quebec is illustrated in the spectacle of every Protestant representative voting with an eye to the race and creed prejudices of Quebec, and with vision blinded to the principles of his own race and creed.
>
> Ontario's treatment of the minority that is over-represented in the government, over-represented in the legislature, is not equalled by the treatment which the minority receives in any other commonwealth on earth.

> Ontario can match her alleged intolerance against the boasted tolerance of any people on earth. It is an outrage that such a province with such a record should be the recipient of lectures on toleration from the bigots of Quebec.

Well, let us see if it is true that Ontario can match her tolerance against the tolerance of Quebec. In Ontario the Protestant population is 1,800,000, and the Catholic population 390,000. On that basis the Protestants of Ontario are entitled to 72 members in this House and the Catholics to 14 members. What is the representation in reality ? Seventy-nine Protestants and seven Catholics, just one-half of what the Catholics are entitled to by their population. These are the figures, irrespective of parties, for they include all the 86 members from the province of Ontario.

But this is not all. Let us take the Dominion as a whole, and see how the representation stands. According to their population, the Catholics are entitled in this House to 87 members, and we have how many ? Seventy-two. I hope that my good friend who publishes the Toronto 'Telegram' will publish these figures, which are exact, being based on the census of 1901. That would be only an act of justice on the part of the 'Telegram,' instead of misrepresenting the people of the province of Quebec, as it has done in the past.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what the average man of Ontario thinks when he reads such articles as are published to-day in the Toronto newspapers ? I wonder if the average farmer of the province of Ontario has ever been taught in his school—I hope he has—what the Catholic clergy have done for this country of ours. I wonder if he has been taught that that same clergy have rendered eminent and inappreciable services to the British Crown during the last 140 years, especially in the acute and critical days of early British rule in America. I wonder if he has been taught that, if he has been informed of the Catholic clergy's unshakable loyalty to the kings and queens of Great Britain since fate went against us on the Plains of Abraham. If the good farmers of the province of Ontario were taught that the Roman Catholic clergy in the province of Quebec have resisted time and again temptations and inducements to take part in agitations for annexation; if he were taught in his early days what education in the Roman Catholic colleges and universities has done towards supplying this country with men who have gained distinction in literature, in the professions and in agriculture, and who, every one will admit, will stand comparison with those of any other country; if he knew that the great idol of Ontario, the late Sir John Macdonald, declared on a memorable occasion in the city of London, that amongst the most faithful subjects of Her Majesty in Canada were to be ranked the French

Canadian Catholic clergy and population; if he were taught in the schools these things, I would have no fear for the result, and would be confident that he would resist any malicious appeals, because he is a moderate man and a man who ponders well before he acts.

Mr. Speaker, I am about to close. I have detained the House longer than I intended, but I find I must claim your indulgence a little longer. I say it is of vital interest, admittedly, that the citizens of this country should not lose sight of their rights but it is far more important that they should not overlook their duties. To sum up my idea, this is the inevitable conclusion to which we must arrive, that the efforts of statesmen and public powers shall always be vain and fruitless if they are not founded on the spirit of good faith and toleration, on that broad spirit of Christianity, vivifying hundreds of thousands of firesides throughout this great land. That spirit of toleration and mutual forbearance between creeds and nationalities in the great west as well as in the older portions of our beloved country, will alone give that social, intellectual, moral and material foundation without which no nation can rise to permanent greatness.

Let us not shelter ourselves under the flimsy parapet of legal technicalities; and if ever doubt should enter our minds, if our path should appear full of difficulties, let us rise to the great responsibilities of our office with courage, justice and a spirit of fair-dealing. Let us ignore both the zealot and the bigot, and plant our feet in the solid ground of honourable compromise. Let us above all remember that this is a land, unparalleled, perhaps, and certainly unsurpassed for its immense resources, and its future possibilities, to which we invite the civilized nations of the old world, and if we desire to be a true nation, a worthy product of the 20th century, we must be prepared to sink and melt our individual differences in the warm rays of the sun of justice and liberty.

Mr. J. BARR (Dufferin). As the hour is late, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the House should rise and would beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. member was not present last evening when there was, perhaps, what I might call an understanding that we should sit later into the night. At all events the observation was made that in assenting to an early adjournment last evening, we should, in order that this debate should be advanced in a reasonable way, work harder and sit later, and I think that is the temper of the House.

Mr. BARR. I must of course, bow to the will of the House. I should not attempt to address the House on this subject, did I not think it was my bounden duty not to give a silent vote on this Autonomy Bill. In voting, as I intend to do, for the amendment of the leader of the opposition, I do not wish to be understood as being opposed to giving to the fullest extent provincial rights to all the great lone land of the Northwest. But before entering upon the remarks I intend to make on the Bill itself, I desire for a short time to follow my hon. friend who has just sat down. I was pleased to learn that the hon. gentleman is not a lawyer, because I naturally supposed that he would take pains to steer clear of the constitutional question which has taken up so much of our time. I think we might well leave that question to be threshed out by the lawyers who, so far as we can judge, will leave it just as hazy as it was when they entered the discussion. And after we shall have heard all the learned arguments advanced by the gentlemen of the legal profession on the one side or the other, I have no doubt that we shall come back to the same conclusion which has always prevailed in the past, and that is that it is their duty to make black appear white and right wrong. And as that is part of their business, I am glad to know that I am not a lawyer, but a doctor. But there is one thing which I presume every hon. gentleman will admit, and that is that it is the duty of this House to make laws, and that, on the other hand, it is the duty of the courts to interpret them, and whether we arrive at the conclusion that this Bill is ultra vires or otherwise, I presume the end will be that it will have to go to the Privy Council. And as that court is composed of human beings who are also lawyers, the probability is that they will give a decision according to the temper in which they are and according as their digestion is good or bad. We shall therefore have to wait for their decision to decide whether this Bill is legal or not. But I venture to say that the free and independent elector, the ordinary man, as he reads the 92nd clause of the British North America Act, will have no hesitation in concluding that so far as education is concerned, that is a question which has to be left to the province, with the exception that this parliament has the right to pass a remedial law in the event of any province not carrying out the law as it is in the statute-books.

My hon. friend has said we should live in peace and harmony. We all agree with that, we would like to live in peace and harmony with all men in all parts of this fair Dominion of ours, but in order to do that we have rights and we have privileges which we must guard and guard safely. We must remember that the majority have rights which they should exercise just as freely as do the minority. My hon. friend attempted to make a point against the lead-

er of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and although not a lawyer he endeavoured to insinuate that we on this side have not succeeded in our argument and that the legal argument of the leader of the opposition had been a failure. I shall not follow that up beyond saying that we are all proud of the leader of the opposition. We feel that we have one man here who is not only able to take care of himself, but able to sustain the combat on any question that comes before this House, legal or otherwise, and to hold his own with any hon. gentleman on the opposite side. He has proved this to be the case in the past, and I venture to say that he will continue to show in the future that it is still the case. Then we have the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) whom I have no hesitation in saying hon. gentlemen opposite have dreaded in the past, but never more than at the present time. This is shown by the very fact that in the past on two occasions when he was defeated, they put forth every effort of the government, not only by their voice and by means that are not too clear or too fair, but they put forth their money bags, which they sent to all parts to accomplish the work to an extent that is detrimental to the best interests and to the morality of this country. My hon. friend who has just sat down (Mr. Beland) tried to make a point out of the fact that they are more liberal in Quebec than in other provinces. They may be, looking at it from a religious point of view, but when we look at it from a political point of view we must know that there are some reasons why there are only 12 Conservatives from that province. The Conservatives have about 100,000 votes in Quebec while the Reformers have only about 130,000, and notwithstanding that there were only 11 Conservatives returned and 54 Reformers, proving beyond a doubt that there was some work going on behind the scenes that was not of a religious nature. I might point to the liberality of Ontario. In the Conservative government of the province of Ontario, one of the strongest governments the province ever had, there is for the first time as Minister of Public Works a French Canadian, and we have as Minister of Crown Lands a Roman Catholic, both men worthy of the positions and we the Conservatives of the province of Ontario were pleased beyond degree when we saw the choice which the present premier, Hon. Mr. Whitney, had made. I ask you to point to such liberality under any other circumstances and I venture to say that if I had the vote here it would be found that so far as their representatives are concerned the Roman Catholics have received a fair share of the vote according to their numbers in the province of Ontario, particularly in connection with the Conservative party. In looking over the votes we find that in all cases they have had a larger representation in the Conservative ranks than they have had in the Reform ranks, proving beyond a doubt that the Conservatives on all occasions have been more liberal along these lines than the Reformers have been in the past.

I was rather amused to see my hon. friend (Mr. Beland) endeavouring to make a point against the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean). He struggled hard, he read 'Hansard,' and read it with all the ingenuity of one well up along that line. He read 'Hansard' to prove beyond a doubt that my hon. friend was opposed to provincial rights, but he did not tell you what the gist of that argument was. He did not tell you what question was being discussed at that time. and of course we all know that there are questions in connection with the rights and privileges of the Dominion and those of the provinces which on many occasions have overlapped; they have not been well defined and great injustice has on many occasions been done in consequence. Look, for instance, at our railways, look at the conflict of jurisdiction in regard to charters for joint stock companies, &c. Here they are running from one parliament to the other obtaining charters of different kinds when the jurisdiction of the different parliaments in that respect should be well defined. We find that hon. gentlemen were discussing matters in connection with these grievances and that the discussion had nothing to do with equal rights such as we are discussing here to-night. I shall not follow my hon. friend further along that line, but I shall dwell now for a few moments upon the great question of the Bill which is before us and I might say that while the educational question is one of the most important dealt with in this Bill, there is great danger under existing circumstances that the attention of the people of Canada will be diverted from the other great questions which must affect that country in the future by the consideration of this one clause, and it may not be until after this becomes law, it may not be until it is beyond remedy, that we will have discovered mistakes which will then be beyond recall. I look upon the question of the number of provinces as one of great importance and one which cannot be too carefully considered. It is my opinion that it would have been much better for these provinces if we had two provinces instead of three. It would have been much better if the province of Manitoba could have been extended either to the north or west or east, and then we would have had one province west of that, making two in place of three. There is no doubt that Manitoba as she is constituted to-day will be at a great disadvantage in the future. It is a small province of 73,000 square miles, against two provinces of 150,000 square miles each. I submit that Manitoba is not receiving justice and before I have finished I shall endeavour to show why this injustice is being done to her. I believe it would be

better to have two provinces in place of three. We know that the more populous a province is the more expensive its administration becomes. At the present time in those two provinces there are only half a million people, surely not more than enough for one province. It has been said before, and I will say it again, that we are very much over-governed in the Dominion of Canada. We have more representatives in every legislature than are required. We have too much legislative machinery. So I say that if there were only one province instead of two in the Northwest one-half less machinery would be required. Perhaps there would need to be a greater number of representatives, but only one parliamentary building would be required. We must remember that to-day we are laying the foundation of what will probably become the two greatest provinces in this fair Dominion of ours. Although they have only 500,000 at present, in less than two decades, certainly in less than a quater of a century, there will be 10,000,000 or 20,000,000 in that vast country, people who have come from many parts of the world and from many nations, mingling together and forming probably the brightest and most intelligent people in this fair Dominion. Under these circumstances it is all important that the foundation should be strong and well laid and that no mistake should be made. As for the capitals of the two provinces, whether they are to be Edmonton or Calgary or not, it is well to let the people settle that question for themselves.

Now with reference to the land in those provinces. I do not agree with some hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken on this subject. I believe it would be to the interest of those provinces that they should have control of the public lands, and I believe it would be to the interest of the Dominion of Canada to leave the land with the provinces. Quebec, Ontario and all the other provinces except Manitoba have control of their public lands. Manitoba has not, because circumstances were very different when she was created a province, there were only about 12,000 souls in the territory now forming Manitoba, and they were not in a position to manage their own affairs. But here we have 500,000 people, very intelligent, and comprising among them able men such as have composed their legislative assemblies. I freely admit that the Dominion has dealt liberally with them, we have given on the whole to each province, $1,124,125. That is a large sum indeed, larger than the revenue which the Dominion will get out of the land. At the same time it is not sufficiently large to carry on the administration of public affairs as it should be carried on. I have made a calculation of the sums we are giving those provinces. For the support of the government and legislature, $50,000 ; 80 cents per head on an estimated population of 250,000, $200,000 ; interest at 5 per cent on $38,107,568, as a set-off against the debt of the other provinces which the Dominion assumed when they entered confederation, $405,373. We are also to pay them by way of compensation for public lands, $375,000 yearly, and we give them annually for ten years $92,750 to provide for the construction of the necessary public buildings. That will be increased as the population increases. When the population reaches 800,000 the two provinces will have an income of $4,415,750. Now I submit that it would be better for the provinces to keep their land, the Dominion of Canada will not make that much money out of the land, and the payments we are making to those provinces will be a burden on this Dominion which will be felt for many years to come. I contend that it would be better for the province to keep the land because it would be administered much better and much more economically than it is at the present time. Take the land offices in the Northwest Territories, I submit that many of them are perfect cesspools of corruption, and I speak whereof I know, as I have had some dealings through agents and otherwise with these land offices, and my conclusion is that they are not conducted in a proper manner. For instance, they are surrounded by heelers, by those who have claims upon the government, and the result is that when an actual settler goes there, when he has picked out his land and desires to place his name upon it, invariably he is told that it will require some consideration. Now if the business was properly conducted, they would be able to say at once to that man : You can have it, or : It is sold. But that is not the course pursued. He is annoyed, and, in many cases, he has to settle with the claims of some other parties. The result is hardships to the actual settler, to the immigrant coming in to make his home there. Many of them do not get the land after they have gone to much trouble in picking it out. Whilst that is the case with the actual settler, it is much worse with the prospector, of whom there are many, they are the most important class of the community. I speak from knowledge on this subject. Prospectors are numerous there, they travel all over the country, hundreds of thousands of miles exploring the land, digging down into the bowels of the earth to see if they can find anything that is worth taking up. When they make application to the land office, in almost every case, I venture to say in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, they are told that it is impossible to decide whether that land is taken up or otherwise, and they will have to wait a few days.

The prospector perhaps spends a large sum of money in locating the land which he desires to obtain. He comes back in a few days and finds three or four bogus claims made, and if he obtains the land by paying two or three rake-offs he is more fortunate than the great majority of pros-

pectors that are doing business in that vast country. They are surrounded by the barnacles that are sticking to these land offices like barnacles to a ship, who are looking for a rake-off, and I say that under these circumstances justice cannot be done. There are in that country hundreds and thousands of this class of men who are becoming rich year after year at the expense of the country. Large tracts of land are sold to speculators for very small sums. There is a condition that they have to settle so much land, but this is not always carried out. Different arrangements are made and the result is that the country is suffering because they are not settling the land to the extent that it should be settled, and that it would be if the land were in the hands of the provinces. I venture to say that there is to-day a state of corruption in that country that could not exist for one day if the lands were in the hands of the provinces. I venture to say, and in this I speak whereof I know, that if a commission was issued and if an examination were made, it would be found that the state of affairs is much worse up there than I have described it. It is preventing settlement, it is preventing people from going in there, it is preventing men who are prepared to invest their money in endeavouring to open up that country from making the ventures which they otherwise would make. One of the strongest claims that we have heard put forward by hon. gentlemen opposite is that they should hold these lands in order that they may control the immigration policy. I submit that if there is one branch of the administration which these provinces should have in their own hands, it is immigration. We know that immigration may prove a curse or a blessing. If we have immigrants coming into this country who are not desirable, if we have a great many immigrants who will not make good citizens, who are physically or otherwise unfit to undertake the duties of citizenship and who are not prepared to earn their own livelihood, then I say these immigrants will prove a curse rather than a blessing. It is a regrettable circumstance that we have had so many immigrants coming into this country who are utterly unfit to earn a livelihood. Many of them refuse to become citizens, and I submit that an immigrant, let him come from whatever country he may, if he is not prepared to become a full-fledged citizen and to fight the battles of this country if needs be, is not a person that any country should desire to bring in. It is a remarkable fact that a large class of these immigrants have been brought into this country on more advantageous terms than those granted to settlers from eastern Canada. I presume that one of the reasons why such great interest is taken in this Bill in the eastern provinces is that the people residing in this part of the country have relatives in the west, that many of them have their sons and daughters up there, worthy sons of the noble sires of Ontario, Quebec and the different provinces of this Dominion, but notwithstanding this fact foreigners and others have been accorded advantages which Canadian settlers cannot obtain in that new land. That is a state of affairs, which, I submit, should not exist. According to the returns of the last year, we brought into this country 134,223 immigrants, of whom 17,055 were under twelve years of age. We paid for the inspection of these immigrants to medical men, a total of $542,126, or $3.57 for the inspection of each immigrant. Yet, we all know that to-day there are hundreds and thousands physically unfit to make their living in this country, that they are a charge upon the Dominion or the province where they are, and we hear from the charitable institutions all over this Dominion that the greater number of those for whom they have to provide are the immigrants that are brought into the country. We know that many of them are affected with contagious diseases, that many are affected with eye diseases, that they have had from infancy, and that if the medical examination had been as thorough as it should have been, the state of affairs that we find in regard to immigration could not exist. Only a few were deported last year, proving beyond a doubt that whilst we have paid large sums for the services of these medical inspectors, the examinations were not such as should have been made, and that those who to-day are imposing the greatest burden upon the charitable institutions are these immigrants. Under these circumstances, I submit we have a state of affairs which could not exist if the provinces had supervision over these lands and of immigrant work, the provinces having much more interest in this work than the Dominion has. Under these circumstances, I submit that it would be much better that they should have the lands. They could make more out of them and they could have settlers of a desirable class coming in under their supervision. Then, again, I submit that the land belongs to the provinces. It is true that the Dominion of Canada paid £300,000 for that country, not for the land, but for the right of the Hudson Bay Company to hunt. Therefore, I say that the land, as I read the British North America Act, should and does belong to the provinces. If the other provinces require all the land they can get in order to make ends meet, if they require money, and if they run in debt year after year, how is it that these new provinces with the amount of money which is to be placed at their disposal, will be able to improve that country as they should? They have to provide charitable institutions for that unfortunate class that is rapidly increasing in all countries, the insane. They

have to provide charitable institutions, they have to build roads and bridges and incur enormous expense, and with the money at their disposal it is utterly impossible for them to build up that country as they should. If the province of Quebec is given its lands, why should not these new provinces ? By this Bill they have nothing under the land, they have nothing but the free air of heaven, and I suppose the Dominion government would have grasped that too had it the power. Quebec has no surplus, but out of the lands of the province they are able to give to the parent of twelve children a bounty in land and money.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Land or money.

Mr. BARR. Very well. We have never advanced that far in Ontario, and I do not think it would be worth while to offer that inducement because there would be very few to take advantage of it. Ontario has her lands, mines, and minerals and without them that province would have been starved years ago. Every year Ontario has found it necessary to sell from her timber limits and her Crown lands and to obtain large sums out of her mines and minerals. Notwithstanding that so far as we in the opposition during many years were concerned we never were able to find a surplus. It is true that the Liberal government always claimed they had a surplus, but that surplus was mythical as mythical could be, and when the books are now thoroughly audited it will be proved that not only has the province not a surplus, but that she is millions of dollars behind. What advantage is it for the new provinces to have borrowing powers if they have no security to offer ? Had it not been that Ontario could obtain a revenue from her natural resources, years ago that province would have been face to face with direct taxation which is the greatest calamity that could possibly happen to any people, province or country, and under this Bill that calamity is bound to overtake the new provinces. Manitoba has control of her swamp lands which in time will become most productive, and from them she derives a large income. Why should Manitoba have the swamp lands and the new provinces be denied them ? I venture to say that in the near future these provinces will be found coming here demanding better terms and putting up such a strong case that better terms will have to be granted no matter what government is in power. At this late hour of the night I will not speak as long as I had intended, but I shall for a short time discuss that vexed question of separate schools in the new provinces, which is to-day agitating the mind of the people in this fair Dominion as no other question has for many years. It is a question which will live, and which will continue to increase in importance, at all events until free and independent electors of Canada will have an opportunity to make themselves heard on it. We have had the legal aspect of this question discussed day after day and while no definite decision has been arrived at, nobody will deny that if the government had not seen fit to insert the separate school clause, there would have been no agitation and the people of the new provinces could decide on the question according to the dictates of their conscience and in their own best interests. It is not necessary to discuss here whether we are in favour of separate schools or not. I am glad to say that I am in accord with a number of those on the other side of the House who have announced that they are not in favour of separate schools. The Minister of Finance has told us that he is opposed to separate schools ; the member for Edmonton told us, as he stated many times on the public platform that he was opposed to separate schools. He is an old war horse who fought for provincial rights in the past, and who stated that he would never consent that separate schools should be inflicted on the Northwest Territories, but now he has changed his mind, like many others, in order to save his party. For my part I would be sorry to deprive any people of their just rights, but the people of the new provinces themselves know best what rights should be respected. It has been argued that because we have separate schools in Quebec and Ontario there should be separate schools in the new provinces, but let me point out that they have no separate schools in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba or British Columbia. We have Manitoba on the one side and British Columbia on the other, free to regulate their schools, and these two provinces wedged in between them, with separate schools forced upon them for all time to come—a state of affairs which I think never should have existed.

The difference between the separate schools in Ontario and Quebec and those in the new provinces in this. By the consent of both parties, by an agreement entered into by Quebec and Ontario, after due consideration, separate schools were established in those two provinces in perpetuity, and the government was embodied in the British North America Act. That is a very different position from the position occupied by these two provinces. When they obtained their territorial rights they were in their infancy ; they were the wards of the Dominion government. They had no voice in the settlement of the school question at that time. The system was provided for in the Bill of 1875 after much discussion, both in this House and in the Senate. An amendment was moved, I think by the late Senator Aikens in the Senate, but was defeated by a small majority. It was then that those memorable words, of which so much has been made, were uttered by the Hon. George Brown, to the effect that in providing for

separate schools in the Territorial Bill, they were establishing them for all time to come. He did not wish to imply that they would have to be placed there ; but, being a far-seeing man, he knew that the fact of that provision being made would be used for the purpose of perpetuating separate schools in those provinces ; and it is well known that he was always opposed to separate schools. Now, what guarantee have we that the separate schools in these two provinces will continue as they are at the present time ? I submit that we have no guarantee. We find that the provisions of the Bill are very hazy, so much so that lawyers might place very different interpretations upon it ; and the ordinances only guide the Territories, but do not ensure the schools as they now exist being continued for all time to come. While no great hardship may be experienced at the present time, it will certainly be a hardship to the majority in newly settled districts to maintain two weak and sickly schools where there might be one vigorous and healthy school. The Territories have no guarantee whatever that these schools will remain for all time to come as they are at the present time. I suppose they could change them for a system of schools similar to what exists in the province of Ontario to-day. According to a judgment given by Mr. Justice McMahon some three months ago, there are one hundred and five teachers teaching in the separate schools of Ontario to-day who have never passed a legal examination. This is a serious state of affairs; and yet these teachers are going on teaching month after month. It is true they have appealed the case to a higher court, and I suppose it will ultimately go to the Privy Council. These teachers are now teaching contrary to the law, except that the late government gave them permits to teach until a decision of the higher court could be obtained. Many of these teachers are not educated. It is said that many of them are priests, who are educated ; but many are ladies and others who have had no training whatever. The law with regard to separate schools in Ontario has been changed in many ways. For instance, the law provides that all taxes paid by corporations must be used for the support of the public schools ; but a private Bill was passed providing that the Sturgeon Falls Pulp Company should divide its taxes between the public schools and the separate schools. If that state of affairs can be brought about in the province of Ontario, why could it not in these new provinces ? The Minister of Customs endeavoured to make a point against the government of the Northwest Territories, particularly against Mr. Haultain, when he used these words :

> Talk about Mr. Haultain not having been consulted. He was consulted frequently, but if he had never been consulted or if no Northwest member had ever been consulted, I ask what better indication can you have of the desire of the people of the Northwest Territories than their own legislation ?

The legislation to which the Minister of Customs referred was a law of the Northwest council, of which Mr. Haultain was the head, particularly a law based on the school law which was handed down to them from this House. The law set forth that there should be an advisory board composed of not less than two Catholics and four Protestants. But it is only an advisory board ; it is not clothed with any power except to advise the Minister of Education, and he can change the regulations at any time ; so that we might have a very different state of affairs in the near future from what we have at the present time. To my mind it seems most extraordinary that the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) was not consulted and more extraordinary still that he himself did not make it a point to be present at the cabinet meetings when this matter was being decided. He well knew that these Bills were being prepared and he should have made it his duty to impress on his colleagues and the right hon. gentleman the necessity of having them passed upon by him before they were finally drafted. In not taking this action, I submit he was recreant to his duty. I submit that he did not do what was expected of him by the people of the Northwest. It is indeed extraordinary that on the subcommittee of the cabinet which undertook to frame those Bills, there was only one representative from Ontario while there were three from Quebec. Mr. Haultain, the premier of the Territories was not consulted, and Mr. Rogers from Manitoba informed us to-day that neither was he consulted, and we must conclude that it was decided by two or three representatives from Quebec that this clause No. 16 should be embodied in these Bills. It is evident that the First Minister took upon himself to bring down these Bills and force them through the House without consulting his colleagues, proving beyond doubt that we have to-day in this country a one man government. Let us for a moment look at the position occupied by this government to-day as compared with the one they took in 1896. In the election of 1896, the position I admit was a unique one. The late government was endeavouring to force on this House remedial legislation against the province of Manitoba. The right hon. gentleman, who was then leading the opposition, seized that opportunity to declare in the province of Quebec that if he were returned to power he would see that Manitoba gave the Catholic minority of that province what they desired. That was the stand taken by the Quebec wing of the right hon. gentleman's party, but what did they do in the province of Ontario ? In the elections in 1896 in that province, I took a rather active part and had the pleasure of hearing the First Minister and the Postmaster General on several occasions, and the arrangement

they entered into was this. The First Minister went up to the western part of Ontario and entered into an agreement with the late Sir Oliver Mowat to this effect, that if the Reform party were returned to power—and the signs of the times pointed that way—Mr. Mowat would resign his seat in the local cabinet and take office as Minister of Justice in the Dominion. Sir Oliver, being a canny Scotchman, was not going to take any chances and would not resign his premiership of Ontario until it was certain that the Liberals were returned to power in the Dominion. Contrary to his protestations in the past, that the provincial government should not interfere in Dominion elections, Sir Oliver Mowat took a very active part in those elections, and I had the pleasure of meeting him on several platforms. The position he then took was this. An effort, he said, is being made by the government of the Dominion to force remedial legislation upon Manitoba to deprive that province of its rights, and I ask the electors of Ontario to look back at my past history and say whether I have not on all occasions stood for equal rights. Have I not, he exclaimed, fought the battle of equal rights in years gone by, have I not fought it in connection with the boundary award and the license question and fought it successfully. And just as I fought it in the past in the local legislature, so I shall, when I enter Dominion politics, fight for the rights, not only of Manitoba but of all that great western country; and he went on to declare that when in the near future the territories would be created provinces, he would see that equal rights were extended to them. He would never agree to separate schools or to remedial legislation for the purpose of forcing those schools upon Manitoba or any province in the great lone land. And if the time should ever come when he would not have that power, he would resign his place in the House. The Postmaster General took the same ground. He declared on many a platform that he would never support separate schools in the Dominion and would never allow remedial legislation to be forced on Manitoba. The First Minister was also loud in his denunciation of the late government. He declared that he had stood in this House, and was prepared to stand in any part of the Dominion, for provincial rights, and that he would never allow this remedial legislation to be placed on Manitoba. He would never shackle any province with legislation along that line. He would never put the fetters upon any of those provinces, he was opposed to separate schools, he was pleased to know that they could attend school together, that they could go to the polls and vote together, and the result was that all these statements had their effect in Ontario. Seat after seat that had gone Conservative in the past went by overwhelming majorities to the Reform party and the result was that in 1896 the Reformers were surprised at the large vote which they received in Ontario. They obtained it under false pretenses in the way which I have pointed out. I ask the question how have they been able to swallow all these principles, to swallow themselves and to come here to-day after making these pledges in Ontario and endeavour to force separate schools upon this province, although they are the very men who denounced them in the past. I wonder how they in ten years succeed in swallowing all these promises. I cannot understand it unless in the words of the poet:

An all-wise and ever-indulging Providence has made them hollow,
In order that they their promises might swallow.

We have no separate schools in my county. We had them on one occasion but they have all disappeared. After a trial the Roman Catholics found that the public schools were much better and cheaper than the separate schools. It has been pointed out to us in the past that our public schools are Godless schools; in fact some speakers almost seem to have the idea that as far as the Protestant religion is concerned there is no God in that. So far as our national schools are concerned they must remember that we had enacted the Ross Bible from which portions of scriptures were to be read each day. Religious instruction can be given by Ministers of different denominations if they so desire and if the trustees and parents desire it and this is very often done. Under these circumstances I submit that it cannot be charged that these schools are Godless schools. So far as the county of Dufferin is concerned they do not want separate schools, and I venture to say that that is the case in many parts of the province as well. I have here a resolution which was passed in my county regretting that a provision for separate schools was placed in this Bill. I have here also the statement of the Minister of Public Works for Manitoba and I must say that it shows a most extraordinary state of affairs indeed. We find that in place of the First Minister meeting these delegates, as naturally we would expect, they were met by the Papal delegate. We have no objection to there being a Papal delegate in the Dominion of Canada so long as he confines his services to the work of the church, but just as soon as he interferes in our educational questions, then I say the line must be drawn and we have a right to take exception to his action. It has been going the rounds for many days that the Papal delegate met Mr. Rogers and Mr. Campbell by appointment and made a proposition to them. The proposition was that they should place a clause in the Manitoba school law that where there were in a rural district fifteen Roman Catholic children or in a city or town thirty Roman Catholic children separate rooms must be provided for them

and that the trustees if they so desired it must engage a teacher of their religious persuasion. Now look how that would work out; suppose there were sixty children in the district, then one-quarter of those would have one teacher and the other forty or forty-five would have one teacher, yet under that direction the trustees would be required to pay their equal share of taxes for the Catholic teacher who was only teaching fifteen children. I submit that this is a most unjust proposal and one that should not be entertained. If that meeting was not brought about I ask why the rumour has not been denied. I submit that it is up to His Excellency that he should set himself right upon it. Here are two men holding honourable positions, standing high in their province, men who have the confidence of their province, and they state distinctly that that meeting took place and that that proposition was made. Did the First Minister know about that meeting or did he not? That is the question to be decided. If he did not know then I submit that the Papal delegate was going beyond his proper sphere in making that proposition and therefore taking it in any light you can it was an improper thing to do; it was wrong to make the proposition. He told them according to this report that if they agreed to put this clause in, it would expedite the enlargement of the province. What does that mean? Does it not carry out the statements that have been made in the past over and over again that Manitoba need not expect any extension of territory unless she agreed to separate schools, and here we have a proposition made that proves beyond a doubt that this was the case. I say again that we in this House object to any interference whatever in connection with church or state. We refuse to allow any foreign potentate to take any part in our legislation or to dictate how our children shall be educated in any part of this fair Dominion of ours.

Now in this age of the world when church and state are being separated in France, we in Canada are binding them together. I submit that is a state of affairs that should not exist. It has been said that in the United States, because they have national schools where no religion is taught, the people have become unchristian, and we are pointed to the eastern countries where state church schools have existed for so long. I have travelled through those eastern countries myself, I have seen the sun rise and set in many lands, and in travelling through them I have observed the way in which the Sabbath was kept, and have endeavoured to learn something of the results of the church schools which prevail there. I found that those eastern countries have not been going ahead as the United States has. Spain has had church schools for centuries, and to-day Spain is one of the dying nations of the world. France has had church schools; and to-day she is severing all connection between church and state, and as a result of establishing national schools I believe we will see France rise amongst the nations of the world. It is true that in the United States where there are no separate schools, there are divorce laws, and lynchings and many other problems that are difficult to solve; nevertheless the United States stands to-day among the foremost nations of the world. As regards Sabbath observance, it is in those countries where church schools prevail that you will find the Sabbath most generally violated, theatre going and all kinds of amusements are carried on on that day. If you want to find a Christian nation you will find one that observes the Sabbath. Where will you find the Sabbath as well observed as it is in this fair Dominion of ours? You will find it observed just as well in those provinces that have national schools as in those that have separate schools. I am not prepared to say that there is any difference. But I think we can boast that we have a Christian people in this Dominion, who observe the Sabbath better than in any other country in the world.

Therefore, I say, that in building up this great country we are making history, and we must carefully procure the greatest freedom to the greatest number of people. We must give those new provinces provincial rights, we must give them all the freedom they have a right to expect at our hands. Sir, the time will come, whether it is this year or next year, when the free and independent electors of this Dominion will assert themselves. We have seen petitions coming from every part of this Dominion, the table has groaned beneath their weight. We have seen public meetings passing resolutions in almost every province in the Dominion, protesting against forcing separate schools upon these new provinces. There is an awakening amongst the free and independent electors such as never existed in this Dominion before, and it will go on and increase. Exception has been taken to the petitions that have been presented and to the public meetings that have been held. Sir, that is the only way in which the people can express their opinions when no election is going on, it is only by petitions and by public meetings passing resolutions that they can make their voice heard. Then we find that the newspapers from one end of this Dominion to the other, except in the province of Quebec, have condemned this legislation. The 'Globe,' the organ of the Reform party, is just as strong on this question as the Conservative newspapers. I venture to say that if we could have now an expression of opinion at the polls, we would find Reformers and Conservatives going to the polls side by side and shoulder to shoulder in every constituency in Ontario,

to vote against this legislation and against the present government. This agitation will not die out. No matter whether the elections come on in one year, or two years, or three years, or four years from now, this is a live question, and I venture to say that so far as the province of Ontario is concerned, even four years from now, this government will not carry half a dozen seats. I venture to predict that the same state of affairs will be found to exist in Manitoba and in those two new provinces. The present government will find that the free and independent electors will drive them out of power the first opportunity that presents itself.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 12.35 a.m. Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, April 6, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

EXTRADITION CASES AT MONTREAL.

Mr. BERGERON—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. How many extradition cases, demanded by the United States, have come, during the past eighteen months, before the extradition commissioner in the district of Montreal ?
2. What decision was given in each case ?
3. Before which commissioner or judge did the said extradition cases come, and by which were they decided upon ?

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) :

1. Five extradition cases demanded by the United States have come, during the past eighteen months, before the Extradition Commissioners in the district of Montreal.
2. In four cases the prisoner was committed to await extradition ; one case (Gaynor and Greene) is still sub judice.
3. All before Mr. Commissioner Lafontaine.

GAYNOR-GREENE EXTRADITION.

Mr. BERGERON—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Is the government aware that, during the extradition proceedings against John F. Gaynor and Benjamin D. Greene, a recusation for alleged reasons was taken against Mr. Ulric Lafontaine, the extradition commissioner ?
2. If so, what course does the government purpose taking in regard to the said recusation?

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) :

1. It is a matter of public notoriety, through the newspapers, that in the extradition proceedings against John F. Gaynor and Benjamin D. Greene, a paper called a 'recusation' was filed against Mr. Lafontaine, the Extradition Commissioner ; but the government has no official notice of any such proceeding. The question of the magistrate's competency is now before the courts for judicial determination.
2. When the matter is officially before the government, it will be time to say what course the government propose taking in regard to it.

EXTENSION OF THE BOUNDARIES OF MANITOBA.

On the Orders of the Day being called,

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to say a few words with respect to a matter that was mentioned in the House yesterday. Let me, in the first place, speak of the letter of February 23rd, which evidently was not received by the Prime Minister. May I be permitted to say that I understood from the remarks of the Prime Minister yesterday that there was rather a reflection on Mr. Rogers in the suggestion that the letter had not been received. I rather gathered that the Prime Minister had some doubts as to whether or not the letter was written. Perhaps I misunderstood the right hon. gentleman, but it is, I think, right to say that very ample evidence was forthcoming of the writing and of the sending of the letter, and while we at once accept most unreservedly the statement of the Prime Minister that he did not receive it, still I would think that, under the circumstances, it would be a perfectly proper thing to include that letter in the correspondence which is about to be printed.

Since the discussion of yesterday a statement has been made by His Excellency Monseigneur Sbarretti. I will come to that a little later on. Let me say that I know nothing of the circumstances under which a delegate of the Holy See was in the first place brought to this country beyond what has been stated by gentlemen on the other side of the House, who are well qualified to make such statements, because they have personal knowledge of that which they state.

As I gather from them the Delegate Apostolic came to this country in 1897, not at the instance of the bishops of the Roman Catholic church in Canada, but at the instance of some forty Liberal members of parliament who are members of the Roman Catholic church. I understand that there was no demand for the appointment of a delegate by the bishops or clergy. In making that statement, of course, I rely entirely

on what has been said by hon. gentlemen on the other side, by the right hon. Prime Minister, by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) and others who have very frankly stated the position of affairs in that regard. The delegate came to this country, as the hon. member for Labelle has stated, because there was a certain misunderstanding between the laity and the clergy of the church. I understood him to say that the difference arose in connection with the Manitoba school question, which was made a political question. Thus, I venture to suggest, not on my own authority at all, but from what has been said by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, that the delegate came to this country in the first place on account of a political question which arose in this country and that his functions have been to some extent at least political and perhaps more political than ecclesiastical.

Now the right hon. gentleman has laid a great deal of stress upon the fact that no communication from the executive of Manitoba in regard to the boundary question had come to this government before the month of January last. But, my hon. friend was not unaware that that question had been brought up in the Manitoba legislature. He was not unaware that resolutions, unanimously concurred in by his own political friends in Manitoba, had been passed by the legislature of that province; and when he sent his letter into the Northwest in the month of September last announcing that new provinces would be created in the Northwest Territories, he knew perfectly well that the question would be to the fore as soon as the Bill was introduced for the purpose of creating those provinces. Therefore, the boundary question was to all intents and purposes to the fore, and very much to the fore, during the present year in connection with the legislation which is now before the House for discussion and in connection with the distribution of territory attending the creation of these provinces. It has been very much to the fore during the last few months especially.

I referred yesterday to certain press comments on the subject, but I did not refer to them very fully. I will take the opportunity of mentioning them again, because they are significant. I have here an article which appeared in the 'Northwest Review,' published in the city of Winnipeg. I am not familiar with the 'Northwest Review'; I have no knowledge except what is stated in the press in regard to it. Other hon. gentlemen who are more familiar with that publication can speak better in that regard. I am about to read a statement which would attract attention coming from any responsible source in this country, and I understand that the source to which I refer is a very responsible one in that regard. The words of the 'Northwest Review' are as follows:

> Two days after the 'Telegram' had trumpeted abroad the Hon. Robert Rogers' great hopes for the western extension of Manitoba, the same wise and prophetic journal deplores the fact that there will be no such extension in any direction. But it omits to give the reason thereof. The only obstacle to the territorial expansion of our province is its iniquitous and cruel school system. Not even the wildest corner of any unorganized territory will consent to saddle itself with such a tyranny. Manitoba must be content to remain small and mean so long as it maintains its small and mean school policy.

Let me say in passing that that small and mean school policy was hailed by my right hon. friend the leader of the government in a speech in this House in 1897, as a happy solution of a very difficult question and one which he pronounced to be perfectly satisfactory to the people of his own province. He said in regard to it:

> The only thing I care for is that, whereas, under the Act, 1890, they had not the privilege of teaching their own religion in the schools, by the concessions which have been made, whether they are concessions of new rights or a restoration of old rights, they will have the right hereafter of teaching their own religion in the province of Manitoba.

Further on:

> Well, the moment I found that the people of Manitoba was ready to make concessions which practically restored to the Catholics the right of teaching the French language and of teaching their own religion in the schools, I submitted to my fellow countrymen in the province of Quebec that it was far better to obtain those concessions by negotiation than to endeavour to obtain them by means of coercion.

Further on:

> And I venture at this moment to say that there is not a man in the province of Quebec, there is not a man in this country, who, looking at the settlement unbiassed and unprejudiced, will not come to the conclusion that it was a happy solution of a very difficult situation indeed.

I hardly think that the words which I have quoted from the 'Northwest Review' are applicable to the happy solution of a very difficult situation which was referred to by my right hon. friend on that occasion. I may say in this connection that some criticism was directed against my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) on account of his statement respecting the confirmation or approval by the people of this country of that settlement in the elections of 1900 and 1904. Why, Sir, my right hon. friend the leader of the government, in 1897, in the same speech to which I have referred, declared that there was ample approval and confirmation of the settlement by the three by-elections which had taken place before the time at which he spoke. Surely, if in the opinion of my right hon. friend three by-elections were a sufficient approval of that

settlement so auspiciously made, my hon. friend from North Toronto did not go too far the other day when he made the remarks to which attention has been drawn in this House. Well, what further? The 'Northwest Review' is not, so far as I am aware, under the control or direction of the government or any member thereof, but there is a newspaper in the province of Quebec which declares itself to be the organ of the Liberal party and to be under the direction and control of my right hon. friend the leader of the government. I quote from an editorial statement of the 11th of February last in that journal, 'Le Soleil,' published in the city of Quebec:

> We declare once for all that 'Le Soleil' is the organ of the Liberal party, and by that fact is under the direction and absolute control of Sir Wilfrid. The supporters of Sir Wilfrid and those who affirm themselves to be such, are begged to take notice of the present declaration.

Now, it will be interesting to know whether or not that is a plain, clear, unvarnished falsehood or whether there is any foundation for the statement made editorially in the columns of that newspaper. It has been stated, and stated without contradiction in this House so far as I am aware—and I speak under correction from the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who know more of this matter than I do—that the editorial management of that journal was controlled by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr Fitzpatrick). Further than that, it is stated that now the control of that journal has passed into the hands of Mr. Choquette, a gentleman who, in the first place, was a follower of my right hon. friend the leader of the government in this House, who, in the next place, was appointed by my right hon. friend to an important judicial position in the province of Quebec and who, immediately before the last election campaign, descended from the bench for the purpose of becoming the organizer of my right hon. friend in the province of Quebec. There is an editorial article in this newspaper, 'Le Soleil,' of 4th of April which I will translate for the purpose of reading:

> The 'L'Evenement' announced yesterday afternoon that 'Le Soleil' had been bought by the Gouin-Turgeon faction. Our contemporary made a mistake; it often makes mistakes. The purchase of a certain number of shares in the 'Le Soleil' Publishing Company by the Hon. Senator Choquette is only an ordinary transaction such as takes place every day in the affairs of every company. As to our journal, it remains as it has always been, the organ of the Liberal party, and in the future as in the past it will defend the policy and the interests of the Liberal party.

Having defined as far as we can define with the information at our hand, the position of 'Le Soleil' and its relation to the Liberal party in this country, and especially to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice, let us observe what that journal has said with regard to this boundary question, because it is sometimes important to consider the utterances of great political organs upon political questions. It is desirable in the present instance to do so, in order to lead up to the incident to which attention has been drawn only yesterday. On the 17th of February 'Le Soleil' editorially made the remarks, which have been translated as follows:

> In proportion to her big sisters Manitoba will count as little more than a large county.
>
> This is one of the reasons invoked by Manitoba's delegates to obtain an enlargement of her territory.
>
> There is another. Quebec and Ontario have extended their limits, the one to the west, the other to the east, to attain on the north the shores of James bay.
>
> Manitoba aspires to the shores of Hudson bay, on the northeast. It would be necessary to withdraw her boundaries several hundred miles towards the north, to cut the district of Saskatchewan and Athabaska, and encircle that of Keewatin.
>
> Manitoba is asking for treble her existing territory.
>
> This enlargement is hardly possible.
>
> The district of Saskatchewan opposes it, at least the part directly interested.
>
> The finances of Manitoba in their actual state are not made to attract the free residents of the districts. Manitoba has a debt of $4,000,000. The school legislation of the little province is not of a nature to attract the immigrants who people the districts. The Northwest has its separate schools. Manitoba has abolished them.
>
> Every good act has its reward, every bad act its chastisement.
>
> Manitoba will remain lowest with her pretentious law.

Those, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, are very significant words coming from a journal which claims to be under the actual control and direction of the right hon. gentleman, and which is said—and without contradiction up to the present time—which is said to have been at the moment of these editorial utterances, under the direct control of the Minister of Justice.

Under these circumstances, what took place? The delegates from Manitoba arrived in Ottawa on the 16th day of February. They came here for the express purpose of discussing with the government the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba; they met the right hon. gentleman and the Postmaster General, and perhaps some other members of the cabinet. According to their statement, they were told by the right hon. gentleman that if they would remain a few days in Ottawa he would send for them again, and perhaps be prepared to give them an answer. They were not sent for by the right hon. gentleman again although they remained in the city of Ottawa until the 23rd day of February. I do not know whether the exact date has

been given, but before they left Ottawa, and some time between the 20th and the 23rd of February, they received a letter from His Excellency, Monseigneur Sbarretti. I make no criticism upon His Excellency in extending to them that invitation; I make no criticism upon them for courteously accepting that invitation. Let us consider, however, how far the situation had developed up to that time. Legislation in regard to the schools in the Northwest was about being brought down; it even then had just been brought down by the administration—or at least by a portion of the administration, because two members of the administration had not been consulted. I will correct myself and say that legislation had been brought down by the Prime Minister in the name of the whole administration. but with the authority of only a part of the administration. It is true that we had very direct avowals from the Minister of Agriculture and from the Postmaster General yesterday, that they were thoroughly familiar with the terms of the legislation as originally brought down and that they thoroughly approved of it as originally brought down. I am making no criticism so far as they are concerned, because the Prime Minister certainly had their approval and the approval of the Minister of Customs, but he had not the approval of the Minister of Finance nor of the Minister of the Interior.

I do not know to what extent any consultations had been had with His Excellency in regard to the terms of this legislation. The statement has been made in the public press—I called my right hon. friend's attention to it yesterday, I invited him to make some explanation with regard to it—and the statement has been made across the floor of the House, that His Excellency had been consulted with regard to the terms of this legislation. I am not at present making any criticism about that; I am only mentioning it to lead up to what follows, because, educational matters in the Northwest Territories were considered, if in these consultations it is a little difficult to believe that the schools of Manitoba were absolutely ignored in these discussions and that the boundaries of Manitoba were never mentioned. What follows ? The interview took place. I made no comment yesterday with regard to that, because I thought it was not advisable for me to do so, as we had not yet the version of His Excellency before us, and I thought we were entitled to have his version of what took place before we should make much comment upon this particular incident. Last night, His Excellency, I believe, gave out an interview which has been published in the newspapers of today, and I will follow the example of my right hon. friend yesterday, by placing the whole of that interview on 'Hansard,' in order that we may have the full benefit of the explanation that has been given.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Monseigneur Sbarretti last night handed out for publication the following statement :

I think it my duty to declare that the press report of a conference with the Manitoba delegates is not altogether exact and that it is given in such a way as to make a false impression on the minds of the people.

These are the facts :

Taking occasion of the presence in Ottawa of the Hon. Mr. Campbell, the attorney-general of Manitoba, whom I had met in a friendly way more than a year ago, I invited him to come to see me. I never met Hon. Mr. Rogers, nor did I have any communication with him. On the evening before his departure for the west, February 23rd, Mr. Campbell came. I asked him if something could not be done to improve the condition of the Catholics of his province with respect to education. I pointed out that in the cities of Winnipeg and Brandon, for instance, the Catholics were paying double taxes. I urged my request on the ground of fairness and justice and referring to his mission to Ottawa I remarked that from the point of view of the Manitoba government some action on these lines would be politically expedient and tend to facilitate the accomplishment of his object, inasmuch as Catholics in any territory which might be annexed to Manitoba would naturally object to losing the right they had to separate schools and to be subjected to the educational conditions which existed in Manitoba. Mr. Campbell then asked me what would be my desire in this respect. I then gave him the memorandum which has already appeared in the press.

This is the sum and substance of my interview with Mr. Campbell. The federal government had absolutely no knowledge of it. It was a private conversation and simply intended to express a suggestion and a desire that the condition of the Catholics in the respect I have mentioned would be improved. Any other assumption or interpretation is altogether unfounded. I think my right of speaking to Mr. Campbell in a private way and on my own responsibility cannot be disputed.

I notice that my hon. friends opposite cheer very much the statement of His Excellency that 'Catholics in any territory which might be annexed to Manitoba would naturally object to losing the right they had to separate schools, and to be subjected to the educational conditions which existed in Manitoba.' That is what they cheer, as I understand. I am amazed at these hon. gentlemen. The other day we had the ex-Minister of the Interior rise in his place and publicly thank the right hon. Prime Minister, without whose aid, he said, the Catholics of Manitoba could not have been deprived of those rights—publicly thanked the right hon. gentleman for having come to the aid of the majority in Manitoba and prevented the Conservative government from restoring to the minority those rights of which they had been deprived. The right hon. gentleman has declared this to be a happy solution of a difficult situation; but hon. gentlemen opposite cheer the utterance which I have just quoted. Their attitude is a little incomprehensible to myself, and I think it must be incomprehensible

to any reasonable man throughout the country.

Now, let us observe a little what His Excellency does say. He is an able and accomplished man, brought up in one of the best schools of diplomacy in the world; a diplomat; a man who, I am sure, would make no suggestion, to Mr. Campbell or to Mr. Rogers, which he did not feel himself able to carry out. And let us see if my hon. friends opposite will cheer a little analysis of what His Excellency does say:

> I remarked that from the point of view of the Manitoba government some action on these lines would be politically expedient——
>
> Politically expedient, mark you——
>
> ——and tend to facilitate the accomplishment of his object, inasmuch as Catholics in any territory which might be annexed to Manitoba would naturally object to losing the right they had to separate schools and to be subjected to the educational conditions which existed in Manitoba.

Conditions which the right hon. gentleman himself stated in 1897 were absolutely satisfactory not only to himself, but to the people of the province of Quebec. Politically expedient—what does that mean? Let us consider it for a moment. It would be politically expedient for the government of Manitoba, which desired an extension of its boundaries, to make certain amendments to that law which the Prime Minister had declared to be a happy solution of a difficult situation. Politically expedient—who had the power to extend those boundaries? The government of this country—hon. gentlemen sitting on the other side of the House. There was one and only one power in this country that could deal with that question, and that is the power represented by the fourteen or fifteen gentlemen who sit around the Council board of Canada; and His Excellency declared that 'from the point of view of the Manitoba government some action on these lines would be politically expedient.' Now, there is only one possible meaning to that, and it is this; His Excellency must have thoroughly believed that he had the authority to suggest to these gentlemen that if they acceded to his demand, to his request with regard to the school laws of Manitoba, there would be such an extension of the boundaries of Manitoba as the government of that province desired. I am reluctant to believe that His Excellency would have made any such suggestion unless he believed he had authority of some kind. I do not know whether he received authority from or had any discussion with the right hon. gentleman or with any other minister of the Crown. I do not know whether we shall receive any information on that subject. I do not know whether my right hon. friend will think it advisable to give us any information. I do remember, however, that after the right hon. gentleman had declared, in answer to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and in answer to myself, only last session, that every document in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company had been brought down, the Minister of Finance weeks afterwards read a document which had not been brought down, and used it for the purpose of debate; and the government justified their action in that regard by declaring in effect that if a document of a confidential character came into their possession, they were perfectly justified in denying in this House that any such document existed. I do not know what denials or what statements we shall receive in this regard; but it is interesting to observe another thing in this statement of His Excellency, and it is this: that there is no direct statement in it, so far as I have been able to observe, that he did not have the authority which he assumed on that occasion. He has said, and the Prime Minister has said, that that interview was not arranged on behalf of the government or at the instance of the government; but I do not observe any statement of His Excellency that he did not consider himself to have authority to make the suggestion which he did make to the Hon. Mr. Campbell on that occasion. If there was a supposed authority, or if beyond that there was real authority given on behalf of this government, or given by any member of this government, how does the action of the members of this administration contrast with their attitude in 1896? Then their cry, at least in most of the provinces of Canada, was: No coercion; hands off Manitoba. That was their answer to a remedial order and remedial legislation proposed by a Conservative administration within the strict terms of the constitution. But what has been suggested might rightly be regarded, I think, as a remedial order of another type—as a remedial order of an unconstitutional and unwarranted character; and I for one am surprised that upon the statement of His Excellency, which I have no doubt is absolutely accurate in every respect, there should have been this suggestion to the members of the government of the province of Manitoba.

I am not concerned wth the question as to whether or not His Excellency should be recalled; as I said yesterday, he is not responsible to us in any sense, he is responsible only to his superiors. But the government of this country are responsible to us, and if there has been any suggestion of this kind by or on behalf of the government of this country, or by or on behalf of any member of it, then I say the country will demand, and I think the people will demand, the dismissal or retirement of any member of this government who ventured to confer upon His Excellency any authority

of that kind. His Excellency is not responsible to us, but the members of the administration are. This was not an ecclesiastical matter, it concerned no ecclesiastical matters in no way whatever, it was to all intents and purposes a purely political matter, the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba. I venture to think that in addition to the explanations which were given to the Prime Minister yesterday in this regard, there should be some further explanations made to the House and to the country to-day, in view of the very frank statement which has been made by His Excellency, and which I have brought to the attention of the House. I move the adjournment of the House.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, in the exchange of courtesies which usually prevail between the two sides of the House, it has been customary up to this time for my hon. friend, when he intended to move the adjournment of the House in order to bring up some important question, to give me some intimation of his intention ; but my hon. friend, for some reason of his own which I do not know, has thought it advisable on this occasion to depart from the practice hitherto followed by himself and by his predecessors.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Allow me to say to my hon. friend that I received no intimation whatever of the extended remarks which he offered to the House yesterday.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I thought it advisable yesterday to give no notice whatever to my hon. friend that I intended to make a statement which concerned myself personally, and to dispute a statement which had appeared in the newspapers on a previous day. Nor did I believe, nor do I believe yet, when a member of this House finds himself attacked in a newspaper in a manner which he thinks is unwarranted, that he requires to give any notice of his intention to rise in his place and make an explanation, particularly when the matter is in no way controversial. It is also the general rule that when a member of the House gives his word in contradiction to alleged facts stated in a newspaper, his word is accepted, nor do I understand my hon. friend to dispute that rule. But to-day my hon. friend has thought it advisable, for reasons of his own, to bring up a matter which is essentially controversial, because it implies a censure by the House, and, therefore, I would have expected that the usual courtesy would have been extended to me. Had I been informed of his intention, perhaps I would be in a better position to give him an answer, which I think I can give him nevertheless on this occasion. I must say that in the multiplicity of business which I have to attend to I had read only cursorily the statement which appeared in the newspapers, given by His Excellency, Monseigneur Sbarretti, the Apostolic delegate, and which my hon. friend read a moment ago. But all this is not very much to the point. We have to-day, according to the hon. gentleman, a new phase of this question, and I am glad to say that we have a new phase, because it is a confirmation and a corroboration of the statement I made yesterday on the floor of this House. My hon. friend referred to my statement yesterday that up to the month of January last we had no information, no official information, of the intention of Manitoba to make an application for an extension of her boundaries. Why did I do that ? My hon. friend, for a reason, explained the alleged interview which was said to have taken place between Mr. Rogers, Mr. Campbell and the Apostolic delegate. In that interview Monseigneur Sbarretti was reported to have said that it would facilitate matters if these gentlemen would consent to the restoration of separate schools in Manitoba, and that if that had been done before it would have facilitated the extension of their boundaries towards the west. Well, Sir, I stated that I could hardly believe that His Excellency could have used such language, because then and there Mr. Rogers would have answered, and could have answered to the Apostolic delegate that there never had been by the government of Manitoba any demand upon this government to extend their boundaries prior to the month of January last, and therefore Monseigneur Sbarretti could not, in my judgment, have used such language in the presence of Mr. Rogers. Now to-day we have the confirmation of my opinion that Monseigneur Sbarretti had never spoken in that way to Mr. Rogers, for the very good and obvious reason that Monseigneur Sbarretti never saw Mr. Rogers. There are many things in that interview published by Mr. Rogers which turn out to be not altogether according to the facts. You have the impression from the interview which was published yesterday, that the Apostolic delegate had sent an invitation to the delegates of the Manitoba government who were in Ottawa, to discuss with him this question of the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba. Is that according to the facts as we know them to-day? No, Sir, we find that the invitation of Monseigneur Sbarretti was not at all extended to the delegates of the government of Manitoba, he says he never knew Mr. Rogers ; but the invitation was extended, not to the delegates, but to Mr. Campbell whom he knew before, and whom he treated as a friend. It is a very different thing to have an official interview and conversation with the delegates of a government, and a private interview and conversation between His Excellency and a gentleman who happened to be in Ottawa at the time, and who was a member of the government of Manitoba.

Now, Sir, there are many things alleged

in this interview which I might comment upon. It is quite evident from the explanation of His Excellency, and is indeed obvious to all, that this interview was not a public discussion, it was merely a friendly conversation between two gentlemen who had met together to discuss a question which they had previously discussed. Now, my hon. friend has hinted, or has attempted to create the impression, that the government of Canada was actuated by sinister motives with regard to the province of Manitoba, and that we refused to extend her boundaries because we wished to punish the province of Manitoba for having abolished separate schools. To establish his point he quotes a statement in a Quebec newspaper, the 'Soleil,' which is a newspaper friendly to myself and which claims to be my organ.

Sir, it is very strange that whenever a newspaper friendly to the government says something which the hon. gentleman thinks is favourable to themselves, he at once holds the government responsible for the statement. Well, does he hold me responsible, for instance, for the attitude of the 'Globe' upon this occasion, or of the other newspapers who do not support the government? And if I am not to be held responsible for the attitude taken by the 'Globe,' why in the name of common sense should I be held responsible for the opinion of the 'Soleil?' There would be just as much reason in one as in the other. 'Le Soleil' is a paper friendly to myself. But, because 'Le Soleil' is friendly to myself and wants to serve me, surely it does not follow that under any circumstances, I am bound to be responsible for everything appearing in 'Le Soleil,' or in any newspaper. It would be absurd to say that because men agree upon political matters, they will therefore see eye to eye in everything. There are other matters than politics on which men can differ in opinion. And it is, to my thinking, a position unworthy of my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) to say that the government should be supposed to have been actuated by belief in a certain line of policy because that policy was supported by a certain newspaper. The day has not yet come when the Canadian government must look for its policy or the ground for its opinions to newspapers, however respectable those newspapers may be. We decide these matters upon our own lines and according to our best judgment. But the hon. gentleman has endeavoured to convey the idea—he did not say it in so many words—that there had been a sort of understanding. He did not use the word 'conspiracy,' but he intended to convey the idea, if he meant anything at all, that there had been a conspiracy between the government of Canada,—and in particular myself and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick)—and Monseigneur Sbarretti to do certain things,—that is to say, that the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba should depend on the restoration of separate schools in that province. Why, we have only to take the facts in chronological order as they are known to have occurred to show how unfounded, how absolutely unfounded, how devoid even of the shadow of foundation, such an assertion as that made by my hon. friend is. What are the facts? As stated yesterday, we received in the month of January, towards the end of it, the request of the Manitoba government for a conference. We agreed to that conference, and it took place on the 17th of February. There were present a subcommittee of council and the question was discussed. We told the delegates that they should have an answer at an early day. That answer they had on the floor of this House four days later, on the 21st of February, when I introduced the Autonomy Bills, and in the course of my explanation stated our position with regard to the boundaries of Manitoba was clearly defined. It was two days afterwards, on the 23rd of February, that the conference took place between His Excellency Monseigneur Sbarretti and Mr. Campbell. When that conference took place, the decision of this government was already known. We had stated what we would do. We had stated that we would reserve the northern portion of Saskatchewan to be annexed to Manitoba or not as circumstances might suggest, and the extension of the boundaries should take place to Hudson bay if there was an opportunity to do so, after conference. The policy of the government was thus determined, and could not be affected by anything that might take place in the conference between His Excellency the apostolic delegate and Mr. Campbell. But, Sir, there is more. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) wants to know whether or not there was any question between the government of Canada and Monseigneur Sbarretti as to the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba. As I said a moment ago, I have not seen the statement of His Excellency,—I have not read it critically—but the answer to my hon. friend's question he already has before him—he has only to read that statement. He has read it, and in it he finds that Monseigneur Sbarretti says explicitly that the government had nothing at all to do with his own action. That ought to suit the purpose of my hon. friend and ought to convince him that he cannot make any political capital on that line. I have only to refer to the words of Monseigneur Sbarretti when he says himself—and his words are in the memory of every member of this House—that he stated to Mr. Campbell that if they would restore the separate schools in Manitoba, it would be politically expedient. Why? In what manner? In respect of any action to be taken by this government? No; but because the people in the Territories would then have no objections to going into Man-

itoba. There you have the whole meaning of this matter of political expediency.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What do these hon. gentlemen mean? Would they suggest that there is something behind? They seek to prove their case by the words of the Apostolic delegate, and I give them his words making clear his own meaning. It would be, politically expedient. Why? On account of any action to be taken here? No, but because the people in the Northwest Territories who were affected would have no objection to be taken into the province of Manitoba. That is all there is in the matter. Yet, in the face of a statement so obvious as this, you have the leader of a great party doing his best to show that there was something hidden on the part of the government of Canada in this matter. A few moments ago my hon. friend said that we would fight this question out elsewhere. I accept that challenge without any qualification. We will fight out this question in this House. We will fight it out elsewhere. We will fight it out on the charge that hon. gentlemen opposite have brought to the attention of the House. I have no fear about the result. This is not the first time in the thirty years of my experience that I have seen the Tory party playing this part of endeavouring to arouse the prejudices of the people. We shall meet again and shall discuss this question elsewhere. In the meantime, I accept the challenge of my hon. friend that we are responsible to the people; and that responsibility we shall not decline, but shall meet it in due time.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, the unwonted heat the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) developed in his speech was unnecessary to remind us of the weakness of his argument in the opening, and, in fact, during the greater part, of his remarks. Though so valiant, though he has fought for thirty years and is willing to fight for ever so many years more, he found himself obliged to plead the baby act in the very first sentence of his speech. His hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), he said, had not given him notice that he was going to bring this new and unheard-of and unexpected question before the House. And this great, strong man of battle for thirty years endeavoured to make a little cheap capital against my hon. friend the leader of the opposition by imputing to him a want of courtesy. But, as he thinks it over the right hon. gentleman will remember that yesterday my hon. friend the leader of the opposition gave notice that he would again discuss this matter. And the reason he did not so fully discuss it yesterday was that there had been no word uttered by Monseigneur Sbarretti, and, for very good reasons and very prudent reasons, I think, my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) refused to fulfil the whole purpose of the discussion until Monseigneur Sbarretti had either been heard from or had refused to say anything about this matter. So that I do not think there was very much in that matter of lack of courtesy. My right hon. friend may refine on the technical point but he certainly came here yesterday fully prepared to make as much as he possibly could out of this question politically. My right hon. friend is, I have no doubt, doing some thinking these days.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. And whether he and his colleagues and his followers are doing much thinking or not we may be certain that the people of this country are doing some thinking these days and I must say there is good material and plenty of it. But, Sir, let us ask now what my right hon. friend took such pains to deny yesterday. He took great pains to deny absolutely and categorically a great many things which are altogether of secondary importance. For instance he made a point against the Hon. Mr. Rogers because he said that they had not been invited on the initiative of the Dominion government to have a conference in Ottawa with reference to the extension or the boundaries. Neither did Mr. Rogers' statement declare that the invitation was on the initiative of the Dominion government. It might have been implied from that letter that it was or it might not, but in all conscience what difference did it make whether the invitation went from my right hon. friend in reply to a request or whether it was on his own initiative. As far as the facts of the case go what difference did it make? But there was a very authoritative, a very absolute and a very much cheered denial on the part of my right. hon. friend of that first statement made by Mr. Rogers. He thought he had triumphantly floored his opponent when he contended that the interview had not taken place on his initiative. He made another strong point in connection with the interivew in that the Manitoba government had from 1896 up to January of this year made no step by way of initiative towards getting an extension of their boundaries. The Manitoba government I suppose is a fairly sensible government. They knew that their legislature had backed up the demand for an extension of territory. It had done it once, it had done it a second time and possibly a third time, but a claim for extension of territory waits generally for the favourable period and during all this time there was the prospect of the erection of new provinces in the Northwest, a prospect coming closer to fulfilment and it was felt that the time when the Territories were to be erected into provinces would be an opportune moment for the Manitoba government to press for an extension of their boundaries,

so that the argument based upon that point was scarcely worth the time it took to state it. It was within the right of the Manitoba government to choose their own time and the time chosen was that of the approaching creation of provinces in the west. Then they pressed their claim and I say that was an opportune time. The right hon. gentleman tried to make something out of the fact that he stated his policy with reference to the extension of Manitoba's boundaries on February 21st, and that therefore there was no reason at all for any person no matter what his position to attempt to gain influence for any purpose over the Manitoba government by holding out to them the idea that their territories might be enlarged. I take issue with my right hon. friend in that respect. He did not state in detail the policy of the Dominion government with reference to the extension of those Territories. He simply stated that they did not propose to extend those Territories until after conference with other provinces, and that steps would be taken at once or as soon as convenient to call the representatives of the different provinces that might be interested to come together and to talk this matter over. It would have been possible to extend the Manitoba boundaries to the northwest, to the north or to the northeast at any time; these districts were all perfectly open and they lay there with all their possibilities. Let us come to one other point, to the very small point that was taken to-day that Monseigneur Sbarretti did not see Mr. Rogers, he did not know Mr. Rogers, he had no conversation with Mr. Rogers, and that therefore the whole argument was against Mr. Rogers. My right hon. friend must have taken leave of his senses. Was the Hon. Colin Campbell down here on a private pleasure trip ? Was he down here as a private citizen ? He was down here with his colleague Mr. Rogers as a delegation of the Manitoba government backed by the resolutions of their legislature as official as any commission could be made. They were here on an official visit and for an official occasion and it does not matter a single bit as to whether this conference was had with Mr. Rogers or Mr. Campbell.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Or with the two of them together.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh ; order.

Mr. FOSTER. It was with an accredited representative of the Manitoba government. But oh, says my right hon. friend—and this is his final argument—this was a private conference. It was not a public conference. In what way would a conference take place? Would it be supposed that Monseigneur Sbarretti would put an advertisement in the newspapers, would send a bellman about the streets to tell everybody that at a certain hour he was going to meet the representatives of the Manitoba government to talk over certain matters of policy ? Would he do that ? In what way could any conference take place between these gentlemen that would not ncessarily be a private conference ? But it was not private in this sense that both of the contracting parties have thought that it was their right and their duty to take the public into their confidence and to tell them what transpired at that conference. So there does not appear to be much in that argument.

There were certain things that my right hon. friend however did not deny and they are quite as remarkable as the things that he did deny. He has been told times without number to his face in this House and he has not once risen to deny it, it has been very courteously brought to his attention to-day and he has thoroughly ignored it, that before he brought down his educational clause on February 21, 1905, there had been numerous conferences between himself and Monseigneur Sbarretti with reference to the provisions of that Bill. Will the premier deny it now ? He does not. Mr. Speaker, I ask you, I ask this House, I ask the people of this country if it has come to this that in Canada the representative of any church I do not care what it is——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Through its accredited highest head—must be visited by the premier of this country before he dares to bring down the policy to be adopted for the Northwest provinces ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. The right hon. gentleman has not denied it yet. Then I wish to ask one other question to aid this thoughtfulness that I am sure is pervading the country at the present moment. Is it proper for the right hon. gentleman as leader of a government to have frequent conferences with the Papal ablegate in Ottawa with reference to a dominant part of his policy in creating new provinces and to give the go-by to the representatives of the people of the government ?

Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman did not consult the Minister of the Interior who represented the Northwest Territories, who was their sole representative in the cabinet in reference to the educational clauses of the Bill, but he sits in abject silence and allows me to state here in the House endorsed by that silence that he did care to consult the Papal delegate here in Ottawa. The right hon. leader of the government did not consult the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). Will the right hon. gentleman tell me now whether he consulted on that educational clause more frequently the one than the other, his Postmaster General or the Papal ablegate ? Why all this trouble and talk in the country because Monseigneur Sbarretti goes to the

representative of the Manitoba government and tries to get something for his people there ? Why all this heated denial, this hedging, this twisting, this turning, in respect of a province which is able to defend itself, which has the absolute legislative power confirmed by the highest judicial authority in the British empire, which is able to stand up like a man and defend itself, if it wants to or which is able like a free man to give what it pleases if it gives it out of its own generosity and good will ? Why all this fuss about such a thing as that, whilst, when it comes to a question of infants in arms, the wards of my right hon. friend, when their manhood and their rights for ever are to be given to them or abridged from them, my right hon. friend ignores the Minister of the Interior, ignores other members of his cabinet, but consults the Papal ablegate. Now, Sir, despite the fiery and incendiary speech of my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) which may be repeated here to-day—I do not know—my position is simply this that if there was a high representative of the Methodist church, of the Anglican church, of the Presbyterian church or of any other church in this country who was here in such a position as the Papal ablegate, and if he were consulted in the same way I should make exactly the same objection. This country is not going to have any semblance of alliance between church and state. The people of this country come from a stock who absolutely denied that doctrine years ago, who fought for its overthrow and enthroned the opposite one in the constitution and laws of their country, and the people of Canada are born and bred to the same idea and they will stand by it. The right hon. leader of the government may be as valiant as he pleases but I tell him that he has raised by his tortuous course a question in this country which far transcends the Manitoba controversy. Why is Monseigneur Sbarretti here ? My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) gave what he considered he could fairly gather from what he knew of the circumstances that led to the coming here of Monseigneur Sbarretti : What were they ? Dare I analyze them for a moment? I think we may take the risk even though the hon. member for Labelle may frown against it. I ask this first question in order to clear matters : Were there any spiritual difficulties between the bishops and clergy and the church Catholic of this country which made it necessary primarily that the Papal ablegate should be sent to this country ? There were no such. It has so been stated. It has not been denied. That gentleman would never have been asked for as he was asked for in his own handwriting by the right hon. gentleman who leads this government if it had not been that there was trouble in the Reform camp, that there was very deep seated trouble and the right hon. gentleman conceived that it would be a good stroke of party policy to bring a very celebrated, distinguished and high dignitary of the church—to minister to his spiritual consolation ? To minister to the spiritual needs of my devout friend the Minister of Justice ? To minister even to the clear white conscience of my hon. friend from Labelle ? Oh, no, it was not spiritual consolation they wanted. It was party political consolation. That and that alone was the prime motive of the movement for bringing the Papal ablegate to this couotry. Who brought him ? Here is a letter.

Ottawa, 30th October, 1897.

Eminence,—I made known to you in the month of August last, when Your Eminence did me the honour to grant me an audience, the happy result which the mission of Monseigneur Merry Del Val had accomplished among the Catholics of Canada, and the profound impression which his high Christian virtues and his talents as a statesman—I say statesman, and the expression is not too strong——

Not spiritual comforts, but statesmanship you see !

——had created in all classes of our population.

Having now returned to my country for several months, I wish to make known to Your Eminence that if these happy results are to remain permanent and efficacious, it is desirable, if not necessary, that the mission of Monseigneur Merry Del Val should be renewed, or rather continued, and that he should be present in the midst of us for a more or less prolonged time as the accredited representative of the Holy See.

I have established, since my return, that there is among a certain class of Catholics an underhand agitation against the work accomplished by Monseigneur Merry Del Val, a work of pacification, concord and union.

The same reason of state which inspired His Holiness in the affairs of France, and which caused him to prescribe to the Catholics of this country the duty of abandoning the old strifes of the past——

In matters of religion ? In matters of church polity ? Nothing of the kind.

——and to accept the state of things agreed upon, has quite as much force in Canada as in France.

What state of things ? A spiritual concordat between the bishops or settlement of dissensions amongst the lesser clergy ? Nothing of the kind. Everybody knows what it refers to. It does not require any interpretation at all.

Such is the opinion of a great number of the Catholics amongst us. I admit that it is not the unanimous opinion ; this very divergence of opinion only renders more necessary among us the presence of a man at once firm and conciliatory like Monseigneur Merry Del Val, and of one who above all would understand all the danger there is of exasperating the men who are sincere, convinced, and who wish to be faithful to their duty as Catholics, while remaining faithful to what they believe to be their duties as citizens.

May I be permitted to ask Your Eminence to be good enough to lay these conditions be-

fore His Holiness, while assuring him at the same time of my profound respect and of my filial attachment.

Accept, Eminence, the expression of the high consideration with which I remain.

Now, Sir, that letter is signed by Wilfrid Laurier; it was written, I imagine, to His Eminence Cardinal Rampollo. So much with reference to that.

Let us carry this out a little further. Not only was this letter written by the right hon. gentleman, who then led and who now leads the government, but a certain counsel was arranged for who was accredited and instructed by this government to visit Rome and to bring about what the right hon. gentleman had made a beginning of in the letter which I have just read. The agent whom they used as an intermediary was appointed by this government after they had dismissed—for purposes of state I wonder, or what?—one of the best and most eminent of the legal counsel that this government has ever had in the city of London. On the 26th of November, at Rome, in the year 1897, Mr. Russell writes the following letter:

Eminence,—I have just arrived at Rome once again at the urgent request of the Catholic members of the government and of the parliament of Canada, in whose name I have already presented myself to you. Although I have come so far I do not dare to present myself to Your Eminence, because I would not in the least like at this moment to seem to be bringing pressure to bear or to wish to impede the complete liberty of His Holiness. Moreover, I know how busy Your Eminence is and I remember with what patience Your Eminence has so many times before heard our representations on the subject of Manitoba, which, besides Your Eminence now fully understands.

This is a very good pointer that it is not spiritual matters, that it is not any disagreement amongst the bishops or amongst the clergy, but that it is for party reasons, and for party reasons alone, that it is urged, reasons arising from the exigencies of the Reform party.

I should not even like to give you the trouble to read this letter if I had not been very particularly asked to go to Rome by those whom I represent, and who, living far from Rome, do not know quite what to do in order to plead teir cause and fulfil their duty to the Holy See.

This is therefore why I take the liberty of writing to Your Eminence as follows:

Some days ago the newspapers caused to appear an item by which it was set forth that His Holiness had published a letter condemning in the most formal terms the concessions obtained for the Manitoba schools.

Obtained by whom? By whom were these concessions obtained?

A few days afterwards a declaration of official appearance made it known that no such letter existed.

Although not resting upon any foundation, the publication of this news has created in Canada such a state of feeling that my principals thought they would be wanting in their duty to His Holiness if they did not bring their respectful representations before him.

The object of my visit is to call the attention of Your Eminence to the subject upon which I have so often negotiated——

He had been there before it appears and on the same errand!

——to know that such a condemnation would have the most disastrous effects for the peace of Canada and the cause of Catholic education in this country, while at the same time it would sow discord among the Catholics themselves.

Now, this is the gist of the whole matter.

We do not solicit His Holiness to sanction as perfect the concessions obtained, but that in his wisdom he will be pleased to regard them as a beginning of justice. With the aid of time and thanks to the patient work of persuasion by their compatriots, the Catholics of Manitoba may hope to obtain satisfaction. The condemnation of the concession made would, at the present hour, render (I am begged to insist upon this point)——

Begged by whom? By those who sent him there; begged by the right hon. gentleman and those who sent him there.

The condemnation of the concession would, at the present hour, render (I am begged to insist upon this point) any future concessions impossible. My instructions enjoined me again to renew to Your Eminence the desire, which I had already the honour to express to you, that His Holiness will be pleased to name a permanent delegate in Canada. The representative of His Holiness would reside on the spot, but would be outside local interests, and thus he could with more wisdom guide Catholics through the difficulties which they have to surmount.

There is another point which I dare to beg Your Eminence to be good enough to consider.

Almost immediately when the Latin text of the letter of the Holy Father appears, difficult and even contradictory translations will appear and, I am sure of it, most regrettable discussions will at once arise as to the interpretation of the words of His Holiness: In order to avoid such a misfortune may I be permitted to suggest to Your Eminence how desirable it would be that the Latin text should be accompanied by authorized texts in French and English. This procedure has been followed, if I recollect aright, on several occasions in the case of France and of England.

I shall leave Rome on Saturday, till that day I am entirely at the disposal of Your Eminence.

This was written by Mr. Russell, who, as he says, acted under special instructions of the Catholic members of the government, including Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Mr. FISHER. May I ask what is the hon. gentleman quoting from?

Mr. FOSTER. I am quoting from a return brought down to the Senate.

Mr. FISHER. Of what year?

Mr. FOSTER. Or was it a question put in the Senate ? Let me see—you will find it in the Senate reports of 1898, page 678 ; part of it is on that page and the rest of it is on another page.

Mr. BRODEUR. Is the hon. member very sure it is a return brought down to the Senate ?

Mr. FOSTER. I took it from a question asked in the Senate.

Mr. BRODEUR. Is it from a speech made by Senator Landry ?

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) rise in his place and deny that such a letter was written by Mr. Russell ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I put a fair question to the hon. gentleman. He said it was a return which had been brought down to the Senate, and he thus implied that it was brought down by the government. I ask him is it a return ?

Mr. FOSTER. And I found it was not a return, and I stated where it was to be found and what it was. But the point is not whether it was a return, or an answer to a question, or from a statement made by a senator—the point is : Was that letter written by the right hon. gentleman as I read it ? If it was not written by him, the right hon. gentleman can now rise and deny it. Was the other letter which I have read written by his accredited and instructed representative, for whose expenses the Canadian public treasury paid ? Was it written by him or was it not ? If the right hon. gentleman will deny it, then that settles the controversy ; but he does not deny it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not know anything about the letters my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has referred to, but I do know that Mr. Russell's expenses were not paid by the Canadian public.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend says they were not so paid, I cheerfully take that statement back, and I am very glad to do so.

Mr. FIELDING. Why was it suggested ?

Mr. BUREAU. What did you make the assertion for ?

Mr. FOSTER. I have heard assertions made in this House——

Mr. BUREAU. By you.

Mr. FOSTER. By gentlemen on both sides of the House as to which, as soon as they were informed they were not true, they immediately accepted the denial. However, it is undeniable that Mr. Russell received money from this government, but it may have been for other services, and as the Minister of Justice says it was not for this service, I unreservedly accept that statement. It matters little on the point at issue.

Mr. FISHER.

Taking these letters as being genuine, and there is no doubt about it, I think we have found thus far in our analysis that the present Papal ablegate was not brought here and is not here to-day on account of spiritual difficulties that have arisen in the Catholic church of Canada.

Mr. BERGERON. Nor asked for by the bishops or clergy of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. This also is suggested to me : that it is not on record and cannot be substantiated, that such a personage was asked for by the bishops and the clergy of the Roman Catholic church in this Dominion of Canada. If that is wrong, it is quite in order for those who know all about it to deny that assumption; but as it is not denied, it goes to strengthen the analysis I am making, and the conclusion that 'par consequence' the only reason for the ablegate being asked to come, and being here to-day, is in order to help the Reform government out of difficulties into which they had involved themselves, and to help them out of that confusion and trouble by the intervention of a higher dignitary of the church. This House and this country will know in a moment whether that inference is a violent one or a fair one. Why, in the whole tenor of those letters, the right hon. gentleman's and the accredited agent's, there is no assumption that he has come here for spiritual or church purposes. It is all put on the basis of political or state reasons. What were the difficulties he was to settle ? If they had put it honestly in black and white, they would have said: the difficulties amongst Reformers and between Reformers and Conservatives, and we want a high dignity of the church to come here and help us to smooth out those political difficulties.

But there is another very singular thing which Mr. Russell put into that statement of his to His Eminence, that is, that his senders, including the right hon. gentleman, who leads the government, writing in 1897, after the right hon. gentleman had declared that he had settled satisfactorily the Manitoba school question, had instructed Mr. Russell to remind His Holiness through His Eminence that they did not pretend to believe that 'the concessions were perfect, but they begged His Holiness to take them as the beginning of justire.' Now, Sir, is that straightforward conduct ? The right hon. gentleman, I said, is paying for his tortuous policy. So he is. In 1896 he saw a bridge by which he could get into power; he was anxious to cross the bridge; he threw his principles, the constitutional principles on which he had prided himself so much, to the winds; he also threw to the winds his solicitude for the Catholic minority in Manitoba; and after he had crossed the bridge by a promise to more than one-half of this Dominion that he was the champion of provincial rights, and by a

promise to the forty-one per cent which has been referred to in this House that he would give them something more and better than the Tupper government could give by the Remedial Bill, and had attained power by these means, he negotiated privately or publicly with the Manitoba government, and then announced to the country that he had settled the question. As an honourable statesman, he ought to have allowed it to remain settled. The Manitoba government came to him and said : this is our utmost concession ; and if he, as the Prime Minister of this country, took it as their utmost concession, why should he send an agent to Rome to say to His Holiness : I do not offer this concession as a perfect settlement ; it is only the beginning of justice ; send out your highest dignitary to reside permanently in Ottawa, so that, by insistence, by methods proper in themselves from our standpoint, he can bring to bear a tireless, resistless pressure, in times of party stress, in time of provincial trouble, when a government has a small support, may be, to tide them over, or when they are exceedingly anxious to get their rights in point of territory, he shall be in a position to use the influence which he knows so well how to use, and backed up by us at the proper time this beginning of justice may blossom out into the perfect fulfilment of separate schools for the province of Manitoba. That is why Monseigneur Sbarretti is here to-day. If it had not been for that reason and that policy of conduct, he would not be here to-day. What futile reasoning for the right hon. gentleman, after thirty years of political battle, to get up and make this kind of defence before the country, and think it will go down with the people: 'Monseigneur Sbarretti did what he was brought here to do; did what I asked him to be sent here for; did what I sent an agent to Rome to get him appointed to do; he did it, but he had no authority from me to deliver the goods.' Does the right hon. gentleman see the two horns of his dilemma ? You brought him here; you have kept him here for those five or eight years ; you brought him for those purposes; you have kept him for those purposes; and when he comes to the final, crucial point, and uses his influence, you disown him. If that is not cowardice, then let it go by its own imputation.

But my right hon. friend does worse than that. He gets up before this House and this country, and says : 'If Monseigneur Sbarretti made that promise of an extension of the boundaries of Manitoba as a political consideration to the province of Manitoba for those two proposed amendments, he did it without any authority or any well-grounded hope that we would supplement his promise.' Come now, I will put a question to my right hon. friend : Suppose that Monseigneur Sbarretti had obtained those two amendments made in the Manitoba law, and then had come to you and told you what he had done, and had read the whole of that correspondence, giving the raison d'être of his being here, would you have refused to implement it ? There is a question for my right hon. friend. I will put another, which is more searching still ; When you say that Monseigneur Sbarretti held out a political consideration to the envoys from Manitoba, and that he had no right to do it, what estimate do you place on Monseigneur Sbarretti yourself? I refuse to believe that a high dignitary of the church, such as Monseigneur Sbarretti is, a man of his training and his parts, would by a trick endeavour to get two amendments for his co-religionists in the Manitoba school law, unless he knew that if they were granted, the other thing would be. Along what by-ways and crooked paths the right hon. gentleman is forcing himself now, as a result of his misdeeds, to tread with sorrow and humiliation.

Now, Sir, I have no more to say on this question at the present time, except to reiterate again that my right hon. friend may take this home and keep it. The people of Canada demand that there shall be no possible alliance between church and state in this country. A bishop of the Methodist church has no more right to be consulted than a layman of the Methodist church in reference to political matters in this country. And so with reference to every other representative of every other church. But can you compare a bishop of the Methodist church or a bishop of the Anglican church with Monseigneur Sbarretti ? Who does not know that, with my right hon. friend in power, when Monseigneur Sbarretti, representing forty-one per cent of the people of this country, makes a plea, he holds out a hope, through his authority of a fulfilment that can be given by no other church or collection of churches in this country. Now, I can see that some one will rise on the other side and declare that I have made an incendiary speech. Why, the right hon. gentleman himself, seeing that he had no argument, had to have recourse to that kind of declamation, and it was very significant of the weakness of his case. For Monseigneur Sbarretti himself I have every respect.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Quite a number of skeptics on that side of the House. But I show my respect for Monseigneur Sbarretti by clearing him of the imputations which the position of my right hon. friend fastens upon him. So far as the Papal ablegate's position in this country is concerned, so far as his position as a spiritual envoy from the Church of Rome is concerned, he is welcome to this country may be stay here and grow up with this country and help to make it great. So far as his mission is confined to spiritual purposes in his own church,

to the reconcilement of differences of doctrine, or of polity, or of church government, or anything in that broad domain, no one will cavil with his existence here, and no one but will wish him a long and happy stay. But when he undertakes, presuming on the raison d'etre of his position in this country, to set up a claim that he can interfere in the politics of Canada and use inducements by his interference, then I say that no protest can be too strong against that, and I believe it will be supported by the voice of Canada.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY (North Simcoe). One thought occurred to me when the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was addressing this House: How long is he prepared to stand by the principles he has enunciated this afternoon? Coming from the province of Ontario, and as a constituent of the hon. member for North Toronto, I have a right to ask him this: Are these clothes which he puts on this afternoon to be discarded as were the clothes he wore prior to 1896 should he be again defeated? If he was speaking sincerely this afternoon, I would welcome his declaration and would be pleased with it. But I have heard him stand on platforms in the province of Ontario and denounce the late Dalton McCarthy for the views which he entertained, I have heard him say that no such sectarian cry as Mr. McCarthy dared to raise would ever have any effect in this country; I have heard him say, when Mr. McCarthy was speaking on behalf of Manitoba in another school case, that he must not forget minorities; I have heard him say that to sit in a Conservative administration he would bury those principles, and he did bury them from 1882 to 1896. Therefore, I ask the hon. gentleman now whether he has cast off for ever the yoke of the hierarchy under which he lived from 1882 to 1896?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I have sent the yoke over to my hon. friend.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. My hon. friend will find out about the yoke.

Mr. FOSTER. I see he wears it very gracefully.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. My hon. friend will find out that the nigh ox is hitched on the off side. He need not talk about the yoke, when one of his colleagues who now sits beside him, hounded Dalton McCarthy from one end of Ontario to the other, saying that he was not worthy to be called a Protestant champion, because, forsooth, he had a Catholic stepdaughter who lived in his house.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask my hon. friend a question? Does he refer to me when he states that I made any assertion of that kind?

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. No, the hon. gentleman was not listening, or he would have heard what I said. I said his colleague who sat beside him, the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), and I have his words here. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) also has spoke in derogatory terms of Mr. Dalton McCarthy. I say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) who has just made this appeal this afternoon, did live under the yoke of the hierarchy of Quebec from 1882 to 1896.

Mr. HAGGART. Did I hear the hon. gentleman aright when I understood him to say that I had made any allusion to a stepdaughter?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. No, no. The hon. gentleman from Lanark, speaking at Brockville, used this language:

> Mr. Haggart dealt at great length with the school question, and then launched out into a personal attack on Mr. Dalton McCarthy whom he called 'that little gentleman.' Mr. McCarthy was, the minister said, putting on airs and talking about different members of the government, particularly about 'my brilliant friends,' the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Ives and Mr. Wood. None were better able to take the measure of a jack-daw posing in borrowed plumage than the electors of the country. A man fighting and quarrelling in small courts of law got a narrow and contracted intellect which unfitted him as a statesman or a representative of the people. He might be able to torture a witness in the box. What did he know beside law? Did he ever make a speech in the House of Commons that was listened to? He posed on the narrow grounds of bigotry and lived upon resentments.

Those are the words of the hon. member for Lanark. Now why do I say that the hon. gentleman from North Toronto lived under the yoke of the hierarchy of Quebec from 1882 to 1896?

Mr. BERGERON. What do you call the hierarchy of Quebec, please?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I am not speaking disrespectfully of them, I am speaking as I would of the Synod of my own church, or the general assembly of the Presbyterian church. The hon. member must know what the hierarchy of his own church is. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) spoke of it the other day. Now I ask the hon. gentleman from North Toronto, who has just made a speech, if he was sincere? If I thought he was sincere I would not be speaking as I am now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. It is all very well to say, hear, hear, but I tell you I come from a stock that knows what it is to be jeered at, just as you are jeering at me now. I know that prior to 1896 they hounded us from one end of Canada to the other. They spoke disrespectfully of us,

they told us we were bigots, they told us that the views we were then expressing, which were in accord with their own views to-day, were not sincere, and were not in accord with our convictions. In 1896 when Mr. Dalton McCarthy defined his policy on the Jesuits Estates Bill, what was the position of the hon. gentleman then? We then pointed out to them that they were leading to the very trouble that exists to-day, they were recognizing in that Bill a Papal power which was thereby given the right and power to dispose of some millions of the peoples' money in this country. These hon. gentlemen, who take another position to-day, said then: Let us stand by provincial rights, toleration and moderation, let that go on as it is. And when we objected to the dual language clause in the Territorial Act, and in the Manitoba Act, what did these hon. gentlemen say then?

An hon. MEMBER. Who are 'we.'

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Mr. Dalton McCarthy. I do not think the hon. gentleman can deny that I have a right to say 'we.' I do not think the hon. gentleman will deny that I have the right to say 'we.' The hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) will remember having seen me in some of these campaigns, when mud was thrown at us because of the position we took. When we asked you not to coerce Manitoba, were you acting under the dictation of the heirarchy or not? I say most explicitly you were. And when the bishops of the Catholic church threatened to excommunicate the opponents of the Tupper government, when the bishops of that church talked about the opponents of that government as 'hell-inspired hypocrites,' were you acting under the dictation of the heirarchy or not? Were you under the yoke of the heirarchy or not?

Mr. LENNOX. What does the hon. gentleman (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) mean by 'yoke'?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) wants to know, I will tell him. The hon. gentleman allowed that yoke to be placed upon him in 1896, when he contested the riding of North Simcoe. The hon. gentleman remembers the result, and I do not want to rub it in too much, as it would be painful to him to recollect that he lost his deposit. I say I am perfectly justified in what I have said so far; and I point out that this very trouble which has taken place was brought to the attention of the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) when he was in the governments of Sir John Macdonald and Sir John Thompson. Mr. Dalton McCarthy urged them both to get rid of section 14 of that Act—Mr. Dalton McCarthy had moved to have it repealed. But the hon. gentleman voted in favour of allowing it to remain on the statute-book, and that is largely the cause of the present difficulty. And now, forsooth, the hon. gentleman says that this Papal delegate is improperly interfering in our affairs. In that I am prepared to agree with him, and I do agree with him. But I want sincerity. And, if I do nothing more than draw attention to what has taken place in the past and to what is taking place now, I shall show to the satisfaction of every reasonable man that it only depends on which party is in power, because whichever one is in power always do these things. You only get a corporal's guard in this House to vote for a straight motion against any such position as is being taken to-day. I say that advisedly, and the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) knows it. What was the position in 1896? It was this: The hierarchy of Quebec were behind the Tupper government, and were threatening to excommunicate the people who refused to vote in favour of the Tupper government at their dictation.

Mr. BERGERON. No.

Mr. L. G McCARTHY. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) says 'no.' But it is on the records of 'Hansard'——

Mr. BERGERON. It is on the records as having been often said, but never proved.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. What about Archbishop Cameron of Nova Scotia, who spoke of those who opposed the Tupper government as 'Hell-inspired hypocrites'? What about Archbishop Cleary, of Kingston, and his speeches? What about Archbishop Lafleche? In 1896, the bishops of the Roman Catholic church—the heirarchy of that church—and I do not speak disrespectfully of them——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Well what is the trouble with the hon. gentlemen?

Mr. FOSTER. The trouble is all over there.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I am glad you have got rid of it.

Mr. FOSTER. We are all right.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman says he is all right. He has changed his spots. He has moved from St. John, New Brunswick, to Toronto, where the sentiment is——

Mr. FOSTER. I am not ashamed of North Toronto.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to finish the line I was on, and then I will deal with the hon. member for North Toronto. I say that in 1896, at the dictation of the heirarchy of Quebec, you endeavoured to coerce Manitoba——

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose that, the hon. gentleman (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) having made a straight statement, he must be replied to by me, or I am in danger of being held to acqueisce in that statement.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. If the hon. gentleman wishes to ask a question——

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order. I deny absolutely what the hon. gentleman stated in his last sentence, and I ask him to withdraw it and give me the credit I demand for sincerity in the statement I made.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the rules of debate require that a member of this House must accept the denial of another member on a personal matter.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all I want.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement. And I change my own to this : I say that the Tupper administration of which Mr. Foster was a member, were endeavouring to force through this House a Bill to coerce the province of Manitoba at the request and under the dictation of the heirarchy of Quebec.

Mr. FOSTER. That also I deny.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) denies that, but I am not obliged to withdraw my statement. I will stand by it, as I have always stood by it ; and I leave it to a discriminating public to judge whether it is true or not.

An hon. MEMBER. You stand all alone.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Well, it is not the first time that a McCarthy has stood alone in this House ; and, please God, if necessary, it will not be the last. I say that, in 1896—and hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to like me to get too close to that—we found the state of affairs that I have spoken of. And here is the peculiarity of the situation. In that year, we found the hon. gentlemen who are now in opposition in close alliance with the bishops of the church of the province of Quebec. It became necessary, apparently, if justice was to be done, for the Papal power to be asked to interfere. If we are to believe what we have heard within the last two days, the Papal delegate came to settle some difficulties—and unquestionably they were difficulties with regard to political affairs,—between the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House and their bishops. If the Papal delegate is interfering I declare his action is highly improper and I denounce it. But, I want this House and country to understand that if the respective parties expect to make capital out of it, their whole record on the subject should be considered. Take the history of Canada from confederation down to the present day, and how many members have ever stood up to vote squarely on an issue of this kind ? Twenty-one, I believe, is the largest number that ever united to prevent such encroachments as these, in regard to which, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) would lead us to believe, he was so sincere in protesting. If so it is the first time in twenty-three years that he has so spoken.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). I do not know that I need say much in reply to the hon. member (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) who has just taken his seat. That hon. gentleman has displayed his political stock in trade. I think the House and the country will acknowledge that the late Dalton McCarthy was a man of considerable eminence both at the bar and in this House. His record is history. But I do not know that anybody would venture to express a belief that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) will ever be noticed in history. The hon. gentleman spoke at a meeting in Toronto a short time ago, and was then very boastful of his Protestantism and of the Protestantism of his family before him. He told the people assembled on that occasion that the cry of equal rights and opposition to French domination in Canada was the cry he had always raised in North Simcoe ; that on that policy he had nailed his colours to the mast and would stand or fall by them. There was a contest last fall in North Simcoe, as there was in the rest of the Dominion, and I challenge the hon. gentleman to produce a scintila of proof that he even opened his mouth upon the equal rights question or any such question as he has dealt with before the House to-day.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I may tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) that I made no such statement in Toronto as that he has attributed to me as to this question been in issue in my campaign last election. I stated that in the first and second campaigns it was an issue. But, if the hon. gentleman wants to know I can tell him that I can produce evidence that I stated at Hawkestone, in the township of Oro, that I was certain that when the Bill for the granting of autonomy to the Northwest came up, the school question would again arise.

Mr. BENNETT. I took occasion to look up the file of a Collingwood newspaper devoted to the government, and, it will be apparent to any body reading that newspaper that the great issue in North Simcoe last election was whether or not the Collingwood harbour should have the benefit of a large grant of government money. And that was the whole question. As to the hon. gentleman's (Mr. L. G. McCarthy's) political stock in trade in that riding, I can tell the House that it does not carry the people as his late uncle used to do. In the township of Vespra the late Dalton McCarthy used to get a majority of about one hundred ; the hon. member (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) was in a minority of thirty in the last election.

This hon. gentleman was in a minority of thirty, and Sir, this hon. gentleman instead of parading this racial revenge question and this religious question in North Simcoe is always toadying to the other element. He had an appointment to make in Barrie a little while ago and, expecting that the township of Tiny which has a large French vote would be attached to North Simcoe, the hon. gentleman threw aside all his Protestant friends and pushed them over in favour of a French Canadian Roman Catholic. Will the hon. gentleman deny that? I think he won't.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I will deny one part of it, that I had any anticipation that the township of Tiny was going into North Simcoe. I will admit that I recommended the appointment of Emile Sevigny as caretaker of the public building in Barrie and I am not ashamed of that appointment.

Mr. BENNETT. That shows how deep his Protestantism is. He had his friends riding the Protestant horse for him from end to end of the riding and yet they all had to be thrown overboard when at the last moment the hon. gentleman driven to the wall—for he had a majority of only thirty or forty—was in this position that he had to toady to the Catholic vote, and he dared not open his mouth in North Simcoe on that question, and had he dared to do so he would not be here to-day.

Now apart from the speech of the hon. gentleman what is all this question about? It is, as has been put by the leader of the opposition, a question as to whether or not any member of this government is responsible for the presence of the Papal delegate in this country and if any member of this government or of the government as a whole commissioned the Papal ablegate to have this conference with Mr. Colin Campbell. We heard a denial yesterday by one member of the government. What was that? When it was charged by some gentlemen on this side of the House that the government of Canada as constituted to-day had asked for the presence of the Papal ablegate in this country, up gravely rose the Postmaster General to say that he as a member of the government had not asked for the presence of the Papal ablegate here. His Excellency the Papal ablegate does not say that he did not consult some member of the government as to this interview with Mr. Colin Campbell. He makes a specific statement that he was not instructed by the government, but he did not make the statement that some hon. member of this cabinet did not ask him to have that interview and there is no denial by every member of the government specifically on that point. It has gone forth in the public press, it has gone forth from the leader of the opposition and hon. gentlemen on this side of the House that in all these negotiations the premier, day in and day out, has consulted the Papal ablegate as to the terms of this measure. That is not denied. The premier has had ample opportunities of denying it but he has not done so. The position of the Papal ablegate is reduced to this that he has made a specific denial of the statement that he was instructed by the government, but he has not made a specific denial of the statement that he was not consulted by some member of it. Every one admits the ability and the standing of the Papal ablegate in the church of which he is so distinguished a member, and does any one believe that the Papal ablegate would be so lost to any sense of common reason that he of his own accord and off his own bat, would go about negotiating as he has been doing? I am not going to traverse the ground that has been gone over by the hon. member for North Toronto as to the equestrian performances of the premier on this question. The Prime Minister has played this game of fast and loose on this question from end to end of Canada. He has gone before Ontario posing as a perfect Ajax defying the lightning as one who has been assailed by the hierarchy, and asking Protestant votes on that score. It is amusing to read the utterances of that hon. gentleman in Ontario when he felt that he had not the power of the church behind him. Let me read his utterance in Toronto on a certain occasion when he thought it was necessary for the exigencies of his political party to make a bid for Ontario support. At a great meeting in September, 1889, in Toronto speaking on the Jesuits Estates Bill, he said:

> Now I believe that the whole of that Act would have passed without any trouble whatever, but for the fact that the name of the Pope is prominently introduced in it, and that it was construed in such a manner as to mean a thing which I shall presently discuss—that it was putting the supremacy of the Pope over the supremacy of the Queen. Gentlemen, I think I put the question fairly. I want to put it honestly and to discuss it manfully. I know one thing, I know enough of my fellow countrymen of English origin, I know enough of English history, I know enough of English literature to know that when Shakespeare put into the mouth of King John the proud words which he makes him address the Pope's legate
>
> No Italian priest
> Shall tithe or toll in our Dominion.
>
> he touched the British heart in its most responsive chord (Cheers). I know this, that there is no man of English blood, let his condition in life be ever so humble, let his range of information be ever so limited, but knows this much of English history that at no time would the English people or English sovereigns allow the sway of the Pope in the temporal affairs of England (Cheers).

And cheers greeted that too.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not think the right hon. gentleman would go down into Quebec

to-day and treat in that slighting manner the Papal ablegate in Canada as he did on that occasion in Toronto. In the speech, as it is reported, he was not meeting with a very responsive welcome, and during the course of his address certain things that he mentioned were hissed by the audience, and he saw that he had to go the Protestant horse. And what did he do ? He made exactly that kind of an appeal knowing of course it might touch the palate of the crowd although he was ridiculing the church of which he is a member. The right hon. gentleman then as usual had two strings to his bow. His language then was very different from that in his address at a great meeting in the province of Quebec when he said that he thanked God there was not an Orangeman in the Liberal party. And how they cheered him to the echo when he volunteered that statement voluntarily to them ! The right hon. gentleman has never denied that statement since. I have heard it charged in this House, I have seen gentlemen with stacks of declarations of gentlemen who were present and what was the result, there was no specific denial that he had made those statements. The fact is he has been pirouetting on both toes and he is where he is to-day.

As far as this meeting between these gentlemen from Manitoba and the Papal ablegate is concerned, I have only this to say that I believe the Papal ablegate was quite within his commission and his duties in inviting these gentlemen to meet him. He had a perfect right to do that. The Papal delegate came to this country at the request of the right hon. gentleman and his political friends and he has been in close touch with the right hon. gentleman all through these proceedings and has had frequent consultations with the right hon. gentleman in reference to the terms to be contained in these Bills. These statements have all gone forth specifically, that the right hon. gentleman had these meetings and the right hon. gentleman has had ample opportunity to deny it but has not done so. It is with the right hon. gentleman that the quarrel of the people of this country rests and not with the Papal ablegate at all. The Papal ablegate has a perfect right to be in this country just as any other gentleman might have as a plenipotentiary or ambassador to any power, but I do say that the people of this country will hold the right hon. gentleman and the members of his government responsible for what has gone on. Talk about the right hon. gentleman leading a responsible and united party which is behind him on this question. Why it is openly seen by the attitude of the Ontario members not only of the cabinet, but of the House that they are all in a condition of doubt and fear on this question. The hon. Postmaster General will not dare to take up the challenge that was thrown to him by my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) the other day to resign his seat and let the question be tested in the country. The hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman), who is discharging the duties of the Minister of Public Works and has been discharging them for the past year, dare not go to the city of London for re-election as Minister of Public Works. Why? Because of this incubus of the school question. I need not refer to other reasons that deter that hon. gentleman from going back there, but if the school question were out of the issue altogether I doubt very much if he would seek a contest there. The hon. gentleman dare not go back to his riding and face this school question as it presents itself to-day.

The people of Canada have no quarrel with the Papal ablegate. They have no quarrel with the powers at Rome for sending the Papal ablegate here to do what he came to do. He came here to try and get restitution of rights, from certain gentlemen who obtained power and place by misrepresentation and fraud as against the Roman Catholic electors of this country which some day they will answer for and must answer for and the people are biding their time to get even with them. There is one consolation for hon. gentlemen who sit upon the treasury benches and those who support them and that is that they will have the full tenure of the five year parliament because they will not venture to test public feeling before their time expires. I should not have risen but for the remarks of the hon. member for North Simcoe. I think the House is tired of the changes rung by that hon. gentleman in regard to the part which he has played in the political history of Canada. While that hon. gentleman dilates at great length in this House he is as silent as a mouse on this question when he goes into North Simcoe. I have had placed in my hand the issue of the Toronto newspaper which published the speech made by that hon. gentleman in Toronto on the occasion of the Massey Hall meeting which will prove that what I stated was actually borne out by the facts. Speaking at that meeting Mr. McCarthy said :

> I appealed to them in 1900 and again was successful, and that time it was against a Conservative, and I appealed to them again in 1904 upon the same ground and the same platform, and was again sustained, though, I regret to say, with a reduced majority.

The hon. gentleman was referring to this question. He redeemed himself to some extent by at last saying that at the village of Hawkstone he mentioned this question. The hon. gentleman did not acquire much distinction from having held a meeting at that village and I will tell you why. In the first place the meeting held by him at Hawkstone was held a night or two before the election. I am not saying it disrespectfully of the people of Hawkstone, but Hawk-

stone is probably one of the most intensely Protestant parts of Ontario, and the hon. gentleman was taking advantage of the fact to crawl down to the Protestant end of the riding and make his Protestant appeal there that he did not dare make in the township of Floss where he was coquetting with the Catholic vote.

Hon. SYDNEY A. FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) sat down a few minutes ago, he stated that probably he would be accused of making an inflammatory speech. I can only take it that a guilty conscience enabled him to read the minds of those who listened to the speech he made for certainly he was right in describing it as an inflammatory speech. The hon. gentleman, in that speech, certainly tried to inflame the minds of those in this country who distrust or dislike the Catholic church and the Catholic religion. The whole tenor of the hon. gentleman's speech was such as to raise Protestant prejudice and Protestant feeling against this government because he implied that this government, led by a Roman Catholic, was in constant touch with the Roman Catholic church in regard to secular affairs in this country. The hon. member himself on former occasions has complained, that he and his government when he was in the government, was subjected to similar attacks, not to similar attacks by Liberals or by those opposed to him, but similar attacks from the ranks of his own party when the late member for West York (Mr. Wallace) and the present hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) separated themselves from the Conservative party ceased their support of the Conservative government in 1896 and tried, as members of the government then said, to raise Protestant and English speaking feeling against the government at that time. Sir, I would like the hon. member for North Toronto to recall a speech he made in 1896, when, replying to an interruption from the hon. member for East Grey, he used these words, and I think perhaps he will admit that when he uttered these broad-minded words he was more of a statesman than he is to-day in making what he himself has characterized as an inflammatory speech. What did the hon. gentleman then say? He was not then representing a strong Protestant constituency in the Protestant province of Ontario, but he was a member of the then government of Sir Charles Tupper, representing the maritime provinces, and he said this, referring to a speech which the hon. member for East Grey had quoted or alluded to as his authority :

> If made by Archbishop Langevin or if made by ten thousand archbishops, the hon. gentleman would yet have no ground in logic or in truth for making the assertion he made here the other day, which was, not that Archbishop Langevin did not agree with the ordinance, but that the government held it in abeyance because the clergy did not approve of it.

Let him mark these words and let the House marks these words and see how well they apply to the speech which the hon. gentleman made a few moments ago.

> This assertion, carried as broadly as newspapers will carry his speech, was meant, and will have the effect of raising prejudice and opposition to this legislation amongst the Protestant people of this country, and fan those fires which my hon. friends there and my hon. friends here so much deplore.

I hope the hon. gentleman will take these words to heart and act upon them instead of acting in the way his conduct shows he wishes to act this afternoon. The hon. gentleman has based the whole of his attack upon this government and upon my right hon. friend the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on implications and assumptions, on implications and assumptions which are not borne out by the interview of Mr. Rogers and which are still less borne out, but are in fact absolutely refuted by the statement issued by the Apostolic delegate. The hon. gentleman quoted some words from Mr. Rogers' statement and he pointed out that something might be implied by that statement. I venture to say, Sir, that anybody who reads the statement of Mr. Rogers, in Winnipeg, will say that there is a great deal more implied in that statement than there is actually contained in it, and that there is an evident intention by the wording of the statement to make implications and insinuations that the gentleman who gave that statement did not dare to come out and state as matters of fact. These implications and insinuations are not founded on facts, but they are false to the record and they are untrue. Sir, the very first thing that would strike anybody in reading that statement, the first thing which I confess, myself, impressed me was that Mr. Rogers had met the ablegate here in Ottawa. The statement contains these words:

> During that interview we presented the claims of the province as urgently and strongly as possible. In reply Sir Wilfrid said that if we would be good enough to remain in Ottawa for three or four days he would again send for us and would then be in a position to give us an answer.

It is 'we,' 'us.' Then it continues :

> In three days' time, on February 20, a letter was received from Monseigneur Sbarretti, asking for a conference.

Who would have supposed for a moment that that did not mean asking 'us' for a conference ; but, as a matter of fact, it was not those men who were asked for a conference. It was simply a private letter from the delegate asking one of these gentlemen, an old friend of his who had discussed this question before with him, for a private interview. The implication and the

insinuation in this statement are not supported by the facts, because the public are led to believe that both of these gentlemen were invited and that both of them had gone.

When speaking a few moments ago, the leader of the opposition laid stress upon the assertion that he did not know yet whether the ablegate had had authority from this government, or any member of the government, to make that offer, as it is alleged, to the representative of the Manitoba government. Now, at the very moment that the leader of the opposition made that statement he knew that yesterday the Prime Minister had made a categorical and absolute denial in these words:

> Before I proceed any further I may say at once referring to the whole tenor of this document, that in so far as there is a charge that there was any understanding between Monseigneur Sbarretti and myself to have the school question considered in connection with the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba, there is not a shadow or a tittle of truth in it.

When the leader of the opposition stated here to-day that he did not know yet whether Monseigneur Sbarretti had authority to make that statement, the hon. gentleman must have known that yesterday the right hon. the leader of the government had given this denial, but yet the leader of the opposition ignored it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What page is the hon. gentleman reading from?

Mr. FISHER. I am reading from 'Hansard' of yesterday, page 3837 just about the middle of the page. And furthermore, when the leader of the opposition made the statement to-day, he must have seen in the 'Citizen' of this morning Monseigneur Sbarretti's own statement:

> This is the sum and substance of my interview with Mr. Campbell. The federal government had absolutely no knowledge of it.

The leader of the opposition is unfair, he is disingenuous, when he stated this afternoon that he had no knowledge of these denials, and that he was at liberty to assume that there had been collusion and arrangement between the government, or any member of the government, and the Papal ablegate. In view of the denial of the Prime Minister and of Monseigneur Sbarretti, the leader of the opposition this afternoon allowed the impression to remain on the House that he was not aware yet, that he had heard no denial yet, and that the public were still in doubt as to whether the members of the government, or the Prime Minister himself, had authorized the statement which was attributed to Monseigneur Sbarretti. There is nothing clearer before the public of Canada to-day than the fact, in the first place, that the government themselves, through the Prime Minister, had stated that they knew nothing whatever about it, that no authority was ever given to Monseigneur Sbarretti for such a proposal; and further, that Monseigneur Sbarretti himself has declared that the government had no information of or connection with that statement on his part. I therefore say that the leader of the opposition was disingenuous and unfair to the government, as well as to the people of the country, whom he trys to lead away from the true facts.

An impression was tried to be created this afternoon that the right hon. the leader of the government was inconsistent in the fact that he had said at one time that the present school arrangements in the province of Manitoba were satisfactory, and that there had been brought about by his intervention a satisfactory settlement of the Manitoba school question; not by coercion, not by remedial legislation, but by conciliation and negotiation.

The other day, when the leader of the opposition was criticising the Prime Minister, he used several adjectives, and one statement he made, slurring it over as if it were a matter of no account, was that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was a great conciliator. Sir, I do not think that anybody in this House or in this country has ever applied a truer and more apt expression towards the leader of this government. Sir Wilfrid Laurier has stood out, not only among the public men of Canada, but among the public men of the empire, as having succeeded, by conciliation, in solving questions which no coercion could ever solve. I venture to say that in the history of Canada Sir Wilfrid Laurier will be held up as the brightest example of a statesman who, without coercion or force, has been able to bring about an entente cordiale between the different peoples, the different religions, the different nationalities in this country, and who has been able to demonstrate that by conciliation majorities and minorities can live together in peace and work for the progress, the advancement and the good government of the country. I said a few moments ago that the intention of gentlemen opposite was to show that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was inconsistent. The settlement of the Manitoba school question was the settlement of a difficulty under a certain condition at that time existing. The law had been passed by the legislature of Manitoba, there were difficulties then existing, and the settlement was a settlement under a condition of affairs which was not absolutely satisfactory, probably, to either side. The Roman Catholics of Manitoba, the Roman Catholics of Canada, would have liked to have had much more. The Protestant element would, perhaps, like to exert a greater influence and to have taken away more of the rights, or the privileges, if you will, of the Catholics in Manitoba. If there are two extremes warring against each other, irreconcilable in most cases one might say, but who are willing and ready, by conciliation, to come to

a common standpoint where their differences will vanish, both sides may agree to a fair and just and equitable compromise. That was the basis of the settlement of the Manitoba school question. But, Sir, to say that because that was the settlement, and that it was on the whole satisfactory to both sides of the controversy at that time, does not mean that under any circumstances in the future, or under a new condition of affairs existing in the adjoining new provinces, such a settlement must necessarily be absolutely satisfactory for ever. We have a totally different condition of affairs in regard to our school legislation in the new provinces. We have a new start to be made. We have a condition of affairs existing today in these Territories which gives certain rights to the minorities in the way of separate schools. To maintain these rights by our legislation, we give in the future a guarantee that these rights shall be maintained. Some people may consider that the condition in the Territories is not better, nor even so good, as the condition of affairs in Manitoba to-day; but, however that may be, the proposition in this legislation is a settlement of the question. Perhaps, as in the case of Manitoba, you may call it a compromise, and probably the two extremes to the controversy may say that the legislation we propose is not satisfactory, but a compromise has to be reached between these extremes. You cannot get a compromise which will be absolutely acceptable to the extreme adherents of one side or the other, but you may get a compromise which will be acceptable to the common sense of the great mass of the people of this country. I believe that by this Bill we have attained that desirable end.

The question of the boundaries of Manitoba has been discussed, and this question is perhaps the raison d'etre of this whole discussion this afternoon. A complaint is made—perhaps not actually made by anybody on the floor of this House, although it is implied—a complaint is made by Mr. Rogers that the boundaries of Manitoba have not been moved westward, because of the difficulties connected with the school question. There is no justification whatever for any such statement. There are newspaper rumours of all kinds. I regret to say that our friends opposite in their press are quite equal to the manufacture of newspaper rumours of all kinds. I regret to say that they feed on these rumours. They have not much else to feed upon, Mr. Speaker. They have been beaten over and over and over again, when the people of this country have been appealed to and have had an opportunity of pronouncing on their policy and their utterances in comparison with our policy and our utterances. We heard just such language here session after session between 1896 and 1900. We heard that the Liberal government was to be swept out of power in 1900 the moment the people had an opportunity of judging our record and our policy. We all know the result. All through the last parliament we had hon. gentlemen opposite talking very loudly in this House about what they were going to do when the elections came on. They impressed a good many people in the country. They are loud-mouthed and denunciatory; and they are like some people who think that by saying a thing very often you actually make it true. But the result of the election in November, 1904, showed them that their loudest denunciations and loudest assertions were mere empty wind, and the government came back with a larger majority than any party in Canada had got in many years.

An hon. MEMBER. Where was their leader?

Mr. FISHER. I will not say anything about that; I do not wish to indulge in personalities. But in that connection I would like to refer to a statement which I saw in a Conservative newspaper within the last day or two—I am sorry I cannot remember which paper it was. The statement was that the people of Nova Scotia and the people of Quebec were inferior in intelligence and superior in bigotry and prejudice to the people of Ontario. It is easy enough to see where a sentiment of that kind comes from; it comes from the disappointed ambitions of men who tried to be elected in those provinces and had to suffer the defeat which their party and their policy deserved.

There is one thing more which I wish to say a few words about; and, coming as I do from the province of Quebec, perhaps I know a little more about these matters than the great mass of English speaking or Protestant members of this House. It may be a little delicate for one who does not belong to the Roman Catholic church to speak about the action of Catholics in regard to their own church, or about the difficulties which may have arisen in the internal economy of that church in this country. But, having lived among the Catholics of the province of Quebec, it may not be out of place for me to say a word or two in regard to the coming of the Papal ablegate. In 1896 a request was made by certain people belonging to the Catholic church for a permanent representative of the Pope in Canada. That was not the first time that a request of that kind had been placed before the head of the Catholic church. Those of us who can look back a little in the history of this country can remember the condition of affairs in the province of Quebec before 1896. We can remember that as long ago as 1876 there was an election in the province of Quebec, in which it was notorious that leading dignitaries of the Catholic church took an active part—such an active part that the Tory candidate in that election was elected; such an active

part that certain Liberals who did not believe in the interference of the church in secular affairs, such as political matters, made a protest to Rome, and asked that a delegate should be sent from the Pope to regulate those affairs within the Catholic church in Canada.

Mr. BERGERON. What election was that ?

Mr. FISHER. It was the election of Mr. Langevin, in Charlevois. The case was tried in the courts, and the interference of the church was proved. Somebody on the other side of the House a little while ago talked about proof—when was proof required, when was proof given, and so on. I think it was the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). I cannot quote the exact volume of the reports in which that case appears ; but the hon. gentleman, who is a lawyer, can find it himself, and he will see that the proof was given. I do not think it was the only case, but it was the one I had in my mind at the moment. The Papal delegate was sent to Canada, not to interfere in political matters, or with legislation, but to prevent the interference in political matters of certain dignitaries of the church, whose influence it was well known had been exerted.

An hon. MEMBER. On whose behalf ?

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend from Beauharnois can remember. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) can remember. I daresay the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), if he searched his historial reminiscences, could remember. It was exerted on behalf of the Conservative government, who for long years carried a large majority of the constituencies in Quebec by reason of the assistance of the Catholic church, and only by reason of that assistance. Coming down to 1896, the hon. member for North Toronto was a member of the then Conservative government.

An hon. MEMBER. Sometimes.

Mr. FISHER. Sometimes. He knows that before the elections of 1896, there were certain changes in that government, and that the gentlemen who were chosen to fill the places naturally given to the province of Quebec were well known to be representatives of the ultramontane wing of the Conservative party of that province ; and it is not very much of a jump for me to suppose that the gentlemen who controlled the then Conservative party and the then Conservative government remembered what had occurred in days gone by, when Sir John Macdonald, having on the one hand the Tory Orange organization of the province of Ontario, and on the other hand the Catholic church organization of the province of Quebec, ruled this country for so many years by means of that unholy alliance.

Mr. BERGERON. For the good of the country.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. member says 'for the good of the country.' I can only point to the condition of the country in 1896. Surely the hon. gentleman must admit that it was for the evil of the country that the government were then carrying on the affairs of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. Which element of the combination is the unholy one ?

Mr. FISHER. The combination was unholy, not either elements of it. It was the alliance, the combination of the two sets of people who held diametrically opposite views, who were joined together in an unholy alliance to keep the government in office. My hon. friend from East Grey rebelled against it himself, he found it quite beyond endurance ; and when, in 1896 an effort was made to coerce Manitoba by the government of which the member for North Toronto was a member, the member for East Grey and others rebelled against the alliance, and stepped out from the support of that party on that occasion.

Mr. SPROULE. Very much like the hon. member and his friends who fought against the church and took it into court ; now they are on the other side and are returning to the church. They want to appeal to both sides.

Mr. FISHER. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by referring to the church. I take it that he has been following the lead given this afternoon by the leader of the opposition and the member for North Toronto, who pretend that in our present legislation we have been consulting the church, and going to the heads of the church for permisson to introduce this legislation. That has been denied by the right hon. leader of the House, and denied by the statement of Monseigneur Sbarretti himself. Therefore the insinuation which the hon. gentleman makes and the implication suggested by the leader of the opposition and the member for North Toronto, are absolutely unfounded and untrue.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman said he did not know what I meant: I was referring to his own statement when he told of the time his party took the church into court and fought the church ; but now they are entering into an alliance with the church and getting the church to help them.

Mr. FISHER. That is what I deny, the insinuation which the hon. gentleman and his colleagues are making is absolutely unfounded and has no justification in any form or shape. Mr. Speaker, in 1896 an effort was made to pursue that kind of policy, the effort was made by the then government to carry the province of Quebec in the same way. A little while ago the member for

North Toronto, in opening his speech, made a remark which I cannot help but consider almost offensive, when he said the right hon. leader of the government started in by doing the baby act. Now, without saying anything about the delicacy of such language, I do desire however to state that if ever there was a man in Canada who has never shown the white feather on any occasion when he required to take courage, to take heart, and to stand before the people and boldly tell them what they should do, it is the right hon. the leader of this government. I remember when, in the campaign of 1896 at the time the Manitoba school question was before the country, the right hon. gentleman went down into his own constituency in the city of Quebec, when the people of that province were more or less excited on the question which was then occupying all minds, and he led them into the way of peace, he showed them that justice and consideration ought to be given to provincial rights in Manitoba ; and in the ensuing elections we saw that by his courage, by the justice of his pleas, and the justice of his position, he was able to defeat the government in the province of Quebec itself, when the Conservative party, by the help of the ultramontane press and members, hoped to carry the province by an enormous majority in favour of the Tupper government. Sir, there never has been in the history of Canada an exhibition of greater moral courage and of greater devotion to duty, whatever the cost might be. I remember another occasion when the right hon. gentleman went to the city of Toronto, at a time there was an agitation being carried on throughout the province of Ontario in relation to the Jesuit Estates Act. The right hon. gentleman faced a great audience in the ultra Protestant city of Toronto, and the first cheer that arose during his speech was on his mentioning the name of Col. O'Brien, who was then supposed to be the champion of Protestantism in Ontario ; the right hon. gentleman showed that audience the justice of his position, and the actual condition of affairs in the province of Quebec, and before he had spoken for twenty minutes, he had that audience in the hollow of his hand, and when he sat down he received an applause which has never been equalled in that great Protestant city of Toronto.

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask the hon. gentleman why they do not put up a candidate in that city to-day ?

Mr. FISHER. Because we do not want to give you and your friends an opportunity to raise fanatical prejudices on this question. Sir, for the hon. member for North Toronto to impute cowardice to the right hon. leader of the government, is going from the sublime to the ridiculous.

Mr. SPROULE. That is pretty strong language.

Mr. FISHER. The case requires strong language, but if it is not parliamentary, I can withdraw it, but nevertheless I want to say it. The right hon. gentleman was charged a few minutes ago with having shown heat when he rose to speak in reply to the leader of the opposition. I do not wonder that one who has seen what has been going on here during the last few days shows heat ; I do not wonder that a man who has his country's good at heart shows heat when he sees the efforts of the press of a great party in this country devoting itself to stirring up religious strife and national prejudice. Sir, heat is required to put down such action as that, and to challenge it, and to meet it. I say that the Liberal party and the Liberal government are ready at all times to fight such a policy whenever it is attempted to be carried on in this country. Sir, the question at issue is the false assertion that this government has refused to extend the boundaries of Manitoba westward because of the school question. The right hon. leader of the government, in introducing this Bill a few weeks ago, gave a clear and explicit statement of the reasons why the boundaries of Manitoba could not be extended to the westward, and in that statement and those reasons there was not a single suggestion that the boundary question had any connection whatever with the school question. The reasons were explicit, and they are shown in the papers laid on the table of the House. The reasons given were that the people west of Manitoba did not wish to be joined to Manitoba and preferred to be in the new provinces, and we had to consider the people who were concerned rather than the desire of the government of Manitoba. And, as I am reminded by my hon. friend from Centre York (Mr. Campbell), why did not they extend it in 1884, when Manitoba made the request. The reasons given then were very much as they have been given now in the answer to the memorial of the government of Manitoba. Those reasons were conclusive with the Conservative party in 1884 ; they are doubly strong to-day. The conditions which made the westward extension undesirable then have been intensified by the development of the country. And these reasons, and these reasons only, caused the government to reply to the government of Manitoba and say that the boundaries of Manitoba could not be extended westward, but that the whole of that territory must go into the two new provinces. It is assuming a great deal—unfortunately hon. gentlemen opposite and their press live on assumptions and they therefore must assume a great deal—but there is no justification for the assumption that the school question was in any way connected with the decision of the government that the boundary of Manitoba could not be extended to the west. I will not deal with this question longer. I regret exceedingly that to-day and yesterday, as several

times before, the time of the House has been taken up in dealing with these question which are really extraneous to the legislation before the House, and the bringing up of which here can serve only one purpose, and that purpose is the continuance of the agitation and excitement amongst the people and the stirring up of prejudice on these questions.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, in taking up the special subject of debate this evening I intend to read another document in order to place it on record, a document which bears very pointedly on the question that has been raised. It is a letter that was sent to His Holiness the Pope by the members of the government and by the members of parliament, and which was referred to in the remarks which I made yesterday. That document, which was sent, I believe, in 1896 or 1897, was as follows :—

Most Holy Father,—We, the undersigned, members of the Senate and members of the House of Commons of Canada, and representing therein the Liberal party, present ourselves before Your Holiness as respectful and devoted children of holy church, to complain of the existence of a state of things which, if allowed to continue, must be extremely dangerous to the constitutional liberties of this country, as well as to the interests of the church itself.

Your Holiness has already been made aware of the conduct and attitude of certain prelates and of certain members of the secular clergy who, during the general elections in this country, in the month of June last, intervened in a violent manner in restraint of electoral freedom, taking sides openly for the Conservative party, and going so far as to declare guilty of grievous sin those of the electors who would vote for the candidates of the Liberal party.

Sincerely attached to the institutions of our country, which ensure to us Catholics the most complete liberty, we respectfully represent to Your Holiness that these democratic institutions under which we live, and for which Your Holiness has many times expressed sentiment of admiration and confidence, can only exist under perfect electoral freedom.

Far be it from us to refuse to the clergy the plenitude of civil and political rights. The priest is a citizen, and we would not, for a single instant, deprive him of the right of expressing his opinion on any matter submitted to the electorate but when the exercise of that right develops into violence, and when that violence, in the name of religion, goes to the extent of making a grievous sin out of a purely political act, there is an abuse of authority of which the consequences cannot but be fatal, not only to constitutional liberty, but to religion itself.

If, in a country such as ours, with a population consisting of persons of various creeds, and wherein the Protestant denominations are in a majority, Catholics did not enjoy, in all matters relating to legislation, the same political freedom as their Protestant fellow-countrymen, they would ipso facto be placed in a position of inferiority, which would prevent them from taking the legitimate part which they are entitled to take in the government of the country, with the possibility, moreover, of conflicts between the various groups of the population, which history shows to be ever fraught with danger.

Then again, an active and violent intervention of the clergy in the domain of political question submitted to the people must, of necessity, produce against a great mass of the Catholic population a degree of irritation manifestly and prejudicial to that respect which religion and its ministers ever inspire and command. Some twenty years ago, His Holiness Pius IX, your illustrious and lamented predecessor on the pontificial throne, acting through the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda, deemed it his duty to put a stop to certain abuses of a similar character, and forbade the intervention of the clergy in politics. This prohibition was generally respected so long as His Eminence Cardinal Taschereau was able to guide the church in Canada, but since old age and infirmities have paralyzed his guiding hand, the abuses to which your illustrious predecessor had put a stop, have begun again, and threaten once more to create trouble among us, and to compromise, not only Catholic interests in this country, but the peace and harmony which should exist between the various elements of our population.

Again affirming our absolute devotion to the faith of our fathers and to the church of which your are the supreme head, affirming our respect and attachment for the person of Your Holiness, our attachment to the interests of our country and to the Crown of Great Britain, its aegis and protector, we beg that Your Holiness will renew in our behalf the most wise prescriptions and prohibitions of your predecessor protect the consciences of the Catholic electors, and thus secure peace in our country by the union of religion and of liberty—a union which Your Holiness has many times extolled in those immortal encyclicals whose precious teachings we desire in all things to follow; and lastly, grant to the children of the church now addressing Your Holiness the apostolic benediction.

Hon. Wilfrid Laurier, Premier of Canada; Hon. Joseph Israel Tarte, Minister of Public Work; Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick, Solicitor General; Hon. R. W. Scott, Secretary of State; Hon. C. A. Geoffrion, Minister without portfolio; Hon. C. A. P. Pelletier, Speaker of the Senate; Hon J. R. Thibaudeau, senator; K. Préfontaine, M.P.; O. E. Talbot, M.P.; C. R. Devlin, M.P.; L. B. Brodeur, M.P.; L. A. C. Angers, M.P.; T. M. Guay, M. P.; F. Langelier, M.P. ; C. Beausoleil, M.P. ; R. Lemieux, M.P. ; A. A. Bruneau, M.P. ; J. A. C. Ethier, M.P.; B. Monet, M.P.; M. E. Bernier, M.P.; J. A. C. Madore, M.P.; P. V. Savard, M.P.; H. G. Carroll, M.P.; T. Fortin, M.P.; P. A. Choquette, M.P.; O. Desmarais, M.P.; C. J. Rinfret, M.P.; G. Turcotte, M.P.; J. H. Legris, M.P.; H. S. Harwood, M.P.; Joseph Lavergne, M.P.; H. Dupuis, M.P.; C. Bazinet, M.P.; Joseph Gauthier, M.P.; T. Proulx, M.P.; N. A. Belcourt, M.P.; J. B. R. Fiset, M.P.; J. H. R. Bourassa, M.P.; R. M. S. Mignault,

M.P.; A. Bourbonnais, M.P.; C. Pouliot, M.P.; Joseph Godbout, M.P.; A. M. Dechene, M.P.

This letter, which was sent by the forty immortals of this country to His Holiness the Pope, complained of certain political grievances which they had in this country, supporting the request already made that he would send a delegate to this country to look after their interests and to protect them from what is here set forth, namely, the unfair interference of the clerics in the province of Quebec with the rights of the electors, and especially with the rights of members of parliament. I must say that I am rather disappointed in the opinion I had formed of the clergy of Quebec after the high commendation of their conduct given by the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) last night, when I see that he has stigmatized, more than any one I know, with these forty immortals from Quebec, the clergy of that province. They have charged them with all kinds of political interference, they charged them with interfering with the rights of the people to vote, and they asked His Holiness to interfere with these clergy in the province of Quebec, so that when the hon. member for Labelle says that members from Ontario have been throwing stones at the clergy of Quebec, he has evidently forgotten that he and forty others signed this document to have a delegate sent out here to regulate the clergy of the province of Quebec. As a matter of fact, the ablegate was sent out here ; we have had three or four of them.

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand my hon. friend read from a certain petition asking that a delegate be sent here. Would he be kind enough to repeat the part of the petition in which that was included ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I said this document set out the grievances and that other missions and presentations made at Rome requested a delegate to be sent out and especially the letter of the right hon. the Prime Minister, which asked that an ablegate be sent to this country and he was sent. We have the facts that these gentlemen, all engaged in politics, after stigmatizing the clergy of Quebec, undertook a mission to Rome to get His Holiness' consent to the appointment of an ablegate to this country for political purposes, that that ablegate has practically had a political mission, that that ablegate from Rome has been here as an appanage of the Grit machine in this country and that especially he was to be the Papal policeman with a big stick to keep the bishops and clergy of this country in order. This is a fair inference to draw from the representations that were made to Rome and from the conduct of the ablegate in this country. I know it for a fact—at least I have seen it stated and I do not think it will be denied—that at the recent election and at other times Liberal candidates in all parts of the country, or some of them, when they had a grievance against any of the clergy of the church of Rome, immediately telephoned to the big policeman at Ottawa to take his big stick and wire back disciplining the Roman Catholic clergyman who dared to hold an opinion of his own in regard to politics.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Again they are laughing, but they laugh when the facts are brought home to them. The truth is, and it is admitted on the other side of the House, that this Papal ablegate was brought to this country as an appanage of the Grit machine, that he is the policeman with the big stick to discipline the bishops and the clergy of the Roman Catholic church and that those who, more than any one else, stigmatized the hierarchy and clergy of Quebec were the forty immortals who signed that document on that occasion.

Now, the hon Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) this afternoon got rather eloquent and grew rather warm when he charged this side of the House with enkindling the flames of ill-feeling in this country. I want to know who lit the flame, who set the heather on fire over this question.

An hon. MEMBER. You did.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I say that it was the right hon. Prime Minister of this country who introduced this Bill at the request of a solid Quebec to coerce the minority in regard to educational matters in the Northwest. That is what caused the flame, that is what lit the torch, or in other words, the torch was carried and fired the moment the right hon. gentleman introduced that Bill.

Mr. BUREAU Will the hon. gentleman tell the House where he gets his authority for the statement that this Bill was introduced at the request of a solid Quebec?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The proof positive is that a solid Quebec will support him.

Mr. BOURASSA. If that be true was it introduced at the request of a solid Nova Scotia, because a solid Nova Scotia will support it also?

Mr. W F. MACLEAN. We will see about that. We have heard about a bolt in Nova Scotia over this Bill and we will hear more of it. What else has fanned the flame? The thing that fanned the flame was the discovery by the great Protestant element of this country that the right hon. Prime Minister had deceived them. He told them by his conduct in the elections of 1896 that the Manitoba question had been settled, that in this country there was to be no more coercion, that the sunny ways had settled this question and these people took him at his word. They accepted the pledge which he made when, as the hon. Minister

of Agriculture said, he went to Toronto in 1889 and made that speech from which we had a quotation this afternoon, that speech in which he said that 'no Italian priest shall tithe or toll in our Dominion.' He went to Toronto and made that speech and what has fanned the flame is that these people of Ontario and these people of the west now find that an Italian priest is in this country for that very purpose and that he was brought here by the right hon. gentleman. The fact that the people have discovered all these things has helped to fan the flame. What more has fanned the flame? It is the discovery of how this Bill was introduced into parliament in so far as it has been divulged in this debate. It has been proved that the sub-committee which drew up this Bill was composed of the Secretary of State, the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister, and no one else as far as we know. Something else has come out this afternoon which will still further fan the flame and it is that the Prime Minister all along was in consultation with the Archbishop of Ephesus as regards this school clause and as regards the boundaries of Manitoba. Is it not enough to fan the flame when the great Protestant majority of this country, the 59 per cent, find that the Bill dealing with the educational liberties of the people of the west was drawn, brought forward and introduced into this parliament by these three members of the government with the assistance of the Papal ablegate and that not one of the ministers who represent the great Protestant body of this country was consulted, but that they were ignored in the matter? Is not that something to fan the flame?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is not true.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Then it rests with the hon. gentleman to state who were there. I am speaking of the committee now and that is all the knowledge we have. The hon gentleman is there to increase our knowledge. All we want are the actual facts, but, so far, I say the public mind is inflamed and the Protestant mind is justly inflamed by this conduct. What further has inflamed the public mind? What has lighted the torch? It is the constant discovery of duplicity and deception in connection with this matter. The flame was still further fanned by the letter of Mr. Rogers, which was published yesterday, and we know what was in that letter. We know, according to Mr. Rogers, that the delegate from Manitoba—and we will have to confine it now to the Attorney General of Manitoba, Mr. Campbell—was asked by the Papal ablegate to put two certain clauses in the school law of Manitoba. It was intimated to him that if they would do that the boundaries of his province would be extended to the north and it was also stated that the reason why his province had not had its boundaries extended to the west was because of the school law of Manitoba. Is not that something to inflame the public mind, to increase this fire that seems to be burning all over the country? But, who is doing it? Is it being done by this side of the House or by the Conservative press? Perhaps somewhat, but everything that is done is based on these revelations of duplicity, of deception and of ignoring of the public right and the right of the people of the west to be consulted in this matter. Again I ask, as did my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) this afternoon, if the Papal ablegate was to be consulted, if he was consulted, if he was waited upon, as he was repeatedly waited upon by the right hon. Prime Minister, and if this matter was discussed why was not the Minister of the Interior consulted, why was not the Finance Minister consulted, why was not Mr. Haultain consulted, why were not the people of the west consulted? And still further will the public mind be inflamed to-day when it is known, as it knows now, that practically the statement made by the Papal ablegate and published to-day is a confirmation in substance of what was stated in Mr. Rogers letter. Here is the crux of the whole matter and it was not denied; grant, for the moment, that the Papal ablegate had the right to discuss the school question in this interview with the Manitoba minister, he coupled the school question up with the boundary question where he had no jurisdiction, but where apparently he claimed to have authority to propose a settlement of the school question.

There is the crux; that is a thing that is not denied. It is asserted by Mr. Rogers, it is not denied by the ablegate and it is not denied by the government. The kernel of the whole matter lies in this that the ablegate discussed the boundary question of Manitoba in connection with the school question. I want to know if the Minister of Justice had night interviews or any other kind of interviews with the Papal ablegate? I want to know if the Secretary of State has been in communication with the Papal ablegate? I want to know if it is not true that the Secretary of State, the Minister of Justice, the Prime Minister and the Papal ablegate, were daily holding interviews about this school question and discussing the matter in all its shapes and forms, while the people of the west and the minister from the west and Mr. Haultain were ignored. Is there any wonder why the country has been fanned into flame when the people discover these things? I would like to know if the Minister of Finance and the Minister of the Interior had any interviews with the Papal ablegate. I do not suppose they will admit it, but all the other gentlemen have to admit it; the Prime Minister had an opportunity of denying it and he did not deny it, and his colleague who followed him was not able to deny it. The additional fact, which goes to the public to-morrow,

will still further fan the flame, when it is known that the Papal ablegate was in the city of Ottawa all the time in constant consultation with the ministers, and that those who are directly interested were not consulted. I have read the letter which the forty immortals sent to Rome, asking for protection from the clericals of Quebec, and the letter of Mr. Russell has also been read here. This evidence proves that the Prime Minister, or Sir Wilfrid Laurier the private individual, induced the Holy See to send an ablegate to this country and to send him here for a political purpose; for the political purpose of being the policeman with the big stick to regulate the clergy of Quebec ; and, also for the purpose of something else.

Mr. BUREAU. What is it ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I will come to that in a moment, but I say now to the Prime Minister of Canada that whether acting as an individual or not, if he induced the Holy See to send an ablegate here for the political purpose which is confessed in his letter, he is responsible for everything that the Papal ablegate has done in connection with our politics in this country. It is now confessed that the Papal ablegate did interfere in our politics. He submitted to the Manitoba ministers certain clauses he wished to be put in the Bill ; he told them if they would pass these clauses they might have their boundaries extended, and that their failure to give relief to the Catholics in the past was the reason why an extension of the provincial boundaries was denied. I do not agree with all that has been said in this debate as to the right of the ablegate to be here. I say he is here as a political agent in connection with the Prime Minister, and the Prime Minister and the government and its supporters are responsible for the conduct of that ablegate in this country. It is up to the right hon. gentleman, either to endorse what the ablegate did in that interview with Mr. Campbell or to repudiate it, and if he repudiates it, to ask for the recall of the Papal ablegate. We are told as a matter of fact that he has been recalled and that he is to leave the country—or rather it is put in a more polite way—that he is to go back to Rome to explain his conduct in this matter. I believe they are most anxious to get him out of the country ; I believe the Minister of Justice has already drawn up his passports, and that the member for Labelle asked to be allowed to drive the hack that will take the cardinal to the station, and that the Postmaster General is to be there in his weeds, to weep and to say : not au revoir but adieu.

Mr. BOURASSA. And the member for South York will play the band.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What else was the ablegate brought into Canada for ? Mr. Russell wrote in connection with the school question, that the first instalment had been granted, but, that a further instalment was to come, and the Minister of Justice to all intents and purposes, is pledged to give that other instalment and not to rest until he restores the school rights of the Catholics of Manitoba, and also gives separate schools to the Northwest Territories. It is clear that the ablegate has been brought to Canada for two purposes : to discipline the clergy and the bishops of Quebec, and to assist the government in securing separate schools for the Northwest. And he has been working on these lines in connection and in conjunction with the government and therefore the government is responsible for everything he has done. The people of Canada will hold him responsible for everything he has done, until they either repudiate him and ask for his withdrawal, or else endorse his conduct. It is this deception that has been practised all through in connection with our public affairs that has set the spark into a flame and fired the heather all over Canada. I am somewhat of a protectionist and so is the member for Labelle, who is especially a protectionist in regard to matters concerning Quebec. But the member for Labelle is not the protectionist I am, for I am in favour of the home product as regards the bishops and the clergy of the country, and I do not believe in bringing from the outside a policeman with a big stick to regulate them. I believe the bishops and the clergy of the province of Quebec are able to manage their own affairs.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The cat is out of the bag.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Then. gentlemen opposite, who pretend to be the great champions of the clergy of Quebec, are the men who asked His Holiness to send over an ablegate who would regulate them and keep them in their place. The bishops and clergy of the province of Quebec resent this conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite, in bringing in a prince of the church for their political purposes. I believe to-day that the great majority of the hierarchy of Quebec are not rejoiced to see what has happened, but they recognize that a mistake was made and that things will be better in the future if there is no more ablegate in this country. I think it has been made clear here to-day that the ablegate has interfered improperly in Canadian politics, and it has been made clear that everything that has occurred in this country, which has inflamed the public mind, is the direct result of the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite. They asserted that they had settled the school question, that it was buried for all time and they would never resurrect it ; yet they have been guilty of that very thing. Again I tell the Prime Minister, who made that quotation in a speech in Toronto, 'No Italian priest shall tithe or toll in these Dom-

inions,' that the people of Toronto have found him out as the very man who brought a Papal ablegate to this country for that very purpose. This is the issue before this country, and I leave it with the House and the country. The proposal is to establish a connection between church and state in the new provinces, and to allow a denominational interest to tithe and toll the school lands of those two free provinces. Hon. gentlemen may laugh and jeer at it, but that is the issue that is to be decided in the country. It may be laughed at in this House ; but every man from Ontario, every man from the west—nay, more, every man from the maritime provinces—will be asked to account for his conduct in regard to this effort which is being made to establish a connection between church and state, and to share the public school funds of this country with one denomination to the exclusion of every other. Another thing which hon. gentlemen will have to settle, whether they be of the government or private members, is the way in which this legislation has been introduced into this House—how only one side has been consulted and every other interest has been ignored. Sometimes it is necessary to say a word in the interest of a majority. There is a majority of fifty-nine per cent in this country that is entitled to fair-play, and that majority says to-day that it has not been given that fair-play which it had a right to expect from the right hon. gentleman when that majority gave their confidence to him, and when he in return gave a pledge, which they took from him on his honour, and which pledge to-day is broken and in the dust. That is the issue, and on that the public will judge hon. gentlemen opposite. The fifty-nine per cent do not want to do anything unfair to the minority ; but those who compose that fifty-nine per cent are of that character that if they think an attempt is being made to manacle or interfere with the educational freedom of those great provinces in the west, they will resent it. All that the people of the province of Ontario say to-day is what they said before. They said in 1896 : Hands off Manitoba ; and they say again to the province of Quebec : Hands off the new provinces in the west ; leave them alone ; let them manage their own affairs, especially their school affairs, as you have full liberty to manage yours. That is all they say ; and if the fifty-nine per cent of this country are to be charged with fanning a flame and stirring up creed and race wars in this country, I say it is not just to make that charge, because they have not done it ; but they have said to the government, in a fair and respectful way : Leave these new provinces to settle their own educational affairs. On the other hand, the charge comes home to hon. gentlemen opposite, and they must give an account of themselves to the people of Ontario. Where is the Postmaster General to-day, who was so anxious yesterday to repudiate the letter of the forty immortals ? He did not want to be identified with it ; and yet is he not responsible, being a member of the government, for every political act of his colleagues ? He is trying to escape the responsibility, but he will be held responsible for it, and so will every other member from the province of Ontario.

Now, my advice to the right hon. gentleman is—not that I want to see him force the ablegate out of the country ; but he had better have an explanation from the ablegate, and if that explanation is not satisfactory, he must repudiate him. Another thing he must do, and I tell him now ; he must withdraw this school clause from that Bill. That Bill will never pass this House or this parliament in its present shape. Leave that school clause out, and leave the courts to interpret what the constitutional rights of the minority in the province are, and we in Ontario and the west will be satisfied. That is all we want. But do not try to fetter when you have no right to fetter ; do not claim constitutional interference when you have no right to interfere. So far as I am able to prevent it, and other members of this House, that clause will never go on the statue-book of this country.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has been busily engaged for the past three-quarters of an hour in his favourite occupation of fanning the flame of religious discord in this country ; but the bellows do not seem to be working as well as they did yesterday, and the flame is not being fanned with the same alacrity as was displayed yesterday afternoon. My hon. friend, coming from the premier province, the largest province of this Dominion, is accustomed to speak, and I am sorry to say a great many other gentlemen who come from that province, are in the habit of speaking of Ontario as if it were the whole Dominion. The time was in the history of this country when our friends who sit on the opposite side of the House claimed to be the national party, the party which stood for a united Canada all round. That is not the song they sing now. We hear Ontario spoken of as if there were no other portion of this whole Dominion, and those of us who come from the maritime provinces and the province of Quebec, and who, in the exercise of our rights as members of parliament venture to express our views on matters of ordinary importance, are pilloried by the Tory newspapers as being more liable to be corrupted than those who possess the high ideals of the gentlemen from the province of Ontario. Sir, I want to resent any such imputation. We, from Nova Scotia, may not belong to such a big province in area ; but we come from a province to which the Tory party were forced to go not long ago in despera-

tion to get a leader. If those gentlemen who sing the song of Ontario so smoothly think their province is the premier one, how is it that they cannot scare up a leader from among the men they send to this House ?

All this excitement, all this religious flame that my hon. friend speaks about, comes from the allegation that the claim of the province of Manitoba to have its boundaries enlarged was not conceded by the Dominion government the moment it was asserted, because there was interference from the Papal ablegate in this country. That is the charge in a nutshell, and I want to examine it for a moment. The attitude assumed by our friends from Manitoba is a most dictatorial one. Without saying a word with regard to the question of having an enlargement of their boundaries for a long period of years, they suddenly woke up on the 16th of January last and said they wanted to have their boundaries extended west, north and east, cutting into one province, asuming a large portion of territory in another, and taking out of the new provinces to be constructed a third portion of territory. They want to have it done right away, not a moment of hesitation. No interests are to be considered, even the interests of the province of Ontario are to be disregarded, and I assume that the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) is one of those who agree with the proposition that although Premier Whitney may think they have some claims, yet they are not to be considered at all by this coterie of politicians that happen to be in charge and who are just now demanding it. Let me say, as coming from one of the smaller provinces of the Dominion, that they also have a right to be considered in regard to this subject. The legislature of the province of New Brunswick, minor in size, though important as a factor in the confederation, no later than a month ago passed a strong resolution in which they represented to the federal government that on this question of the accretion of the provinces the rights of the smaller provinces should be considered. We hear about Manitoba being a postage stamp on the map. Well, we who come from Nova Scotia, although it may be a postage stamp on the map, we come as one of the partners in this confederation, and we say that we have the same interest as New Brunswick to be considered before any addition is made to the territory of any province. Let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the province of New Brunswick, through their legislature, asserted no less than a month ago that by reason of the accretion of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec which was made a few years ago, their position, as regards their representation in this House has been imperilled, according to the decision of the Supreme Court and the Privy Council, for all time to come. The same thing may occur in regard to Manitoba. And are we to be told that this government who were asked on the 17th of February to add to the territory of Manitoba, because they took four days to answer it, and answered it in this House, are doing this at the dictation of the hierarchy and of the Papal ablegate to this country ? I say that the federal government would be recreant to the interests of every province in this Dominion if they did not hesitate long and seriously before they decided to increase the province of Manitoba or any other province by one foot of territory. Now these are the facts upon which these gentlemen base the proposition that because they did not get, in four days time, what they asked for, that therefore there is some interference from outside. Our friends opposite grow almost hysterical over the failure of the government to grant these demands, which every one of them, on deliberation, will concede are demands that should be well weighed as affecting the rights and status of every province in this confederation.

Now let us examine somewhat critically the position of affairs in regard to this whole question over which the hon. member for South York spoke so excitedly. In the province of Manitoba the premier has been negotiating for some time with Archbishop Langevin in regard to the postion of separate schools in that province. It is evident that these negotiations conducted through Archbishop Langevin have reached the Papal ablegate. These negotiations were initiated by the Manitoba government some time ago and Mr. Campbell, the Attorney General of Manitoba, had an interview with the Papal ablegate with regard to this question. Were they initiated by this government, or even at the suggestion of this government ? The statement of facts that has been issued by this buccaneer member of the Manitoba government do not contain the faintest suggestion that these negotiations were initiated by any member of this government. On the contrary, we have the fact stated that the Attorney General of Manitoba consulted with the ablegate a year ago ; we have the fact asserted and not denied that negotiations have been going on for a long time between the premier of Manitoba and Archbishop Langevin on behalf of the Papal ablegate. Now these gentlemen come down to Ottawa of their own accord, at their own suggestion. Who asked them to come ? Did this government ask them to come ? On the contrary, the correspondence laid before the House last night by the First Minister showed conclusively that when these gentlemen woke up on the 16th of January they wrote to Sir Wilfrid Laurier and asked that they might be permitted to come down and discuss this question.

No doubt, at the instance of Premier Roblin, Attorney General Campbell and Mr. Rogers intended to see the ablegate when they came down here in regard to this school question—there is not the slightest doubt about it—and they did go and see the ablegate. Now what took place ? We have a statement of alleged facts given to the people of this country. Is it issued by the man who is supposed to guide the province of Manitoba, by the premier of that province ? Does he venture to give his official sanction to any statement of facts in regard to this matter ? Not at all. Is it issued by the Attorney General of the province of Manitoba, the man who had the interview with the ablegate ? If we are going to have any official statement as to the negotiotions, as to what was said and done, and if we are going to have this flame of religious discord fanned in this country by our hon. friends opposite, at least we should expect them to start this flame agoing by some facts based upon the statement of a man who was present and who took part in the interview. Why, Sir, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition is too good a lawyer—and we recognize him in our province as a good lawyer—he is too good a lawyer not to know that hearsay testimony is not worth anything, and the statement of Mr. Rogers upon which all this flame of religious discord is to be started up is the worst kind of hearsay testimony, it is testimony that my learned friend, if he were a judge, would not listen to for one moment, and would reject if it were offered in evidence.

Now the result is that we have all this excitement based upon what ? Upon a statement of facts made by a gentleman in regard to certain things within his own knowledge? No, Sir, mark that. While we have been discussing in this House and the newspapers have been discussing for days certain alleged facts in regard to certain things, no public man has yet ventured to state that he knows anything of these things of his own knowledge. But we have this hearsay statement, and hearsay statements as well as any other old statement are sufficient material just now for certain gentlemen to fan a flame of religious discord. We have in addition to the statement two insinuations. The first insinuation is that Sir Wilfrid wanted time to enable the invitation of the Papal ablegate to be acted upon. Well, now, what do we find ? We find that the interview with the premier of this country took place on February 17, we find that the interview with the ablegate took place on February 23. In the meantime the policy of the government had been formulated in regard to the western boundaries of Manitoba, and it was announced in this House and in the country what the policy of the government was. Could it be possible, is it reasonable to suggest to any sane man that a statement made two days after an announcement of policy in this House, could be taken as being indicative of an intention to have anything to do with, or any influence upon, this government in determining that policy ? Yet that is what is being asserted. Then we are told that the ablegate's suggestion was made with the full knowledge and consent of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, which is the second insinuation. And what do we find ? We find that the premier of this country solemnly stated yesterday :

I assert that if Mr. Rogers stated that Monseigneur Sbarretti did press him to make the suggestion of terms and conditions which he says Monseigneur Sbarretti did with my knowledge, he states something which is not in accordance with truth.

Could any statement be more categorically denied than that? And no member of this House ventures for one moment to declare that that denial should not be accepted with the fullest credence. Let us look at what the ablegate said in regard to this matter :

This is the sum and substance of my interview with Mr. Campbell. The federal government had absolutely no knowledge of it.

And yet, as I say, upon hearsay testimony, upon inferences which the youngest child would not draw and which no judge in this country would venture to think of considering in a case tried before him, this House is being detained to listen to assertions such as we have heard for two days past. And this is done, because hon gentlemen opposite have been eight years in opposition and have exhausted every possible effort to tarnish in the slightest degree the escutcheon of the great leader of the Liberal party, and hope, at last, by this roorback, by this fool story, that judge and jury would not hang a cat upon, to mislead public opinion.

Let us look at this statement, the only statement of fact we have from any source as to what went on—every hon. member will agree that Mr. Rogers' statement must be discarded as hearsay testimony. The ablegate says :

I never met Hon. Mr. Rogers, nor did I have any communication with him.

On the evening before his departure for the west (February 23), Mr. Campbell came. I asked him if something could not be done to improve the condition of the Catholics of his province with respect to education. I pointed out that in the cities of Winnipeg and Brandon, for instance, the Catholics were paying double taxes.

I urged my request on the ground of fairness and justice, and referring to his mission to Ottawa, I remarked that, from the view of the Manitoba government, some action on these lines would be a political expedient, and tend to facilitate the accomplishment of his object, inasmuch as the Catholics in any territory which

might be annexed to Manitoba would naturally object to losing the right they had to separate schools, and to be subjected to the educational conditions which existed in Manitoba.

Mr. Campbell then asked me what would be my desire in this respect.

I then gave him the memorandum which has already appeared in the press.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) this afternoon endeavoured to build an argument upon a certain construction which he put upon the words 'politically expedient.' Let me submit to the reasonable attention of the House what the inference to be drawn from these words is. For whom was this to be 'politically expedient'? Was it for the government of the country that, for the third time had received a mandate from the people, and by an overwhelming vote, by a majority greater than ever known in the history of the country? What would be the necessity for this government to descend to 'political expediency'? In whose interest would the course suggested be 'politically expedient' then? Unquestionably in that of the Manitoba government, the government that had been interviewing Archbishop Langevin, the government whose Attorney General had been interviewing the ablegate endeavouring to arrange to obtain political support—as I would say, if I were to use the style of argument of hon. gentlemen opposite—in return for making these concessions. For whom else could it be 'politically expedient' than for the government that was talking of having a dissolution some of these days, and was looking for political support? I submit that the argument of my hon. friend and the inference he attempted to draw were wholly unwarranted. Who were the people who were chasing this ablegate in relation to the schools? Were they the members of this government? On the contrary, the indisputable evidence of the facts before us, shows conclusively who were engaging in these 'political expedients.' For, what does the ablegate say? He says it will be politically expedient,

——inasmuch as the Catholics in any territory which might be annexed to Manitoba would naturally object to losing the right they had to separate schools, and to be subjected to the educational conditions which existed in Manitoba.

For whom was this 'politically expedient'? For the government that wanted to secure the support and sympathy of the people of the Northwest Territories, so that they might come and ask to be joined to Manitoba. Surely the inference is so irresistible that no one came to any other conclusion than that this was the reason why the statement was made that it was 'politically expedient' for the Manitoba government. And the story of this matter has not yet all been told? We have not heard from Mr. Roblin yet. This forecastle member of the administration, who is, perhaps, playing the game of politics for his own personal advantage——

An hon. MEMBER. Looking for Roblin's job.

Mr. MACDONALD.—and looking for Roblin's job, as an hon. friend suggests—when we come to get the whole story about this political pirate from Manitoba, it may be found that there are some little things yet to be said that will not be heard with very great satisfaction by our friends who have raised this question.

Now, we are told, in the light of facts such as I have outlined—outlined fairly, I submit—that the Protestant feeling in this country should be roused against this government and against the leader. That is the argument that hon. gentlemen opposite have been making and to whom are we asked to look for guidance? To the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) who leads the opposition. Well, that hon. gentleman knows very well that his entrance into political life was signalized by the advocacy of the coercion of the province of Manitoba. He knows that the then leader of the Conservative party, recognizing his legal abilities, was anxious that the hon. gentleman should lend those abilities to the advocacy of the cause of the coercion of Manitoba, to which that leader was then committed. The hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) did not enter political life under auspices of so clear and unequivocal a character as to be able to hold out very alluring hopes even to my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), who might be looking for a leader on this question. Or, are we to look to our hon. friend (Mr. Foster) who addressed us this afternoon and who reads us a moral lecture every time he gets on his feet. This hon. gentleman assumes a high moral attitude. As he soars above ordinary mortals, and as 'his tongue drops manna, and makes the worst appear the better reason,' he fancies that the people of this country are deluded by the sermonettes he gives us. Why, Sir, what is the political history of that hon. gentleman? Born in the province of New Brunswick, representing the county of King's, his native county, he was driven thence after four or five years. He found a resting place, for a moment, in the county of York—but, as an hon. friend behind me remarks, he dare not go back. He flitted about St. John for a while; and then the people of New Brunswick took summary methods of dealing with him and drove him away politically, not only from St. John, but from the province of New Brunswick for ever. And the result has been that for some years past he has been a political Ishmaelite. He has been going up and down this country like a lonely pelican of the wilderness, like a solitary sparrow on the housetop, looking for

some nest in which he might sit and from which he might descant upon the decay of political virtue in Canada. At last he has found, in an adjoining constituency to that of my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), a place that was willing to take him in. And, coming back to the political arena once more, he proceeds, absolutely oblivious to the past record. Like the ostrich he puts his head in the sand and fancies that no one sees what is going on. Metaphorically he has put his head in the sand and says to the people of Canada : Do not look at my history previous to 1900, but gaze on this apostle of virtue, this George Eulas Foster, who has come to life again. My hon. friend who descanted upon this question so glibly was a leading member of the former government of this country. He talks about Italian prelates who are going to take tithes from interference in the political affairs of this country. He talks with great glibness, with a great deal of energy but my hon. friend was the associate of gentlemen who were very glad not so many years ago to look to these gentlemen for aid and comfort and were fanning the flames of religious discord—only they were doing business from the other end of the line. What do we find they were doing in those days ? The history is embalmed in the records of our courts. I refer the hon. gentleman who is looking for data on which to discuss matters likely to give rise to discord not to take hearsay statements from buccaneer politicians but to look at the Supreme Court reports of the Dominion of Canada. What do we find that the associates of my hon. friend who descants on political virtue to-day were doing in the past when he blossomed and flourished as a minister of the Crown ? We find in evidence here that in those days some of the clergy in the province of Quebec discussed political questions in this way :

> You know in what manner the serpent found his way into the terrestrial paradise, with what cunning he succeeded in convincing Eve that she should not die, nor Adam either, by eating of the forbidden fruit. You all know what took place ; the serpent was the cause of the misfortunes that are weighing upon us. In the same manner Catholic Liberalism wishes to find its way into the paradise of the church to lead her children to fall. Be firm, my brethren, our bishops tell us that it is no longer permitted to be conscientiously a Catholic Liberal; be careful never to taste the fruit of the tree Catholic Liberal.

These are the injunctions of the friends of the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in days gone by. Let me give you another quotation from the same case to show how delightfully consistent he is, how lovely my hon. friend from North Toronto has been, and what a splendid record he has upon this question. What do we find ?

> Now, if sometimes it is sinful to vote in a certain way, rather than in another way, it cannot be, assuredly, when you are voting according to the wise counsels of all the bishops of the province ; and if it is not in that way, it must be in the opposite. However, I must tell you that if you are voting for a Liberal candidate, not believing him to be so, because your conscience tells you that he is the man that will best represent your interests in parliament, in such case you do not sin. But if you know that he is a Liberal, you cannot conscientiously give him your vote ; you are sinning by favouring a man who supports principles condemned by the church, and you assume the responsibility of the evil which that candidate may do in the application of the dangerous principles which he professes.

Let me say further that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and I regret that he is not here—was engaged in other political matters in this country in 1896 which touched on religious matters and fanning the flames of religious discord was a favourite occupation of the hon. gentleman and his friends in those days. What do we find was the battle cry of our Conservative friends in 1896 in Quebec and other places in this country ? We find that they were aware of and assented to the issuing of a mandement dealing with the question of how people should vote. In a sermon of Bishop Lafleche in 1896, after quoting the latter part of the speech of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the bishop added :

> In the circumstances, a Catholic could not without making a mortal sin vote for the leader of the party who has made such a statement (referring to Sir Wilfrid's speech) and for the partisans who support him so long as they will not have publicly repudiated that error and taken the engagement to vote for a remedial law approved by the bishops.

This is the record of the member for North Toronto in 1896, a record which he would fain forget. And of course he tells us to-day that as long as the grass grows and water runs he is not going to do the like again. The only difference now is that while he is trying to carry on the same game he is now trying to work upon the Protestants of this country instead of on our Roman Catholic friends. And he tells us he is not going to do this again because he was beaten, forsooth, in 1896 and in 1900 and in 1904. That is not the Spartan-like virtue of the old heroes who when they fell down got up again. He is perfectly willing to desert the cause which did not give him office or bring him satisfactory results. There is only one thing to be said with regard to my hon. friend and it is this that the men who sit behind him, that the Conservative party in this country found him out four years ago. Down in New Brunswick, they knew him right along and this year when the opportunity came to these men, when he had been for twenty years in political life, to advance him to a position of honour and leadership in that party, they knew him so well that they would not trust him, hence it is son of my own province sits

him, hence it is a son of my own province sits

as leader. But fancy the humiliation of this old political veteran who has to sit as second to a man many years his junior. Let me say that when the hon. member for North Toronto or any man in this country after so long an experience in political life with such a record as this talks as he talks in this House it is not likely that the Protestants of this country will have the slightest faith in the assertions or statements or leadership of a man of that kind. Whom are we asked to follow? We are asked to follow my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean). We all recognize our friend from South York, the W. R. Hearst of Canadian politics, the gentleman who runs sensational journals. He is a well known advocate of public ownership, and he is so able an advocate—and I am going to give him credit for it—that he was able to foist it on his leader and his party and enabled them to get soundly beaten on it last year. My hon. friend who comes along with all these fetishes of his, according to the eloquent speech of the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland) last night, not so many years ago instead of being a stout advocate of provincial rights, an expression which he rolls as a sweet morsel under his tongue to-day was going up and down this country and in this House demanding a strong central government, and saying that the intention of the fathers of confederation was that power should be centred in the federal government in Ottawa, and that there should not be found in the various centres of Canada little legislatures exercising varied powers but that everything should be done in this great central body. The record of my hon. friend is hardly as inconsistent as that of his coadjutor from North Toronto, but on this question of provincial rights he has not much license to speak in this House or in this country.

Then we are asked to follow the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) a gentleman who has had a long career in politics and a gentleman whom I am sure we respect, because I think he is the only one of the four that believes in this talk that he is giving us. I am free to say that I believe that, but I am also free to say that my hon. friend from East Grey is in very strange company. Was he not a follower of old Sir John? In the United States it used to be the proud boast of men who had been through the war that they had fought with Grant and it is only a short time in Canada since the Shibboleth of the Conservatives was that they had been with Sir John. Now what was Sir John's history on this question of provincial rights? He was the great centralist as the hon. member for South York told us. Every one knows that Sir John Macdonald was not a federationist, or a legislative unionist, that he was not an advocate of provincial powers, or of the recognition of the rights of provincial legislatures to control certain questions, merely conceding to them those questions that could not be kept from them. Why, the day was when the Conservative powers in this country asserted that the King was not present in a provincial legislature, that this parliament was the only power that had the right to pass license laws, and we all recollect the occasion when Sir John Macdonald asserted the right, as a legislative unionist, of this federal parliament to pass a Liquor License Act. We all remember the time when he asserted on a question in relation to the constitution of the courts the right of the federal government to appoint King's Counsel's. And we also remember that in the days when the battle went on in the province of Ontario, the little tyrant, as they called him, manfully withstood the efforts of Sir John Macdonald, the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and some other old veterans on the other side in the House who sought to filch from Ontario her rights, legislatively and territorially, and that the men who are now claiming to represent provincial rights and who speak about them as if they were something sacred are the very men who spent all their lives battling against provincial rights and in favour of the centralization of power. Although we have to respect the hon. member for East Grey because he is sincere, I am sure that when he talks about provincial rights he must feel a twinge of regret that he is departing from the policy of the old leader under whom he entered politics and under whose political aegis he developed in this parliament. There was not an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who supported Sir John Macdonald who knew anything about provincial rights. The word sits very strangely on their tongues. They were never provincial rights people. They never knew what provincial rights were, and yet they are coming here to-day and talking about a proposition in which they assert that the compact recognized by Sir John Macdonald and by all the fathers of confederation as being the essential element in the formation of this confederacy, namely, that the rights of minorities in all the provinces of this Dominion should be respected, is one which shall not be kept. They come here and in the name of provincial rights go back on their record, go back on the traditions of their old leader who sleeps in Cataraqui cemetery at Kingston, they forget the great position that he once occupied in this parliament, and there are none so poor as do him reverence because they turn to those propositions that were advocated by his traditional opponent, Sir Oliver Mowat. Shall we follow these men to-day upon this question? Or shall those of us, who represent not merely what may be called Protestant constituencies but who represent constituencies, even though they come from smaller provinces,

where people are guided by the principle that here, in Canada, the lines of race and religion must be obliterated, and who demand that we shall be Canadians one and all, not rather follow him, who, during his long life, not merely on the testimony of his friends but on the testimony of those who ought to be his friends, but who have for a peculiar reason, become opponents of his, battled for civil and religious rights in the province where he was born and bred ? I want to know if there is any one who has studied the history of Canada who does not recognize that great leader of the Liberal party every year of whose career as a public man is marked by progress and by some effort on behalf of the rights both civil and religious of the provinces of this confederation. But, talking about the ablegate being brought to this country, I want to know whether there is a man who will say that the sons of the Roman Catholic church who had suffered by reason of the tyranny exercised on behalf of the Conservative party should not go to the head of their church and ask for the intervention of that dignitary by the appointment of a representative in Canada in order to see that the system of interference in politics which had hitherto prevailed should be obliterated from this country. That is why the ablegate came to Canada. Everybody knows that is so, and everybody knows that the reason why Quebec spoke in 1896 as she did and as she has spoken since is because the great heart of the French people rose above all those limitations which had bound them and because the people of that province recognized that in their great leader they had a man who was ever ready to stand for equal rights for all and special privileges for none. As he stood for the rights of the provinces in 1896 so he stands to-day for the constitutional rights of minorities and the recognition of the principles which the confederation compact involves and which were embodied in the constitution. But, cries such as we have heard here to-day are not new. My little province down by the sea has not turned its ear to any such appeals as seem to avail in other portions of Canada. But, in the county from which I come and in which I have run three federal elections, I want to say that in every fight we have had to contend against the canvass which was being made on behalf of the Conservative party amongst the Protestant and Presbyterian section of the electors in these words : Surely you will not vote for a Frenchman and a Roman Catholic like Laurier. That was the shibboleth of the Conservative party. But, our people rose above that. Our people recognized that he was the champion of civil and religious liberty in Canada, that he was possessed of a generous mind, that he was a believer in all that was going to make Canada great and her people happy, and they sent a unanimous delegation here to support him. Let me say that we are unanimously behind him to-day and further let me say that upon this question we know in whom we believe. We are not asked to follow any man whose record is of a character such as I have outlined as being possessed by some hon. gentlemen opposite. We know that when the excitement upon this question passes away the Protestant people of Canada will recognize as in days that have gone, that in our great leader we have a pillar in the storm, a man who has stood above all these cries of race and religion, a man who rises above them and who sees with clear vision the path which we should follow and the principles by which we should be guided. So, I say that when the history of this country comes to be written our children's children will speak of the great leader of the Liberal party who has fought the battle of civil and religious liberty and who has stood up for the rights of provinces and minorities as one whose name will ever shine with lustre so long as Canada has a history.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, if this took place in some country barnyard, I imagine I could hear some old farmer saying it is not the first time that he heard a great deal of noise and cackling for a very small egg. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has taken an hour to enlighten us on the subject before the House and he has trotted out almost every subject under the sun which suggested itself to his mind but he has studiously avoided touching the question before the House, and I think it would be quite in order for me to ask, Mr. Speaker, to read the question before the House because the attention of the House has been directed to everything except that. The hon. gentleman treated us to a great many subjects : Roorbacks; cold storage, Mr. Rogers' statement must be discarded; absolutely untrue ; sparrow on the house tops ; pelican in the wilderness ; manna dropping from the tip of the tongue; fanning the flames of religious strife;—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. Buccaneer politicians——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. A political Ishmaelite——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. These are a few of the subjects the member for Pictou dealt with in his very intelligent way.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. I presume he wishes us to imagine that we are looking towards the east, and we see the silver edged lining of the cloud which betokens the rising sun of a clear day. The effort of the hon. gentleman to enlighten the House on the subject

reminds me of a story I heard when comparatively a boy, of a would-be celebrated chemist, who, asked to demonstrate a proposition in chemistry said : Well boys, you will take an effervescent and you add a deliquescent and there will be a precipitation and that is a conglomeration and that amounts to a demonstration. The chemist defied any one to prove the proposition more logically than that, and the chemist's demonstration is about on a par with the demonstration we have had from the member for Pictou. It was a conglomeration in the highest sense of the word. He told us that Ontario thought she had all the intelligence of the world, but that we were not above going to the east to get a leader. Well, Ontario is like Simple Simon ; she knows a good thing when he sees it, and takes it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. The man he called a political Ismaelite was born in the maritime provinces but they discarded him, and we accepted him with gratitude and pleasure and I think he has given the member for Pictou and his friends one of the best drubbings they have got for some time. Scripture tells us that it was from the east the wise men came, and we have drawn many a wise man from the east, but if we are to judge from the sample we heard to-night I can assure him we are not likely to make any more pilgrimages east in search of wise men. The member for Pictou said that Sir John Macdonald was a legislative unionist and that the member for East Grey who championed political rights to-day was a great admirer of his. If the member for Pictou were as familiar with the political history of this House as he seems to be with the barnyards of Nova Scotia, he would know that the member of East Grey disagreed with Sir John Macdonald on many of these questions in regard to provincial rights, and that the member for East Grey was as sincere then as he is to-day upon the question we are now dealing with.

The fact is admitted that the Attorney General of Manitoba had visited the Papal ablegate. Who admitted it ? The member for Pictou made the pure bald statement without anything in the world to back it up so far as we know except his own imagination——

Mr. MACDONALD. Would the hon. gentleman permit me to call his attention to the fact that the ablegate's statement shows that Mr. Campbell visited him.

Mr. SPROULE. Did he say they had a conference ? He incidentally met him.

Mr. MACDONALD. Will my hon. friend read for himself ?

Mr. SPROULE. The ablegate says : I met him in a friendly way a year ago, but there is not one word with regard to a conference ; there is only the solitary statement that they met and the member for Pictou wove out the rest of the fairy tale, and presented it to the House as a fact. The member for Pictou tells us that his province is not opposed to provincial rights. No, but if he represents his province, Nova Scotia is opposed to the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba because it is one of the smaller provinces.

Mr. MACDONALD. The attitude adopted on that question was, that the smaller provinces of the Dominion should be consulted before the boundaries of any other province in the confederation were extended.

Mr. SPROULE. It was not that the smaller provinces should be consulted, but that Nova Scotia as a small province was opposed to enlarging other provinces because it would make Nova Scotia comparatively smaller. That is the only logical deduction from his remarks. The hon. member for Pictou told us that the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) is singing the song of Ontario. Yes, he is singing the song of Ontario, and Ontario has sung a good many songs and they have all panned out well, and this one will also. He told us that the member for South York is fanning flames of religious strife. Is he ? We hear that from every hon. gentleman on the other side of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. I hear the weakling from Cape Breton say 'hear, hear.' The only two things he can do is to say 'hear, hear' and ask a question.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. If you come down I will be ready to meet you at any time.

Mr. TURRIFF. I wish to say that the hon. member for Cape Breton was strong enough to defeat the leader of the hon. member for East Grey in 1896.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. What is starting the member for the west ; is he after another cinch ?

Mr. TURRIFF. I was just remarking——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. I cannot hear a word the hon. gentleman says. He is good at interrupting ; he had better wait——

Mr. TURRIFF. I want to answer your question.

Mr. SPROULE—because if it is necessary I may direct attention to him in a way that would not be pleasant to him, and if I am driven too far I will and don't forget it. The member for Pictou says that the Reform party are fighting for the rights of the

people, and one of his friends said that the Reform party fought the church a few years ago, and that it even took the church to the courts and that this is an evidence that the Reform party is not in favour of a Papal ablegate. Perhaps not, but it was the Reform party that brought him here. The member for Pictou told us that we on this side dislike the Catholics and the Catholic church. That is a peculiar assertion on his part; it has no foundation in fact, not the slightest in the world. So far as I know and I verily believe it, there is no sentiment of dislike here either for a Roman Catholic or the Roman Catholic church. We have the same respect and veneration for that church that we have for other churches and for its members as we have for other members of the community. That statement of his only exists in his imagination and I want to say so. What is the gist of all this discussion this afternoon? The Minister of Agriculture gave us a very learned disquisition but he never touched the subject. He tried to draw a red herring across the track like the member for Pictou who never mentioned the issue from the moment he rose till he sat down. He tried to do like that little fish that spouts out an inky fluid in the water so as to becloud everything—I see the hon. member for Pictou is leaving the House; the sun has gone down.

Mr. MACDONALD. I will come back to oblige the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPROULE. I am glad he came back.

Mr. MACDONALD. You will find me no quitter at any time.

Mr. SPROULE. Perhaps I was doing the hon. gentleman an injustice. Unlike some of his friends he is willing to stay in the chamber and hear what is being said. Of all the speeches made on the other side of the House, none of them touched the subject at all. The Prime Minister told us: we will fight this battle to the end upon the very line upon which it is brought into the House. What are the lines on which the battle was brought into this House? What are the lines to-day? The interference of the church with the state. I tell him that we accept the challenge, and that we are prepared to meet him on every platform in the broad Dominion of Canada. He will find us ready for the battle, and willing to take our share in it. The allegation is that a representative of the church has improperly interfered with the duties of the state. Who is responsible for that? Not the ablegate. He is trying to do his duty, and I do not blame him; he is representing his church. Who is responsible for it? The men who brought him here—brought him under false pretenses if you can judge from the history of the ablegate since he has been here. What did he come for? To reconcile differences between them and their church that they were unable to reconcile for themselves. As long as he was doing that we had no complaint to make. Is that the work he is doing to-day? Not at all. He has gone beyond the bounds of that work, and who is responsible for it? Who is to blame? Is it the ablegate? No. He is reputed to be an able statesman, a diplomat, and he was brought here by men who think themselves statesmen, but who are not equal to the occasion. Who are they? The Prime Minister was the first who sent to Rome, and he was joined by thirty-nine of his supporters. They are the parties who brought the ablegate here, who are responsible for his being here, who have been using him since, and who are bringing discredit on their church by the capacity in which they are employing him. I say that if there is any objection to what the ablegate has done, we do not blame him, and have not a word to say against him; but we blame the men who brought him and who have employed him in that work. They are the parties who are responsible, and they are the parties who will be brought to book for it as soon as the voice of the people of Canada has an opportunity of being heard on the subject. The memories of the people of Canada are not so short that they will forget it. They will not forget it by any means. I ask again, who brought him here? I have answered that question, and can my answer be denied? Is there any attempt to deny it? Not at all. There is and always has been in this country a dread of the interference of the church with the state, and there will be the same dread in the future; and when we see the first indications of that interference cropping up, we want to stop it. That does not refer to one church more than another. When I say church, I include every church, and we are ready to fight one as vigorously as another. I am speaking of a principle which is inherent in the constitution of the British empire. We have learned long since of the painful effects of the interference of the church with the rights of the state. That question was fought out, and the relative duties of each was assigned to it. But that question is cropping up to-day, and who are responsible for it? The present government; they are the parties who have introduced that question. We are told that there is excitement in the country to-day. If there is, what is the occasion of it? It is the danger apprended by the people of Canada that we are going to have the issue of state and church to fight over again. That is why there is excitement; that is why so many letters and petitions are coming to Ottawa; that is why there is such an intense feeling throughout the country against the present government. Is there to-day any interference with the affairs of the state by any church? Need I ask that question after the information that has been given to this House several times during the last few

days? My answer is, yes, there is. By what church? By the representative of the Church of Rome, who was brought here by the present government. What important questions of state are under the consideration of parliament to-day? There are two. One relates to the establishment of new provinces in the west. The other is the question of whether the boundaries of Manitoba shall be extended. These are two important questions which the state is dealing with to-day. We are erecting two new provinces and giving them provincial rights and provincial powers. Then, application is being made on behalf of the province of Manitoba for the extension of its boundaries, so that it may be of a size proportionate to the other provinces around it. It is much smaller to-day. Let me deal first with the question of erecting these new provinces. One of the duties of the state is to assign certain rights to these provinces, among them the right to legislate with regard to education. The state is exercising its undoubted right to pass this legislation in this House. It is claimed, and not denied—no hon. gentleman in this House has dared to deny it up to the present—that the proposal in the Bill was submitted to the Papal ablegate ; that several conferences over it took place between him and the premier, if not between him and the Minister of Justice and the Secretary of State as well ; and that it was made satisfactory to His Eminence before it was submitted to parliament or the country. Is that interference by the church with the state ? Certainly it is.

It is as plain as anything can be, and it has not been denied. Attention has been drawn to it several times, but neither the First Minister nor the Minister of Justice have dared to get up in this House and deny it. Therefore we assume that it is an admitted fact because there is no denial, and if there was any ground for denial there is no doubt the denial would be given. It is afterwards asserted and not denied, either, that the minister in the cabinet representing Manitoba and the Northwest objected to a certain provision in the Bill—the clauses relating to education—and he struck, he left the cabinet, and carried his followers from the west with him. It was shown that there was trouble ahead, and there was a proposal to amend one or two clauses in that Bill. Several conferences took place with the western members on the one side and the premier, and with whom on the other ? With the Papal ablegate, to see if they could make some arrangement that would suit the Papal ablegate, and at the same time suit the member for Brandon and his followers in the west. Several times we were told that they had reached a conclusion satisfactory to both parties, but the next day the negotiations were off again. So we were kept in suspense day after day for nearly two weeks, until finally they reached a conclusion and it was announced to the House. But the conclusion was not announced to the House until after it was finally submitted to the Papal ablegate and was found to be satisfactory to him. Therefore, I again ask the question : Is the church through its representative interfering with the state, is it or is it not ? Is the church interfering with the duties of the state, with the policy of the state, with the functions of the state ? I say it is, and this is the question that is interesting the Canadian people to-day, and this is the question which will be fought out in the future. The Prime Minister says : We are prepared to accept the challenge and we will fight it out. I tell him that it will be fought out. Well, when the Bill was first presented, some of the western members objected to some of the provisions, but when amendments were made that were satisfactory to the ablegate and satisfactory to the members of the west, they were announced to the House, then and not till then. Now, who is responsible more than anybody else for these educational clauses ? The Papal ablegate. I do not blame him, not at all ; he is trying to do what he believes to be a good work. But the government of this country have abnegated their functions, and have given them over to the church, they have given them over to the representative of the church, and they have got him to do what they could not do themselves. They saw that the Papal delegate possessed the element of statesmanship and desired to avail themselves of his diplomatic powers and his great foresight and statesmanship to help them out of what would otherwise have been a very difficult position, and he has succeeded in helping them out of it so far. But these were matters of state policy about which the church should have no concern, and over which it should have no control. The church had no right to be consulted with regard to it.

Now then we come to the question of the extension of Manitoba's boundaries. A conference was held with the government, they hear representatives, and say that an answer will be given in a few days. The First Minister, in dealing yesterday with the statement of the Hon. Robert Rogers, said :

> So far as the action of the government is concernend in this matter I wish to give the statement a direct, an absolute and a categorical denial.

'A direct, an absolute and a categorical denial.' It is said that the whole is made up of its parts. First he denies it in its parts, and then he denies it in toto. Well, after all this is done does the denial hold good ? He admits a conference took place afterwards, therefore that part of the categorical denial falls to the ground, because Mr. Rogers states that a conference was held with the government, and that they heard the representations of Manitoba. Mr. Ro-

gers says that the premier told him that an answer would be given in a few days. Well, the premier says, I have no remembrance of making such a statement, it is possible I may have done it, but I have a good memory and I have no remembrance of it. In the meantime an invitation comes from the Papal ablegate to one of the delegates, and they visit the Papal ablegate. What takes place there ? Now then what does the Papal ablegate say ? He admits that he invited them to come and see him :

Taking occasion of the presence in Ottawa of the Hon. Mr. Campbell, the attorney general of Manitoba, whom I had met in a friendly way more than a year ago, I invited him to come and see me.

Yet everything was denied so far as the premier knew or could tell.

I never met Hon. Mr. Rogers nor did I have any communication with him.

Now the Minister of Agriculture expressed himself strongly of the opinion that the whole thing was unreliable, because it was proven that Mr. Rogers was not there, while Mr. Rogers spoke of the delegation which came down in the plural number as if there were two. Well, I suppose that a member of the government referring to what the government did, if he said : We did so and so, would not necessarily mean that he was individually present. I presume that any conference that took place between the ablegate and any member of the delegation, represented a conference between the ablegate and the delegation. And that is what Mr. Rogers says, he did not say he visited the ablegate. The ablegate admitted that he invited Mr. Campbell, and Mr. Campbell came.

I asked him if something could not be done to improve the condition of the Catholics of his province with respect to education.

That is an admission that there was a conference, and an admission as well, what he was there for.

I pointed out that in the cities of Winnipeg and Brandon, for instance, the Catholics were paying double taxes. I urged my request on the ground of fairness and justice, and, referring to his mission to Ottawa,——

And what was his mission ? To extend the boundaries of Manitoba.

——I remarked that from the point of view of the Manitoba government, some action on these lines would be politically expedient——

'Politically expedient.' Why ? Because he was dealing with politicians, and he was pointing out how they would be likely to accomplish their end.

——and tend to facilitate the accomplishment of his object, inasmuch as Catholics in any territory which might be annexed to Manitoba would naturally object to losing the right they had to separate schools and to be subjected to the educational conditions which existed in Manitoba.

It would be 'politically expedient,' and would help them to accomplish the mission on which they came here. Was not that diplomacy and an interference with the rights of the state ? Was not that an admission that Hon. Robert Rogers' statement was correct ? And if Mr. Rogers came to the conclusion that the ablegate was an intermediary between the government and the delegate, was not there sufficient circumstantial evidence to justify him in reaching that conclusion ? In my judgment there was. Lawyers often depend on circumstantial evidence to establish a case. Even in the matter of life or death, the lawyer will tell the jury that circumstantial evidence is often much stronger and more reliable than direct evidence. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), an eminent lawyer, I have no doubt has advanced that plea over and over again. Applying it to the hon. gentleman himself and his government, is there any circumstancial evidence here to justify the conclusion that Hon. Robert Rogers, when he assumed that the Papal delegate was speaking for the government, and that the Minister of Justice was in it and the Prime Minister was in it ? Certainly there was. He goes on to say.

Mr. Campbell then asked me what would be my desire in this respect, I then gave him the memorandum which has already appeared in the press.

This, he says, is the sum and substance of the interview. Now, what was the memorandum he gave ? It was two carefully drawn clauses handed by the Papal delegate to Hon. Colin Campbell to enable him to facilitate the object he had in view—the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba. He proposed to this end the alteration of the statute of Manitoba relating to education, by adding to section 125 two subsections. One was as follows :—

(b) And when in any city or town there shall be thirty or more Roman Catholic children and also thirty or more non-Roman Catholic children, or in any village more than fifteen of each of such classes, the trustees shall, if requested by a petition of parents or guardians of such number of such classes, provide separate accommodation for each of such classes and employ for them respectively Roman Catholic and non-Roman Catholic teachers.

That was one of the amendments. The other was to provide for exactly the same in the country—two carefully drawn, well-worded subsections to put in a statute. And what conclusion did the Manitoba delegates reach with regard to the matter ? I say the only conclusion they could come to was that these clauses were drawn up by the government here. And I think that they honestly believed that they were drawn up by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Does that hon. gentleman deny that he had anything to do with the drawing up of these subsections ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is scarcely worth denying.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not a denial.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I will say this, Mr. Speaker, out of courtesy to my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule), for whom I have a certain regard—there are gentlemen, of course, for whom I would not reply—I never saw those clauses till they were published——

Mr. SPROULE. And never knew anything about them ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Never knew anything about them, directly or indirectly, nor of the interview, until yesterday.

Mr. SPROULE. Now, the Minister of Justice has made a statement which I accept with pleasure, as I always do any statement he makes in this House. I only gave him the opportunity, in view of the statement made in the press over and over again concerning him. Very frequently, when a direct stetement is made concerning any important politician, that politician takes the earliest moment to deny it. I only gave the hon. minister that opportunity——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) will bear witness that I am not very lavish with my denials. I do not, as a rule, pay much attention to statements of that sort.

Mr. SPROULE. I speak only of the general practise among politicians. As the Minister of Justice has denied it, I have nothing more to say. But was it not natural that the delegate from Manitoba should come to the conclusion that the government's hand was behind it ? Was it the fine Italian hand alone that accounted for it ? How did he know our statutes so as to be able to draw clauses that would dove-tail into them and accomplish what was wanted in Manitoba ? Was there not some power behind him that prepared these subsections for him ? There must have been. And certainly it would not have been any one in the Manitoba government, for they did not accept it. Now, it is admitted and not denied that the Papal ablegate took an important part in preparing these Autonomy Bills to establish the two new provinces, in drawing up their educational clauses. It is admitted that conferences took place, that he was satisfied and accepted them. Now, if separate schools are fastened on half a continent there, who has done it ? The government through the representative of the church. He helped them to do it. And if he was successful in establishing them over 500,000 square miles of territory, is it any wonder that he attempted to go farther and fasten them on Manitoba as well ?

When he had succeeded so well with the government of the day with his diplomacy and with the craft which belongs to men of his position in getting the state to accept that, is it any wonder that he tried to go a little farther and attempted to add to his name something else that would embellish him in the history of fame if he could only compel Manitoba to give these separate schools. Why it is the most natural thing in the world. He had the same men to deal with, he had been successful with them once and he hoped to be successful with them again. He ventured a little farther and he entered into communication with the delegates of Manitoba who came down here in a case of emergency in their strong desire to have justice done to their province, and he takes advantage of their necessity and of their dire necessity to play the game a little further. He endeavoured to secure from them the establishment of separate schools in Manitoba. Is this not another case of church interference with the rights of the state ? That was a state matter, that was a government policy and a function of the state and this was an interference with it. It is not denied, it is practically accepted by the present government and yet the First Minister says we will fight it out along these lines to the end. I will tell him to keep on with that fight and to congratulate himself on the result when he comes to the end of it. It is claimed and not denied that this proposal in the Bill was submitted and it was carried through. There is no doubt on that subject. Now, we combine the statement of the Papal ablegate and the Dominion government with regard to the statement of the Hon. Robert Rogers. Three of the five specific items mentioned by Rogers which are known to the government are admitted to be correct. As to the fourth one a lapse of memory is pleaded ; the First Minister says : I have no remembrance of it and I think I would remember it if it was so—but he does not say it was not so. On the fifth one the government denies that they had any knowledge of what took place when the Manitoba delegates were with the Papal ablegate. Rogers never said they knew what took place but he assumed they did in consequence of the circumstances that surrounded it, and I say he was justified in that conclusion. Then we take the Papal ablegate's admission that he invited them ; as Rogers said an invitation came. When did it come ? Mr. Rogers says March 20, the Papal ablegate says : I think I met them on the 23rd or the 24th before they left for home. The invitation seems to have been on the 20th of March. When was the Bill to be introduced in the House to give separate schools to the two new provinces ? On the 21st of the month. When was the first disclosure to be given to the people whether or not their boundaries were to be extended ? On the 21st. Is it not natural to reach the conclusion that that

invitation which went on the 20th of the month was in order to have the benefit of that conference before the information was given in this House and in order that the First Minister could take advantage of it. Was it not likely ? It seems the most likely thing in the world. That conference was held, the Manitoba delegates did not accept the invitation and respond to it as desired, by agreeing to grant separate schools, and what was the result ? The next day when the announcement was made they were told through the Prime Minister's speech in the House that their boundaries could not be extended. No reason was assigned except that other provinces might be interested. Practically no reason whatever was assigned for it, but they have that simple information. Robert Rogers says they were to get information in a few days. Afterwards Mr. Rogers writes a letter asking whether the information was not forthcoming. The Prime Minister says he never received the letter but we have had evidence in this House that that letter was sent direct to the Prime Minister's own house. That was established by indisputable evidence. There was no doubt about that. Whether it ever went into the Prime Minister's hands I do not know, but it went to his house.

Mr. BELCOURT. He has denied that.

Mr. SPROULE. That it was sent to his house ?

Mr. BELCOURT. He denied that.

Mr. SPROULE. Allow me to say he did not.

Mr. BELCOURT. He did.

Mr. SPROULE. He says if it ever came to his house it was not put into his hands.

Mr. BELCOURT. Well.

Mr. SPROULE. That is all he says and we have the evidence of the party that carried it. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) is a lawyer and is too previous and ought to be correct in his facts before he starts to contradict.

Mr. BELCOURT. My hon. friend——

Mr. SPROULE. I am dealing with the statement of the First Minister, a more important man. Allow me to finish with him. I say that the First Minister said : That letter may have reached my house, but it never came into my hands.

Mr. BELCOURT. That is a different statement.

Mr. SPROULE. That is an admission of another plain fact ; there is no doubt of it whatever. The statements are admitted as facts and are established by irrefutable evidence in my judgment.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. CALDWELL. Might I ask a question of the hon. gentleman ? May I ask him if he is sure that that letter which he is saying was delivered was the letter which he meant ?

Mr. SPROULE. The letter was handed to a messenger brought into the room for that purpose by the member who was charged with it. His word should be worth something in this House. That messenger gives his word that he delivered the letter. Is he making out that that messenger was a liar or the member ? Which ?

Mr. CALDWELL. You do not understand my question.

Mr. SPROULE. I have answered the question.

Mr. CALDWELL. I am asking a question, are you sure that the letter delivered was the one that you referred to ?

Mr. SPROULE. Did the messenger get any other letter ? Is he aware of any other letter which he got ? The messenger says he delivered it. The letter was handed to him by a member of parliament who says that this letter was the one written by Robert Rogers. Is that direct enough ? I might very properly ask whether the minister got a letter at all that day ; I might ask a dozen questions from some messenger, I am taking the evidence that has been submitted to this House, but that I think, is reliable and should be accepted. Part of it is the evidence of an hon. minister of the Crown, part of it is that of an hon. member of parliament and the other portion of it is furnished by a messenger whom we believe to be telling the truth and by the record of the book which shows that the message was taken. What was the subject discussed ? The extension of the boundaries of Manitoba ; the school question. The Papal delegate admits that the suggestion was made that it will facilitate business if you will make these two amendments to the school law. That is what Mr. Rogers says ; that is what the Papal ablegate admits. And then the ablegate admits that the proposed clauses of the Act read substantially as he gave them. Put the story all together and what is it ? It exactly confirms the statement made in the main by the Hon. Mr. Rogers. Now, the Papal ablegate has a connection with the Autonomy Bill, he has a conference and his success in fastening separate schools upon two provinces naturally create a desire to go a little further and see if he could not extend that system to Manitoba. That is the most reasonable thing in the world. Why would he not do it ? He ventured to do it. What does this mean if it does not mean that there is interference with the duties of the state by somebody? Who is that somebody ? The representatives of

a certain church. Who brought that somebody ? The present government. Who are charged with discharging the functions of the government or the functions of the state to-day ? The present government. Who have given over a portion of those functions to the Papal ablegate ? The present government. Who is responsible then for that improper interference of his ? I say it is the present government and that they and they alone, will be held responsible for it. There is no donbt about it whatever. I ask: Is it to be continued ? Will it be stopped right here ? The people of Canada say it must be stopped and it will be stopped.

Some hon MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, hon. gentlemen may laugh in derision. The weakling is to the fore again. Sometimes it is said that loud laughter speaks the vacant mind. But there is a stronger voice than that of the weakling and the electors of Canada will speak with no uncertain sound in the future. The members of the government as well as the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) will be obliged to obey their mandate when it is given. In view of all this is it any wonder that there is excitement, that there is a strong feeling created and that there is anxiety in the country to-day ? If there is excitement, anxiety, and noise, who is responsible for the whole of it ? —The present government who introduced this subject and who brought this man here under false pretenses. There is no doubt about it whatever. The premier says we will fight this to the bitter end. Yes, we will fight it. He has given the challenge and I want to tell him in the name of the people of Canada that that challenge has been accepted. The same challenge was thrown down by the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) some nights ago when he said that this fight will never cease until we accomplish the end which we have in view. We accept that challenge and this fight is going on. I say that there shall be no cessation of it until we show that church that this is not one of the rights which belong to a church, but that it is a right belonging to the state, and if this government will not do their duty they must get out of office because the people will hold them to account. They themselves began it. They gave the challenge and they will be met on every platform in this broad Dominion of Canada. This discussion is going on. We have the inalienable right of free speech in this country as in every British country in every part of the world. I say that we will transfer this discussion from this tribunal to the high tribunal of the nation, we will let that tribunal speak and when the voice of the nation has been heard we will be vindicated in what we are doing to-day, because we are fighting the fight of constitutional government. We are fighting against the interference of the church with the state, we are fighting along the lines of the British constitution and in doing so we believe that we are doing what would be regarded as our duty not only as politicians but as statesmen in any part of the British empire.

Hon. Wm. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). Mr. Speaker, having already spoken upon the second reading of the Bill I did not intend to say anything more, one speech only being allowed while the Speaker is in the chair, until the Bill is in committee. Nor, would I have spoken to-night, when another motion made by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) affords an opportunity for speaking, except for the reason that I think it is now time that there should perhaps be more speaking from this side of the House. I have abstained from endeavouring to waste the time of the House—I do not want to use that expression in an improper way—taking up the time of the House—further than is necessary in order to intelligently discuss questions coming before us. To-day we are not engaged in discussing the question that is properly before us. We are not discussing a question of principle. We have been moved to adjourn the House to afford the hon. leader of the opposition an opportunity of supplementing the remarks he made yesterday in reference to the statement that was made by a brother Tory of his through the medium of the newspapers. He did not say—and I do not blame him for it—all that he perhaps should have said to the House yesterday and he took this opportunity of returning to it again. The opportunity has been taken advantage of by other hon. gentlemen opposite and the object, as I conceive it, that these hon. gentlemen have is not to discuss whether church and state are being united in the Bill before this House or whether the principle of provincial rights is involved ; the one object it seems to me, not judging uncharitably, of that letter, that manifesto—call it what you will—of Mr. Rogers, the speeches of the hon. leader of the opposition and the bringing it up in the House the second time, the speech of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) were not to establish a principle or to declare that church and state shall not be united, but the object is that these men want to inflame the passions of the people of this country. There is no other object. A high object that is for gentlemen sitting in the parliament of Canada ! Upon what statement has this been brought up—a statement by Mr. Rogers. Who is he? The bosom friend of hon. gentlemen opposite, is he not ? Why did he write that letter on the 23rd ? What did the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) tell us—it was written and he rang the bell from room No. 6 and it was sent. What was he doing in No. 6 ?

An hon. MEMBER. What is No. 6 ?

Mr. PATERSON. No. 6 is the old room that we were in for 18 years and that the opposition are in now. When we were in opposition and when we occupied that room our leader used to visit us sometimes there. Did the hon. leader of the opposition visit that room when Mr. Rogers was there ? Has he seen Mr. Rogers ? Has he talked with Mr. Rogers ? I ask the question and he does not deny it ; therefore, according to his argument, it is a confession.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I may tell my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson), if he is so inquisitive, that I was not in Ottawa at the time.

Mr. PATERSON. May I ask the hon. gentleman another question ? Was he away from Ottawa all the time these delegates were here ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, I was not.

Mr. PATERSON. Then he saw these gentlemen, I suppose ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I certainly saw Mr. Rogers.

Mr. PATERSON. Ah ha ! Oh yes ! That is very good.

We can get something out of this cross-questioning. Here is a letter posted from No. 6; we find the leader of the opposition in conversation with Mr. Rogers; we find Mr. Rogers' letter, and Mr. Rogers after a time tells us what is in this letter.

Mr. BARKER. Oh, no, you don't find the letter.

Mr. PATERSON. I am alluding to Mr. Rogers' manifesto, if you may call it that.

Mr. HENDERSON. Where did you find it ?

Mr. PATERSON. In the 'Citizen.' An interview took place, as is alleged, between the Papal ablegate and the Manitoba delegates, but, it now appears that it was only with Mr. Campbell. There is great indignation expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite because some one on this side of the House, as they suppose, had arranged for that interview in some way. If there was something so very wrong in that interview, as these gentlemen suppose—notwithstanding that any knowledge or any connection with it by any one on this side of the House is absolutely denied—what kind of characters are these gentlemen opposite who consort with the men who went there, and held that interview ? Mr. Rogers professes to tell us what transpired, and what the ablegate said. I submit it would be of still greater interest to know what these people said in reply to the ablegate. If the thing was so very bad and so very wrong on the part of the ablegate, if it was such an encroachment of the church on the state, if it was such an awful thing, how is it that these Manitoba ministers listened to it ? Why did he not rise and say : sir, you insult me ; the idea of trying to propose to this country what you have proposed; I will out of your house and never enter it again. But, Mr. Rogers, or Mr. Campbell, manifested no indignation, or at least the indignation was bottled up six weeks nearly before we heard anything about it. And yet these very gentlemen opposite are the men who talk about this government having something to do with the gentleman who occupies a high position in connection with one of the churches of the land. My hon. friend from East Grey does not think that the ablegate drew up these clauses himself, and the only one he could think of was the Minister of Justice, and when the Minister of Justice did not rise at once to contradict him—the Minister of Justice would be on his feet all the time if he tried to keep contradicting all the suspicions of the member for East Grey—the hon. gentleman took it for granted that the charge was proven, till the Minister of Justice thought it worth while to tell him that he was altogether mistaken. The member for East Grey wants to know who drew the clauses. I cannot tell. I believe the Colin Campbell he was interviewing is the Attorney General of Manitoba, and it seems to me that it would be a more natural conclusion to arrive at that Mr. Campbell wrote the clauses than that they were written by the Minister of Justice, who knew nothing about it at all. But talking about interviewing people and talking about rumours, with which the leader of the opposition and his friends deal so largely. When the leader of the opposition got the emphatic denial of the Prime Minister yesterday, the best thing left for him to say, as he thought, was : well, this thing has been rumoured and why didn't the Prime Minister deny it sooner ? That was a mighty poor refuge for the leader of the opposition to seek. But, I think there were some rumours a couple of years ago when the leader of the opposition and his band of trained followers made an excursion out west to try and capture the votes of the people. The member for East Grey was with the party, and rumour had it that when they got to Winnipeg the member for East Grey left the party. Might I ask if that is true ?

Mr. SPROULE. What has that to do with the question before the House ?

Mr. PATERSON. May I ask the member for East Grey if that is true ?

Mr. SPROULE. If the question did not come from a minister of the Crown I might deign to answer it, but it seems to me that the question is very far from the discussion.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, then, I shall have to fall back on the rumour. and the

rumour is that the member for East Grey left the party and got home before them. Will the leader of the opposition say why the member for East Grey left the party? Was it because there was a rumour that the leader of the opposition and some of his party went to wait on Archbishop Langevin?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I never heard any such rumour as that.

Mr. PATERSON. Do you know it to be a fact? What has the member for East Grey to say?

Mr. SPROULE. I say there is not a word of truth in it; that is what I say.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PATERSON. We have a denial now from the member for East Grey, but not from the leader of the opposition.

Mr. COCHRANE. That settles the school question.

Mr. PATERSON. If there is not a word of truth in it, then the member for East Grey did not come home before the rest of the party.

Mr. SPROULE. Three or four members of the party came home before the others.

Mr. PATERSON. If there is no truth at all in it, the member for East Grey did not arrive home earlier than the others.

Mr. SPROULE. If it is a matter of any importance for the hon. gentleman to know, I can tell him that business at home compelled me to come away before the others.

Mr. PATERSON. Then there is some truth in it.

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all.

Mr. PATERSON. There is no necessity for the member for East Grey explaining something that never happened.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Customs put a straight question and I answered it. His statement was, that owing to the visit of the leader of the opposition to Archbishop or Bishop, I forget his name, he said the member for East Grey left and came home. I say there is not a single word of truth in it.

Mr. PATERSON. Do you say it is not true that the leader of the opposition went to see the archbishop?

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Customs now says I left for home before the others, and that because of that there is some truth in his statement.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, I said you came home before the others.

Mr. SPROULE. That was not your statement at all; it was that I had left the party on account of the visit.

Mr. PATERSON. A little further explanation will be interesting. Did the leader of the opposition and some of his party wait on Archbishop Langevin on that occasion?

Mr. SPROULE. That reminds me of a story——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Answer the question.

Mr. SPROULE. Allow me to answer it——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Answer it, yes or no.

Mr. SPROULE. It reminds me of the story of two sharp 'Alicks' putting questions to each other, and one said: Why is it you never see any dirt around the mouth of a chipmunk's hole; the answer was: Because it commences to dig at the bottom; and the other asked: How did it get there?

Mr. PATERSON. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman thought he was a 'smart Alick' until the Minister of Justice gave him his answer. But the point remains: has the member for East Grey good reason to suspect that such a horrid thing happened as that the leader of the opposition when he was in the west on a political tour, visited Archbishop Langevin?

Mr. SPROULE. If he did visit the archbishop, I would not regard it as horrid.

Mr. PATERSON. Church and state! What an exhibition hon. gentlemen opposite are making of themselves in order to try to light the fires of sectarian bigotry and race and ill-feeling in this country. Here you get behind the scenes, and see the bosom companions of these men meeting in room No. 6 and posting their letters from there.

Mr. STAPLES. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the hon. minister has said during my absence. I was out for a moment or two, but I have been told since I came into the chamber that he spoke of me being implicated in some way in the construction of a letter. All I can say to the hon. gentleman and this House is that, so far as my having anything to do with the construction of a letter in room No. 6 is concerned, it is absolutely untrue, and I know nothing of it. What I stated yesterday in reference to the letter were the simple facts. I was asked by the Hon. Mr. Rogers to see that that letter was immediately transmitted to the First Minister of this Dominion, and the messenger was particularly told that Mr. Rogers wanted that letter delivered to the First Minister immediately, because he was leaving that evening for Toronto.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not charge the hon. gentleman with constructing the letter. I make no statement of that kind.

Mr. STAPLES. That letter was not written in No. 6.

Mr. PATERSON. If the hon. gentleman is ashamed of having anything to do with the letter, I have nothing to say. All I did was to quote what he said yesterday :

On the 23rd of February, the Hon. Mr. Rogers, after writing this letter, asked me to see that it got over to the Hon. the First Minister. I rang the bell from room no. 6, and there came a messenger named Julius Beaulieu, I gave the letter to him, and he said he would deliver it.

Mr. BARKER. There is more than that. You have not read it all.

Mr. PATERSON. I am referring to what took place in room No. 6. If the hon. gentleman wants to hear the rest, I will read it :

He says now there is no doubt but that he did deliver the letter. Surely we are living in a mysterious age, mysterious things are taking place every day, and this is one of them. I wish to call the right hon. gentleman's attention to another statement he made. He told us to-day that his memory is as fresh now as it was in his younger days.

Mr. BRODER. Dispense.

Mr. PATERSON. I would if a member less important than the hon. member for Hamilton had not asked me to read it.

He stated that the Hon. Colin Campbell was on the floor of the House on the 22nd day of February when these Bills were introduced, which is not the case. I may add regarding that letter that I have been down and consulted the records in the messengers department in this building, which show that this wonderful letter went from room No. 6, and that it was delivered to the messenger at about the time that the messenger states it was carrid to the right hon. gentleman's residence on that particular day, and they show that it went from that particular room.

Now, why did the hon. member for Hamilton desire to have the whole letter read ?

Mr. BARKER. Because, according to the statement made by the hon. gentleman as quoted in 'Hansard,' the messenger said that the letter was actually delivered on that day.

Mr. PATERSON. What is the object of the hon. gentleman, unless it be to insinuate that the word of the Prime Minister may not be taken ? Surely the hon. member for Hamilton ought not to take that position. The statement of the Prime Minister is before the House and the country.

Mr. BARKER. May I ask the hon. gentleman to let me explain why I asked him to read further ? I did so simply because he omitted to read the most material part of the statement.

Mr. PATERSON. The material part of the statement in my argument was that this gentleman was in No. 6. Whether the letter was delivered or not might, I think, be safely left between the Prime Minister, the member who is interrupting me and the messenger.

Mr. STAPLES. I ask the permission of the hon. gentleman to put a question to him.

Mr. PATERSON. Go on.

Mr. STAPLES. Have you made the statement to this House that that particular letter was written in room 6 ? Have you or have you not ?

Mr. PATERSON. What I did was to read what the hon. gentleman said. I was not there.

Mr. STAPLES. You will not answer ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman did state over and over again, as he knows, that that letter was written in No. 6.

Mr. PATERSON. Where was it written ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why did the hon. gentleman not state that when the question was put to him ?

Mr. PATERSON. I read what the hon. gentleman stated. If there is any doubt about it, where was the letter written ? Who wrote it ? The hon. gentleman said :

On the 23rd of February the Hon. Mr. Rogers after writing this letter, asked me to see that it got over to the hon. the First Minister. I rang the bell.

'After writing it'—as if the letter had been written right there ; and the hon. gentleman immediately rang the bell. If the hon. gentleman says the letter was not written there, I will, of course, accept his statement.

Mr. STAPLES. I say the letter was not written there.

Mr. PATERSON. Might I ask the hon. gentleman then to inform the country where it was written ?

Mr. STAPLES. All I know about it is what I stated, that Mr. Rogers came in with the letter and asked me to see that it was delivered to the right hon. the premier.

Mr. PATERSON. I will not ask the hon. gentleman if he knows what was in the letter.

Mr. STAPLES. I certainly know what was in the letter. It was read in the House yesterday. The only thing I do not know is where it went to.

Mr. PATERSON. The main point I made, by reading from the hon. gentleman's remarks in 'Hansard,' was that Mr. Rogers was in room 6. I suppose he will not deny that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. A very strong point.

Mr PATERSON. Yes, I think the inference is that way. The member for East Grey says that circumstantial evidence is very strong.

Mr. MACDONALD. That is where the letter was sent from, too.

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, yes, he says he rang the bell. Well, now, there has been a complete denial given by the First Minister as to his having any connection whatever with the interview that took place between these gentlemen. They should be more concerned to know what took place at that interview, what led up to it. Is there any truth in the rumours that were alluded to by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr Macdonald) that negotiations have been going on between the members of the Tory government of Manitoba and the clerical dignitaries of the church in that country. Is that true or is it not? Are we to take their test again and say that because these gentlemen don't deny it, therefore it is true? Are we to deal with them as they attempted to deal with the First Minister and the Minister of Justice with regard to any rumours they hear?—and dear knows there are enough of them going about through the Tory papers nowadays—that because they don't deny the rumours therefore they are true. Where is the denial that the Manitoba government have been negotiating with the dignitaries of the church? Is it true or is it not? Sir, I judge from what we see in the newspapers that they will come out and tell us what has taken place in these negotiations with regard to the improvement of the condition of the children of the minority in the province of Manitoba, or at least what the minority consider would be an improvement. I cannot say more than what I see in the papers. Perhaps these hon. gentlemen may be able to get an answer from Mr. Rogers, or from Mr. Roblin, or from Mr. Campbell to know what has been done in that direction. But I want to say emphatically that if it is the object of the hon. gentlemen opposite—and I do not see what other object they could have—to fan the flame of religious antagonism in this country, they are engaged in a work that is not creditable to any man who engages in it. I think the people will ask them whether the parliament of Canada is the proper place for members elected to represent all portions of this community to endeavour to excite one portion against another on matters that come very close to their hearts. Great love is professed by some of them for the Papal ablegate. Oh, how they admire him, how they respect him, and so on; then in another breath they call him a man who is conspiring against the liberties of the people. Take the 'World' of yesterday, the organ of my hon. friend opposite. Here I may say that if the leader of the opposition holds the Prime Minister responsible for what appears in 'Le Soliel' and other papers all right, if that is to be the line, we will hold him responsible for what appears in the organs of his party.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The journal in question had declared itself to be under his particular charge and direction and to be the organ of the Liberal party, and it was admitted.

Mr. HYMAN The 'Journal' said that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am speaking of the 'Soleil.' I read an extract from the editorial utterance of the 'Soleil' of the 11th of February, and I also pointed out that, as we understood, the control of that paper was vested in a very important member of the present administration, the Minister of Justice.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, I heard what the hon. gentleman said; and I leave it to your judgment, Mr. Speaker, and to the members of the House, whether that connects the Prime Minister with the 'Soleil' as closely as the Toronto 'World' is connected with the hon gentleman who leads the opposition. The editor of the 'World' is his supporter, to judge by his utterance, he is his right-hand man—if you leave the member for North Toronto out—in this House, and he will not deny it. He is not the one who was anxious to have the hon. gentleman to come to Carleton with the hope of getting a seat in the House, when unfortunately he was defeated in his own province; he is the man who rises and speaks for the party, the bosom friend of the leader of the opposition. Surely, surely, the paper of that hon. gentleman may be taken as indicating the views of the leader of the opposition, according to the reasoning of the leader of the opposition with regard to the 'Soleil.' What is one of the leading editorials in that paper to-day? Speaking of Monseigneur Sabatti—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. I am glad to be corrected, because it would be too bad to make a mistake with reference to his name, lest the wrong person should be summoned. But the organ of my hon. friend, known to be his organ because it is edited by one of his chief lieutenants, wants this reverend gentleman to be brought to the bar of the House. That is what they want to do with him. Now, then, I want to ask the leader of the opposition, does he propose—if we are to hold him responsible, according to his own reasoning, for what appears in the Toronto 'World'—does he propose to bring —I had better say the Papal ablegate—before the bar of the House? Is that the policy of the leader of the opposition and his party with reference to this matter?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the hon. gentleman's policy?

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman does not deny it. Are we then bound to assume, by his silence in answering my question, that they propose to bring that gentleman to the bar of the House? If that is a part of their policy, they had better bring Mr. Rogers too, because he has said a great many things in his manifesto which are very difficult to reconcile or to understand; and if there is to be any examination at the bar of the House as to what has transpired, it would be very nice to put some questions to Mr. Rogers. It would be very nice to ask him, in the first place, how he came to write that manifesto which anybody reading it would suppose to mean that he himself was the one who had the interview with the Papal ablegate. He speaks in the plural, the hon. gentleman says, and he was one of the deputation. And in the document also he speaks in the singular—he says 'I' rather a mixed document. Like to know where the singular ceases and the plural commences. Like to know why he thought it necessary to write such a document. His indignation, it would seem, was aroused against this Papal delegate for daring to suggest such a thing to him, but he had no opportunity, apparently, to express his indignation for six long weeks. And at last, when he had time to express his indignation, he carefully dug out from 'Hansard,' or somewhere else, correspondence that had taken place between certain parties years ago, when some members of this House professing the Roman Catholic faith had communication with the head of their church in reference to matters in which there was feeling in the province of Quebec in which these gentlemen resided. And these things are dragged in here. What for? Why to work upon the feelings and passions of those whom hon. gentlemen opposite hope to influence. But let me tell these hon. gentlemen one thing which, if they go on, I am sure they will find out for themselves. My province, which is also the province of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), the province that I am proud to call my own, will not be led away by such unworthy cries as these.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to read the hon. gentleman a letter from a respectable constituent.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) might read me letters. And am I uncharitable in saying that the object of the hon. gentleman in bringing up subjects like these, taking up the time of the House and delaying the business of the country, is to keep alive the feeling that has been created? But that is the very reason why these hon. gentlemen must have their answer every time they bring these matters up. We must know whether their object is to uphold the grand principles of provincial rights and separation of church and state, or whether it is that the Tory party may be restored to power by creating dissention among the people.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman Mr. Paterson) whether, when he occupied hours of the time of this House in denouncing the Manitoba school law he was raising a race and religious cry?

Mr. PATERSON. Certainly not. The Liberal party does not do that. Certainly not. And we are challenged and told that if we go to the country we shall be defeated. Does the hon. gentleman know that all these events the correspondence concerning which has been dug up by Mr. Rogers occurred before the election of 1900, when the country sent the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) back to carry on public affairs? Is he aware that this matter was before the country, and all the documents in 'Hansard,' before 1904 when an appeal was made to the country, and when the Liberal party was again returned to power by a sweeping majority? There is only one object in this that I can see, and that is the vain hope that, now that there is some feeling—and I am bound to confess a good deal of feeling—in the country owing to the press, not alone the 'Toronto World,' but papers from whom better might have been expected——

An hon. MEMBER. What about the 'Globe'?

Mr PATERSON. If the 'Globe' differs with the government in reference to the Autonomy Bill as they understand it, hon. gentlemen opposite can get an idea of the 'Globe's' opinion of Mr. Rogers if they read the editorial of to-day's issue. I have not the paper with me, but I think the Tories will find that the portrait of the man they have tried to magnify is not a flattering one as presented by the 'Globe.' I must not detain the House longer, having spoken at greater length than I had intended. But I make no apology. I have no desire to prolong the debate, and I want the business of the House to go on. For that reason, I have remained silent sometimes when I would have liked to speak. And so have other members on this side. But, if this is to be made the arena in which the battle of political parties are to be fought out on the basis of attempts on the part of Liberal-Conservatives, to arouse the passions and feelings of the country, I am prepared to take my part by speaking here when it becomes necessary. And the same is true of other hon. gentlemen on this side. Hon. gentlemen opposite will not deny the 'Hamilton Spectator' as one of their organs. The hon member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) dare not deny it. And what does the 'Hamilton Spectator' say. Here it is—black line at the top, and the heading 'Never again.' The article says:—

The attempt made by Sir Wilfrid Laurier to force separate schools on the new provinces

of the west will settle one thing. Never again will a French Canadian be entrusted with the premiership of Canada; never again will a French Canadian have the opportunity to betray the people of this country. Canada cannot afford to take chances again.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have had read 'Le Soleil' and other Liberal papers, and sought to hold the government responsible for their utterances. The Prime Minister has given his answer. But here is the organ of the Tory party in the city of Hamilton, where dwells the chief organizer, as I understand it—Mr. Barker—and I ask the leader of the opposition: Is that the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party under him? Well, Sir, if it be, all I can say is that it is unworthy of any party or any paper to take such a position as that which he has taken. Sir, what is implied in it, and what is in it? That two-fifths of the people of this country can never expect to have one of their number, no matter how gifted, no matter how pre-eminent his abilities may be, to fill the first position in this land; he cannot have that position because he is a French Canadian. That is something which I think the people of my province will not endorse. That is something which the people of this country will not endorse, and I hope to hear a repudiation of that from hon. gentlemen opposite, for it will be better for them to denounce such sentiments as that. Sir, all I want to say in conclusion is this: The attempt is made by the party opposite, in order to secure power, and it is made through their press, to attack the leader of this government, knowing the strong man that he is, and believing that if they can strike him down, they might then hope to attain office, and to this end you will find such articles as I have read to you and such expressions in this House. These attacks are made in order that he may be struck and that, by striking him and by possibly weakening his power, they will weaken the party which he leads. They tell us they have succeeded to such an extent that, as one hon. gentleman told us, only two counties in Ontario would return Liberal supporters of the Liberal government—the county of Prescott and the county of Russell. They ask us: Why don't you open London? Why don't you open other constituencies?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. London is not vacant. They say we dare not open a county. I would ask them: Do they suppose that if Centre Toronto, or London, or any other single constituency in this country, was opened and was carried by them, that that would mean the inevitable return of the Conservative party to power? Sir, if it was to be decided by the verdict of a single constituency and on one question, I would say that the better place to open a consistuency would be in the Northwest Territories, where they say these people are going to be bound and shackled.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. I am glad to hear that they approve of that; I thought they could not do otherwise. If there happened to be an election there that would be a better test in reference to this question than any constituency you might open in another province. They tell us there is a departure from principle in this Bill. They say that the relations of church and state are embodied in this Bill. I would like to know how? Are these separate schools, as they are termed in the Bill, in the Northwest separate schools for Catholics alone? No; hon. gentlemen know that they are minority schools for Protestants as well as Catholics. Do you say the provinces do not want them? Then why have they kept them, as I am told they have? As was pointed out by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Scott), while there may be a minority of the Catholic faith in the Territories, taking them as a whole, there are several localities where the Protestants are in the minority, and if in some of these they desire to have their minority schools, they are, under the law which it is proposed to continue, the law of the Territories, enacted by the legislature representing these people, enabled to have their schools and to have their religious instruction of a Protestant character and according to the Protestant faith. Where is the connection between church and state? Provincial rights! Members talk about provincial rights who have not been noted for standing up for them in the past. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), who made that inflammatory speech this afternoon—and he has admitted by the reference which he made at the close that it was an inflammatory speech—gives us to understand that he is on that platform, admits that he hopes he may be able to climb into power, not, as he professed some years ago, by being in favour of securing liberty and rights to the minorities, but by being in favour of taking them away from whom? As far as he is concerned, by taking out the clauses in the Bill that now gives liberty to the minority. He told us on a previous occasion that for three successive elections this question had been fought and the Liberal party sustained, and, therefore, as long as grass grew and waters ran, he did not feel disposed to go against that will as thus three times expressed upon that question. Sir, a principle, if it is right, is right all the time. If minority rights were sacred in his eyes, as he said they were in 1896, minority rights ought to be sacred to him now, no matter how the election went. Sir, I am not going into the question; I have spoken once, and I do not want to again take the opportunity of doing so. I am replying to what hon. gentlemen opposite have said in their speeches. All I have to

say is that they may strike at the Prime Minister, their papers may endeavour to inflame the people, as in that article which I have just read—and they confess that it is having its effect on the country, and that some friends of the Liberal party are not in accord with their friends on this Bill, and that may be true, and I shall regret if it continues so—but I want to say that, so far as I know, the Liberal parliamentary party, which ought to know as much about the nature of this Bill as any one, a party who, I believe, are as honest and conscientious as their fellow-men, are not divided, are not disunited on this Bill. And, Sir, when the time comes that this question has to be discussed before the people, as it will come, then it will be discussed in all its bearings, and whatever the verdict may be, the government, and the members who have confidence in the government, will accept the verdict that may be rendered by the people. Prophesies as to what will occur are of no value. We had prophesies before the last election, great prophesies which utterly failed. All I have to say is that I believe the Liberal party stand to-day where they have ever stood. They stood on the principle of ruling this country in such a way as to give equal rights, liberties and privileges to all classes and creeds, and we are here to-day. There has been no departure. There was an attempt made by the Conservative party in 1896 to have this parliament enact a law which would override a law passed by a province which had the power to pass that law. They say that the right hon. gentleman who leads the government threw himself across the path and prevented it. Yes, because he said that the only way to accomplish that was to accomplish it through the action of the local government which had the power under the constitution, as had been declared by the highest court in the empire. But, Sir, is that the case of the Territories ? Is that the case of this Bill ? Are we seeking to override the law of the Territories, making them take something they do not want? We are simply continuing what the government and the legislature of the Territories enacted as their school law, and which their premier says, if he were a dictator to-morrow, he would not rescind or abrogate. Sir, where is the principle of provincial rights in this? Yes, the attempt was made to have the country believe that the right hon. Prime Minister has gone back on the principles he professed and that he is no longer worthy of the confidence of the people. Well, I say we have confidence in him. They speak about what he did in 1896. They unearthed the documents and read them to-day. What has been the condition of this country since 1896 under, as their papers will say, a French Canadian Prime Minister, or as they put it sometimes, a French Prime Minister? What has been the condition of this country ?

What was it before 1896?—stagnation, no increase of population, an empty Northwest, as Mr. Blake said at one time, trade almost paralyzed, hope in many breasts gone, divisions among the people like what I am afraid their efforts tending in that direction may produce again. And yes, there were divisions in the government as well and this was the result of it. Yet we find a member of that government standing up to-day and making the speech that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) made, speaking in reference to this matter, belittling this government, or the members of this government, although he was a member of that government during the years of this stagnation and decay. What is the condition of the country to-day under Sir Wilfrid Laurier, French Canadian Premier though he is? We do not put it in that way; French by extraction, French in his ancestry. His ancestors were French and he is proud of it, yours may have been English and you are proud of it, yours may have been Irish and you are proud of it, mine were Scotch and I am proud of it. Still we are Canadians one and all, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier is Canada's Prime Minister. I say to the hon. gentleman opposite and to those whom my words may reach outside of this House who have given us their confidence in the times past that there is no one who will say that Sir Wilfrid Laurier by any unworthy motive can be swerved from what he believes to be the line of duty. Not only do I want to tell these people but I want to tell you younger members of the House who have come in here that I was here when the Liberal party lost the services of Edward Blake. It became a question who was to lead us. We were in opposition and a small minority too. There was one man amongst us who stood preeminent above all others, known and admitted, and of course the choice fell on him. He was asked to accept. He hesitated; no, he refused at first. Pressure was brought to bear upon him. I remember his reply: No, I am one of the minority in race and one of the minority in faith; I think that the party would do better to elect one of the majority. The reply of the Liberal parliamentary party was this: The Liberal parliamentary party do not ask a man what his race or ancestry have been. They do not ask at what altar he kneels. If they know him to have the qualities and the character that mark him out above all others for the position that is the man they want. Reluctantly he accepted it. For years he led us in opposition. Eight years in power under his leadership, eight years of unexampled prosperity under his reign; eight years of national peace.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not wonder that some hon. gentlemen opposite laugh. These

are laughing times, peaceful times, times of plenty and prosperity and due largely to the right hon. gentleman who leads the government to-day. We do not object to our Conservative friends rejoicing with us in the prosperity of the country. We wish to do them well, and, Sir, we believe that by keeping the Prime Minister in power under his happy influences, supported by the men who are around him, who have full confidence in him, there are in store years of progress and prosperity greater even than we have attained in the past, and, Sir, in this young country we must above all things be a united people, be Canadians one and all with equal rights and privileges.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I thought that this House had for the last two or three weeks and especially for the last two or three days been discussing a most serious question, a question that is recognized in this country, that is recognized by every hon. gentleman who has spoken on the other side of the House, except the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), as the most serious question we have had before this House in many and many a session of parliament. I suppose the strain of it has been too great, and therefore is has been arranged that we should have, for our relief, an exhibition of nigger minstrelsy and that a member of the government should be set up to do the Bardell and Pickwick sergeant Buzfuz act. He has done it admirably. He has done it to the entertainment of the hon. gentlemen who sit in front of him and behind him, but he has not done it to the edification of the country, nor has he answered the charges that are made against the government.

The question before the House to-day is not the prosperity of the country; the question before the House to-day is not concerning old matters and old controversies between old members on this side and old members on that side of the House. The question before the country to-day is: shall we be governed by our own people or shall we be governed by a delegate representing a foreign authority ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBER. Shame.

Mr. OSLER. Now, let us look at it squarely and fairly in the face——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes, look at it fairly.

Mr. OSLER. Let us look at it fairly and let us face it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Face it honestly.

Mr. OSLER. Yes, honestly. When this Bill was first brought into this House, it was admitted that the man who ought to have been consulted, the Premier of the Northwest Territories, had not been consulted——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. OSLER. Was not consulted on this clause.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. OSLER. It has been admitted that the other member of the Northwest Territories cabinet of the same faith as the Prime Minister——

Mr. BELCOURT. What has that got to do with it ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is a great crime to be of that faith.

Mr. OSLER. I do not make that charge against any one at all——

Mr. BELCOURT. Oh, no.

Mr. OSLER. I am only showing the unfortunate position that the Prime Minister has put himself and the country in——

Mr. SCOTT. May I ask my hon. friend to whom he refers——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. OSLER. It has been charged here to-day——

Mr. SCOTT. May I put a question to my hon. friend ? To whom in the Haultain cabinet does he refer, as being of the same faith as the Prime Minister ?

Mr. OSLER. It has been charged here to-day——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Answer the question.

Mr. OSLER. It has been charged here to-day, and it has not been denied, that the Prime Minister, although he did not consult the premier of the Territories, was in constant consultation with the Papal ablegate in the framing of these educational clauses. I will give the Prime Minister an opportunity to deny that now, and if he denies it I shall withdraw all I am going to say ; I will not proceed farther.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. OSLER. That is the charge that is made. When the storm arose after this Bill was brought in, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice, the next time they spoke, both said that the intention of that clause was simply to let things in the Northwest remain as they are to-day. Is that true ? If that be true, it took a whole month after the first Bill was introduced to get somebody to agree to the modification as we have it now. If the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice, and all the other members of the cabinet understood, or rather meant, that one thing should be embodied in that clause but found that another thing quite different was really in the clause

as drawn—and that has been admitted by the Prime Minister and the members of his government—if that had been so, why should not that connection have been made within twenty-four hours ? Why did it take a whole month of bickerings, of wranglings, of strife, which necessitated the resignation of one minister ; the most important minister in connection with this Bill. It took a whole month of tribulation in the ranks of the government before any change was made. The Prime Minister said that he did not understand that clause to mean what it did mean, the Minister of Justice said that he did not understand that clause to mean what it did mean.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, I did not.

Mr. OSLER. Did not the Minister of Justice say that ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, I did not.

Mr. OSLER. I beg the minister's pardon ; he said he did not understand it to mean what it did—what it was supposed to mean.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Let him go on.

Mr. OSLER. It took a month to have that clause changed. It was not in the Prime Minister's power, apparently, to change it to suit his own views within that time. There was a power outside the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice who had to be consulted before the concession was made that that clause should be changed.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Rubbish.

Mr. OSLER. It is the view the country takes of it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That's rubbish.

Mr. OSLER. It is the only view sensible men can take of it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is the view evil-disposed persons take of it.

Mr. OSLER. The colleague of the Postmaster General took the view I take, namely, that the meaning of the clause at first introduced, was so radically different from the clause now before us, that he resigned rather than accept it as first introduced, while he accepted it as now changed. The Prime Minister says that originally he intended the clause as it is in the Bill to-day. Was it not easy then, if he had the power to alter that clause to its present state, to do so without requiring the resignation of the Minister of the Interior ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is not the point.

Mr. OSLER. That is the point.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman has shifted his ground.

Mr. OSLER. I have not shifted my ground.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That hon. gentleman said a moment ago that the government were not allowed to make this change without the consent of some outside power.

Mr. OSLER. I say so still.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Then the hon. gentleman says what is absolutely without foundation. He has no authority for such a statement, and it is a malicious fabrication.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; take it back.

Mr. OSLER. Oh, no; let the Postmaster General's statement go on 'Hansard'; I know him.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Your statement is absolutely untrue.

Mr. OSLER. I know the Postmaster General, I know him. Then, if I am to accept the Postmaster General's statement, I say that the First Minister and the other ministers in needlessly delaying a month to make that change, committed a crime against this country that it will take generations to wipe out, for they have during that month aroused such a passion in this country——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) has.

Mr. OSLER. No, I deny it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. He and his party have.

Mr. OSLER. I deny it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. You tried to.

Mr. OSLER. I say that all that has tended to arouse passion in this country has come from that side of the House.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Nonsense.

Mr. BUREAU. What about the Hamilton 'Spectator' article.

Mr. OSLER. Like the other article read to-day from a French paper, there are injudicious articles on both sides, and no one appreciates that more than I do. There is no one more sorry than I am that this condition of affairs has arisen——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It seems to gratify you.

Mr. OSLER. I say that the country will hold the Prime Minister and the ministers responsible until they deny, and they have not denied it yet, that they are under the influence and have been influenced by outside parties in the framing of this Act. Canada can stand bad government, she can stand bad laws——

An hon. MEMBER. The Canadian Pacific Railway law, for instance.

Mr. OSLER. The Canadian Pacific Railway and anything that is bad about it. The people of Canada can stand anything, but they cannot stand——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Having the Tories in opposition; that is the worst crime Canada has committed yet.

Mr. OSLER. If the Postmaster General will cast his mind and his eye back to that pathetic appeal which the Minister of Finance made to persuade himself that he was in favour of this Bill, he will find that the Minister of Finance looked down at his venerable chief, and he pictured the disaster that would overtake the country if Sir Wilfrid Laurier were to resign. Great Heavens; there would not be another immigrant come to this country, we would be bankrupt, we would be a laughing stock. Well, if the Prime Minister resigned I think the country would be fairly resigned also. The Minister of Finance pictured what would happen if the Prime Minister would resign and the woeful disaster that would follow. I venture to say that consols would not fall one-eighth of a cent if the Prime Minister resigned. I venture to say that not one immigrant less would come into this country this year, and that the business of the country would go on and continue to be quite as prosperous as it is. The Prime Minister is being lauded as the man of conciliation. I say that in the manner in which he has introduced this Bill he has done more to cause racial and religious strife in this country than all his previous life of conciliation could counteract; and when his biography is written, instead of his epitaph being conciliation, as the Minister of Agriculture suggested, it will be the reverse. In this one act, be it as honest, as straight, as simple in intention as it is claimed to be, yet, from the fact that he consulted outsiders and ignored the men who ought to have been consulted, he has brought about a state of things in Canada the effects of which not one man in this House will live to see wiped out.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say one or two words with regard to the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Customs with reference to myself. In the first place, it does seem to be a very considerable lowering of the dignity of parliament for a minister of the Crown to stand up in this House and make such an extraordinary exhibition of himself as the Minister of Customs has made this evening. I hesitate to apply words to the conduct or the hon. gentleman, because I am afraid that I might transgress the rules of the parliamentary decorum.

Mr. PATERSON. Don't be afraid.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Oh, I am not afraid of the hon. gentleman. I have never observed anything very alarming about him, although he has a very loud voice. He is comparatively harmless. He is perhaps not as wise as the serpent, but after all he is as harmless as the dove. He has suggested as plainly as he could that I am in some way endeavouring to foment religious strife in this country——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentlemen on the other side say hear, hear. I want any one of those hon. gentlemen, when he comes to address this House to-night or on any future occasion, to point to one single word of mine during the progress of this debate which he can call in question in that regard. I am perfectly ready to be judged by my utterances; but I do not want general statements of that kind applauded by men who apparently do not know that of which they speak. I have never said any word in this House or in this country which would suggest that any man, on account of his race or religion, should not have the right to be Prime Minister of Canada. On the contrary, many times, in portions of this country where there was no man of the French race or who understood the French language, I have said, with regard to my right hon. friend who leads this House, that I saw no good reason why his fellow citizens of the province of Quebec should not entertain for him the very highest possible admiration as a distinguished public man of their own race; and I challenge the production of any word I ever uttered such as the hon. Minister of Customs has endeavoured to-night to fasten upon me. Fomenting discord!—why, there was more in the speech of the hon. Minister of Customs to-night to foment race cries and religious discord than anything I have heard in this House since this debate began, and in his heart he knows it. And he knows the intent with which he quoted from the Hamilton 'Spectator'; no one knows it better than himself. He did it with a motive, and that motive is unworthy of any member of this House, and especially unworthy of any man who strives to pose as the hon. Minister of Customs has done in this House ever since I have been a member of it.

Mr. PATERSON. Did not the hon. gentleman quote 'Le Soleil'?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did quote 'Le Soleil,' and I attached the responsibility of its utterances to the Prime Minister, because I knew that that paper was published by responsible men, and that those responsible men had said that it was under the control and direction of the Prime Minister.

Mr. PATERSON. Is the Hamilton 'Spectator' not controlled by responsible men?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will come to the Hamilton 'Spectator' in a moment. Further

than that, when the control of 'Le Soleil' passed from the hon. Minister of Justice, it passed to the very gentleman who descended from the bench of the province of Quebec in order that he might become the organizer of the Liberal party in that province in the last election. That is why I attached some responsibility to the right hon. gentleman in connection with its utterances; and I would like to know whether or not the Minister of Customs thinks that in so doing under these circumstances I took anything like the position which he did with regard to myself and the Hamilton 'Spectator.' Has the Hamilton 'Spectator' ever pretended to be my organ? Have I any control over it? The hon. gentleman knows, and he knew it when he made that quotation to-night, but he suppressed the fact, that the Hamilton 'Spectator' has most severely criticised me in connection with the very Bill which is before the House.

Mr. PATERSON. I did not know that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, the hon. gentleman ought to have known it before he spoke.

Mr. PATERSON. Why should I have known it? Am I to be expected to read the Hamilton 'Spectator' every day? I did not know that it had criticised the hon. gentleman adversely in connection with this Bill, as he states.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have not seen it myself, but I have been informed that such is the case, and I believe it to be correct.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. Will my hon. friend permit me to ask him a question? Will he deny that within a comparatively recent period the Hamilton 'Spectator' has declared that it is perfectly satisfied with the manner in which the hon. member for Carleton is at present leading the opposition?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know whether it has done so or not; but I have been informed that the Hamilton 'Spectator' some two or three weeks ago severely criticised me in connection with this very Bill; and yet the Minister of Customs seeks to place upon me the responsibility of utterances of the Hamilton 'Spectator,' and accuse me of inciting race prejudice and religious discord in this country. That is what I understood to be the hon. gentleman's charge; am I correct?

Mr. PATERSON. If the hon. gentleman assumes that my remarks were all addressed to him, the remarks that had reference to many gentlemen on the other side of the House, he is assuming a good deal. My words will show for themselves what I said.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, the hon. gentleman will not answer a straightforward question which I put to him. Very good. I will pass from that. If he has not the courage to answer yes or no, I will leave him to the judgment of the House and of the country. But I want to know this from him, and from those who have said so much about exciting race prejudice and religious discord, whether they make that charge also against the Laurier Club of Toronto, which has uttered some protests on this subject. whether they charge that against the Indian Head Liberal Club in the Northwest which has addressed a similar protest, and whether they charge that against the hundreds of Liberals who attended a large meeting in the city of Toronto at which resolutions were passed with regard to this Bill. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs is very inquisitive, might I address the question to him and ask whether he is charging these gentlemen with exciting religious discord and race prejudice?

Mr. PATERSON. No, I am not. A great many of my remarks were intended for men whom they will fit. I did not allude very much to the leader of the opposition in the remarks I made, his remarks in this House have not been of the inflammatory nature of some others. But if he wishes to assume responsibility for all that has been said on the other side of the House, then of course I am not to blame. Individually, I did not attribute it to him. My remarks, if I must say it here, were based more especially on what has been said by the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), who is not in the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then I must say at once that I very much misunderstood the hon. gentleman. He was pointing his finger at me in a somewhat dramatic way, and on several occasions at least he alluded to me because he mentioned the leader of the opposition. I do not think that gentlemen throughout this country, and many of them Liberals who have protested against certain features of the Bill now under discussion—I will not discuss it at all, the hon. gentleman spent about twenty minutes or half an hour in discussing the Bill, which he had no right to do—I do not think these gentlemen can be accused of exciting religious prejudice or race discord. Nor do I think that they should be characterized, as the member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) has characterized them, as renegade Liberals.

Mr. BELCOURT. I did not do anything of the sort.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did not the member for Ottawa use that expression?

Mr. BELCOURT. Yes, but not in the connection that the hon. gentleman states now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. To whom did he apply it?

Mr. BELCOURT. That is my business.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, these gentlemen, these Liberals throughout the country who have some difference with the government with regard to the principle of this measure, will have to decide for themselves as to those that term applies to, because they get no information whatever on the subject from the hon. member for Ottawa.

Mr. BELCOURT. It applies to whoever the cap will fit.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It was applied to them, as I understood, somewhat comprehensively. I did not notice that the hon. gentleman, in making his remarks, expressed any reservation, I understood his words had a general application.

Mr. BELCOURT. Whoever the cap will fit may wear it.

Mr. R. L. BORREN. Then whoever differs from the government is a renegade Liberal, according to the member for Ottawa, because this cap may fit him. Now something has been said about the interference of clergymen in the province of Ontario and elsewhere, and I myself have read protests passed in different portions of the maritime provinces by religious bodies and bodies composed of clergymen, in regard to this matter. They have been charged, as I understand also, with exciting religious prejudice and race discord, so I suppose the observations of the Minister of Customs will apply to these gentlemen as well. Does he charge them with exciting religious prejudice and race discord ?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, then, I want the Minister of Customs to answer me this : Where has anything been said in this House in criticism of this measure that goes beyond the protest to which he referred from his Liberal friends throughout the country, and from clergymen in the province of Ontario and in the maritime provinces ?

Mr. PATERSON. A great deal has been said that goes beyond.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, I have not heard it, my hon. friend has not quoted it. Now I have here the expression of the hon. member for Ottawa to which I alluded, it is this :

> Is it not true, Mr. Speaker, that this agitation has been confined almost exclusively to the Conservative press and to gentlemen who belong to the Conservative party ? With the exception of a few misguided or misinformed or renegade Liberals, the agitation has been carried on.

That is the expression.

Mr. BELCOURT. Some hon. gentlemen on the other side asked me if that was applicable to the 'Globe.' Perhaps the hon. gentleman will go on and read what I said.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the hon. gentleman like me to read it ?

Mr. LENNOX. What about the 'Globe.'

Mr. BELCOURT. I said renegade Liberals.

Anything further ? Well, I will leave it in that way, Mr. Speaker. Now some criticism has been made by the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Agriculture with regard to my having adverted in this House to a statement made by the Hon. Robert Rogers. May I be permitted respectfully to observe that I made no reference to that, except a very brief one yesterday, after it had been introduced into this House by the right hon. the Prime Minister himself. My observations to-day were not based upon what Mr. Rogers said in the interview referred to ; my observations were confined almost exclusively to the statement which has been given out by His Excellency, the delegate of the Holy See. I did not base that article, although the article has been characterized as a hearsay article by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). He asked whether I did not know as a lawyer that hearsay evidence is of no value ? I ask him as a member of this House who sat here and heard me, where were his ears ? Does he not know, or did not he hear at all ? What is the use of his talking about hearsay evidence ?

Mr. MACDONALD. Does my hon. friend undertake to say that he does not pay any attention to this statement of Mr. Rogers, and does not put it forward as a ground for this discussion ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The question of my hon. friend is an impertinent one. That is all I have to say with regard to it.

Mr. MACDONALD. My learned friend can characterize it as he pleases.

Mr. FIELDING. The leader of the opposition cannot characterize it as he pleases, he cannot use the word 'impertinent.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, you will be good enough to observe that we have a new speaker, the hon. the Minister of Finance, who is giving us his ruling.

Mr. FIELDING. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have the floor, and the Minister of Finance is out of order in attempting to take it from me.

Mr. FIELDING. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Very good.

Mr. FIELDING. I submit that the leader of the opposition is not at liberty to say that the speech of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) was impertinent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not say so ; I said his question was impertinent.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman's use of the word 'impertinent' I submit, is out of order, and he should not persist in it.

Mr. SPEAKER. The word 'impertinent' is one of those words classed as out of order in the authorities as I have read them.

Mr. HENDERSON. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that a former Speaker of this House ruled that the word 'impertinent' is allowed, if used in a proper sense.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will not take up time with regard to that. I will simply say that the hon. gentleman's question is not pertinent—which is what I understand the word 'impertinent' to mean. I assure my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) that I did not use the word in an offensive way. I thought he was rather quibbling when he put the question and so answered in the way I did. His point was that I had used hearsay evidence; mine was that I had used the statement of the delegate himself. He asked me if I considered the statement of Mr. Rogers of any value. That was not pertinent to the matter with which I was then dealing. I was pointing out that he was absolutely mistaken, and could not understand why he should be mistaken, when he suggested to me that I was using hearsay evidence and that as a lawyer I ought to know that it was of no value.

Mr. MACDONALD. The question is whether he places any value on the hearsay evidence of Mr. Rogers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If my hon. friend will permit me to say so without offence, I place more reliance on the statement of Mr. Rogers than I do on statements of my hon. friend.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not saying that in any offensive sense. It would be natural as Mr. Rogers has been called a Tory friend of mine, that I should place more reliance on statements of that hon. gentleman than I would on the statements of the hon. member for Pictou. Now, just a word more. So far as the subject I introduced to the attention of the House this afternoon is concerned, I trust my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will not think that I was guilty of any intentional discourtesy in not sending him word about it. The relations between the right hon. gentleman and myself in that regard have been very good, and I think he will do me the justice of saying that I have taken pains, sometimes even when I thought they were unnecessary, to give him notice of matters that I intended to bring up in the House. There was a statement made by the right hon. gentleman yesterday and he was perfectly in order in making it without giving me notice, though I might have supposed that, if he intended to make the extended remarks he did, it would have been proper that I should have had a word of intimation. But, as the subject was taken up and as it was followed by the statement of His Excellency the delegate himself, I did not suppose for a moment that he would expect further notice from me. And I trust that he will accept the further assurance that if I had dreamed that he would expect notice of my bringing it up to-day, I would have given it and so fulfilled the courtesy that was due to the right hon. gentleman, and which has always been extended from him to myself in all matters.

So far as the question at issue is concerned, the debate has wandered considerably from the point at which it started. I do not know that I could usefully add anything to what I said this afternoon. I endeavoured to express the views that I hold in a temperate and moderate manner; and, without any idea of fomenting religious discord or race prejudice, I brought the subject to the attention of the House and drew certain inferences which, in my judgment were well founded, but which, are matters of judgment and opinion. These were very strongly controverted by my right hon. friend in the remarks he addressed to the House. I have no fault to find with the tone of his remarks or with the challenge he threw out. It may be that the right hon. gentleman's prophesy will prove correct: If this question ever does come as a direct issue before the people, the course the right hon. gentleman has taken may be found, in the judgment of the people, to have been a wise, prudent, and constitutional course. I greatly doubt it. So far as I am concerned, if that verdict is given, I shall be perfectly willing to accept it. For the present, the only thing that remains for me to say is that whether the verdict of the people shall be as the right hon. gentleman prophesies or not, I shall have no word to withdraw from those which I have spoken on this subject to-day.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). Mr. Speaker, the speech my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has just made is such a speech as those of us who have known him for the last seven or eight years in this House would expect. He is quite evidently heartily ashamed of a great deal that has been said in this House and for which, perhaps, improperly, he has been held responsible, and he is even more ashamed of what has been said outside of this House; and in as far as it was possible for him to do it, he has fully apologized and excused himself for his connection direct or indirect

with what has been said. Sir I was somewhat at a loss to apprehend the meaning of this discussion, somewhat at a loss to understand the cause of it. I must admit that, I could scarcely see the reason for resurrecting a debate that had practically ended yesterday. But when a distinguished politician from the province of Quebec, one who is prominent in the local legislature, appeared on the floor of this House this afternoon, and when I witnessed the enthusiasm of the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), when my hon. friend the leader of the opposition was speaking, I realized what it all meant. And what does it all mean ? It means neither more nor less than an attack upon the Papal delegate, not for anything he has done in connection with the particular question now in issue before this House, but because of the political conditions which have existed in Quebec since his coming here. Now, the events of 1896 are fresh in the minds of all of us. I have no desire to go over the old story of our troubles and misfortunes at that time. Every one here knows what took place in the province of Quebec, and knows the circumstances under which it was necessary for a certain number of Roman Catholic gentlemen in the province of Quebec to appeal to the Pope ; and every one knows who has followed the current of political events that the result of that appeal was the coming to this country of the delegate. And since his coming in the province of Quebec we have had peace, and since his coming political liberty has reigned in the province of Quebec. And that peace and that political liberty are what our friends on the other side from the province of Quebec do not want, and the hon. gentlemen are now endeavouring to obtain the recall of this gentleman who has become a burden to them, because that peace of which I have spoken a moment ago has become irksome to these gentlemen who have fed and thrived on discord during their years of power. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has in the performance of what he believed to be his duty to his party brought this matter up in a half-hearted way. He has brought it up because he has thought it necesary to do it and I cannot say that with any word he uttered I can find fault. I do not find fault with the leader of the opposition ; those with whom I find fault are the gentlemen who are hiding behind all this agitation and who are not courageous enough to come out and say : We want to take up this fight with the delegate and to get rid of him. It has been made a matter of reproach to us that the delegate was brought to this country and it is now said that he has been interfering with this political question in the Northwest Territories. Why, is the memory of our friends so short that they cannot go back to 1870 when the leader of the Conservative party of that day dispatched a message to Rome for the purpose of calling to his aid Archbishop Taché, and sent him up to settle a difficulty in Manitoba ? Were they so indifferent then to the influence of the hierarchy ? Were they then such superior persons as they profess to be now and so anxious to separate church and state, so desirous of having nothing whatever to do with the Catholic clergy ? Why did they send at that time for Archbishop Taché ? Why did they bring him out and utilize his services at that time ? Where is the difference ? The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) is pleased to laugh. Perhaps instead of laughing he will explain ?

Mr. BERGERON. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And tell us whether down in his heart of hearts he is not seeking revenge for 1896 ?

Mr. BERGERON. You seem to be running in advance.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Reference has been made to the fact that the delegate in some way or other is supposed to be connected with this Bill, that he has been consulted in connection with it and that he represented the minority in the negotiations for a settlement of this difficult question. Am I rightly informed that in 1896 a Remedial Bill was introduced into this House ? Mr. Speaker, who is there here who will tell me who drafted the Remedial Bill introduced in 1896 ? Who will tell me what connection Mr. Ewart, of Winnipeg, had with that Bill and whether Mr. Ewart was the intermediary between the government of that day and the representatives of the Roman Catholic minority ? Who will deny it ? Where is the difference ?

Mr. INGRAM. Quite a difference.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Assuming it to be true that the delegate was consulted, where is the difference in principle between the case of our friends in 1896 and the present occasion. I do not think it is necessary to take up the time of the House very long with these quotations from newspapers. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) was somewhat indignant at the Minister of Customs quoting from the Hamilton 'Spectator' and he imputed motives to my hon. friend because of that quotation. What about the motives of the man who wrote the paragraph quoted ? What about the men who sat silently by and derived benefit from it? What about these motives ? Where is the difference between the action of the man who wrote that article for some sinister motive and the action of the gentleman who brought the attention of the House to it ? Does the hon. gentleman expect that we are to allow these things to go by ? Does the hon. gentleman expect

that we are to allow attacks of that kind to be made and not draw attention to them? If they are right what are they ashamed of? If they are justified what are they ashamed of? If they are not right why do they not repudiate them? Why do they not deny any complicity with any such doings or any desire to benefit by such a course of action?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As far as I am concerned——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I except my hon. friend——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I want to assure my hon. friend that I never heard of the article until the Minister of Customs read it here in the House to-night. I most unhesitatingly say that I do not approve of it. I most unhesitatingly say that, and I thought it would be gathered from what I said before.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I accept, of course, the repudiation of my hon. friend and I want to add that this is only a sample of a thousand other paragraphs that are published daily in the press of Ontario. That is only a sample of the articles and the cartoons inspired by the same spirit that are published every day in the Toronto 'World' and the Toronto 'News.'

Mr. BARKER. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask a question. Does he attribute that article to any other person on this side of the House?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not attribute it to any person on that side of the House; I attribute the article to the gentleman who wrote it whoever he may be, who published it in the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite and I attribute the result of the article to the gentlemen who tolerate the publication of such articles.

Mr. BARKER. What I would like to know is whether in his own mind, in his own suspicion, he means that any person on this side of the House had anything to do with that article. He used language that implied that. He ought to withdraw that language if he does not mean it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not as a rule deal in suspicions or inferences; I try to make statements. I stated that the article was published in an important paper connected with the Conservative party of Ontario. I say that that article is only a sample of other articles that are constantly being published in the same press by the result of which hon. gentlemen opposite hope to benefit. The leader of the opposition refers to an article published in 'Le Soleil' of 17th February, 1904. You can take almost any article in any newspaper and make extracts from the article which can be made to mean almost anything, but now I want to quote for the benefit of the House the text in the original, of the reference read by my hon. friend with the surrounding sentences and I can say this that that article does not bear the construction based upon it. You must begin with the article somewhat further up than the quotation is made and you will find that among other things after having discussed the question of the division of provinces the article goes on to say:

> Proportionately to the great sister provinces, Manitoba will not be of much more import than a large county.
>
> That is one of the reasons urged by the Manitoba delegates why they should be granted an increase of territory.
>
> There is another reason. Quebec and Ontario have extended their boundaries, one westward, the other eastward, in order to reach towards the north, the shores of James' bay.
>
> Manitoba wishes to get to the shores of Hudson bay towards the north-east. To attain that object, it would be necessary for her to extend her boundaries several hundred miles northward, cutting through Saskatchewan and Athabaska and taking in Keewatin.

All this has never been quoted before and this is the introduction to what follows:

> Manitoba wants as an increase three times its present area. Such an extension could hardly be granted. The district of Saskatchewan, at least that part which is directly interested, is opposed to it.
>
> The finances of Manitoba, in thoir present state, are not in such a condition as to attract the free inhabitants of the districts. Manitoba's debt aggregates $4,000,000. The school legislation of the small province is not of a nature to attract the settlers in the districts. The northwest has its separate schools. Manitoba has wiped out those that existed within its limits.
>
> Every good act has its reward; every evil act its penalty.

Now for those who understand the French language, what does that paragraph mean? I shall endeavour to translate it off hand:

> This extension is hardly possible. The district of Saskatchewan is opposed to it, at least that part of the district that is directly interested.

Now they give the reasons why they are opposed to it:

> The finances of Manitoba in their present state are not in such a condition as to attract the free inhabitants of the district.

That is the first question, the financial question.

> Then they are giving us the school legislation of a little province which is not of a nature to tempt the immigration of people into the districts adjoining. The Northwest Territories have separate schools. Manitoba has abolished them. All good acts have their rewards; all bad acts have their punishments. Manitoba shall remain small because she has pernicious schools.

There is the text; there is the whole article. Now, what does that mean? Does

that mean anything like what has been suggested ? If you extract one or two phrases from it you can make it mean anything you like. But, take the article in its entirety. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition quoted from the 'Northwest Review' and sought to make the government responsible for its utterances.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, I expressly said that it had no connection with the government as far as I understand.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend says it has no connection. Then, I will go a step further. I am sorry to say it has considerable connection in the way of criticism. I think it has been the most violent opponent that the government has had. I would refer my hon. friend to the articles published in 1896 by the 'Northwest Review' in which they criticised my right hon. friend the leader of the government more severely than any other paper in the country. They even went to the length of comparing him in effect with Judas Iscariot among the other vagaries which they indulged in. This is an organ for which this government cannot be held responsible. I do not think it is necessary for me to go very much further. But, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) this afternoon said, in speaking of this interview that took place down at the delegate's house, that both parties to the interview agreed to take the public into their confidence. Nothing could be further from what I conceive to be the fact. The parties to the conference, as far as I can judge of what occurred, both respected the obligation that is binding upon gentlemen. The delegate is a gentleman and I presume that this applies with equal truth to Mr. Campbell. I am sure that he is a gentleman but the man who violated the confidence of these gentlemen is Mr. Rogers. This is the man who takes it upon himself to tell us what took place out of his presence and without his personal knowledge. How is it that Mr. Campbell has not corroborated this interview ? The delegate has made the statement only because this document has been published, only because his confidence has been violated. That is the only reason. The delegate has not taken anybody into his confidence. I appeal to the hon. leader of the opposition to tell me whether or not he thinks that this conference having taken place under these circumstances. Mr. Rogers was justified in violating it. That is what strikes me at the outset. How is it Mr. Rogers makes this declaration ? Why did Mr. Campbell not make it if he had any declaration to make ? If it were necessary for somebody outside of Mr. Campbell to make this statement why did Mr. Roblin not make it ? Why did Mr. Roblin, the head of the government, not issue this manifesto ? Does his silence suggest anything ? Perhaps before this controversy ends we will hear from Mr. Roblin and we will understand why it is that he has not made this statement, that he has not issued this manifesto.

Now, I will not detain the House any longer. But, perhaps I might draw the attention of the House to the interview with the delegate. I might say that in so far as I am concerned, and I am speaking entirely for myself, I have no desire to see the delegate leave this country. He never will leave it in so far as I am concerned if I can prevent it. There shall be, there can be no misunderstanding about my position. He has brought about peace in the province of Quebec, that peace has been maintained since 1896 and I trust that he shall continue to be with us so that peace may continue to remain with us. What is it that he has done in this matter ? What is he to be criticised for ? Some hon. gentlemen have told us that he was in Manitoba last year. He there met Mr. Campbell. He does not say what occurred between them. He is a gentleman. Then he tells us that hearing that Mr. Campbell was here on the 23rd February, a few days after this Autonomy Bill was introduced into this House, he asked him to come down and meet him and there he discussed with him this question of the condition of the Catholics of Manitoba. I want to say here and now that in so far as I am concerned the delegate was perfectly within his rights when he discussed this matter, that the delegate was perfectly within his rights when he endeavoured to obtain from this gentleman the redress of this grievance that has continued for a long time. When Mr. Campbell got down there what occurred between them ? The delegate pointed out again to him the condition of the Roman Catholics in Manitoba and said to him : Cannot you alleviate in some way the grievance under which these people labour ? Can you not in effect extend to the larger towns, such as Brandon and Winnipeg, the same privileges that you have extended to the Roman Catholic population in the country districts ; that is simply extending the law in operation in Manitoba in such a way as to enable it to be availed of in cities and towns. Mr. Campbell does not appear to have repudiated the suggestion. He accepted it. Then, the delegate said : You are endeavouring to have your boundaries extended. This was a matter of common notoriety, it was a matter of common notriety that the inhabitants of the district which would be affected were opposed to any extension of the boundaries of Manitoba and he said that the first step to be adopted in the direction of obtaining what was desired was to conciliate the interest of the people in the Territories to be affected.

Mr. LAKE. In the district of Keewatin ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No the district adjoining Manitoba on the west.

Mr. LAKE. I thought that question was settled.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It was settled before this interview. That is exactly what we contend for. The delegate evidently did not know anything about what had taken place. It was settled two days before that conference. He said that if you want your boundaries extended the best thing you can do is to conciliate the inhabitants of the country to be affected because the government cannot agree and will not agree in all probability to extend the boundaries of Manitoba against the wishes of the people whose political interests depend upon the change and whose political interests would be affected by the change. And he said to him : Here, these people, the Roman Catholics, are in the enjoyment of separate schools, whereas if they come into the province of Manitoba they will be under a different constitution and they will object to any extension of the boundaries of Manitoba which will prejudicially affect their interests in so far as the school question is concerned. Is there anything improper in that ? Is there anything wrong ? Is there anything that the delegate should apologize for ? Incidentally let me observe that we have heard a great deal about the nefarious system of separate schools in the Northwest. We have heard a great deal about the shackles that we are going to put on the hands of the people there, it has been said that we are going to submit the people of the Territories to an indignity by imposing upon them a separate school system and yet here we find that these people, instead of desiring to throw off the shackles, unanimously protest against any change. This is simply an incidental remark that I want to make at the present moment. But, I shall not transgress the rules of the House. Unfortunately, some time before we reach the third reading of the Bill, I shall be obliged to inflict a speech upon the House. But, is there anything improper in what has taken place which makes it necessary to speak of the delegate in the ill disguised terms of contempt which have been applied to him by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House ? Why should he be called a policeman, or likened to a cabman ? Is there any necessity for that ? Is there anything in what has occurred to justify these epithets that were applied to him ? Now, the delegate goes on, and see what he says about his conversations so far as the government is concerned. He says :

> The federal government had absolutely no knowledge of it.

That is to say ; had absolutely no knowledge of his interview with Mr. Campbell. And, as had been suggested by my friend beside me here, sometimes people think that I have more to do with these things than I actually have, but I can tell you that I never knew of that interview until yesterday.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I will add this : if the ablegate had consulted me about it probably this interview would never have occurred—I saw these two gentlemen when they were here with Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The delegate goes on to say :—

> It was a private conversation and simply intended to express the suggestion and the desire that the condition of the Catholics in the respect I have mentioned would be improved.

What was there wrong about that ; what was there improper about that ? What is there in that of which the government need be ashamed ; what is there in that for which the government can be held responsible ? The delegate says he had a private conversation with this gentleman, that his object was simply to improve the condition of the Catholics, and he says the government had no knowledge of it. Why should we be held responsible for that. If I were not a member of the government and had not certain responsibility as such, I would say immediately right now, that I would be prepared to take all responsibility for everything the delegate said. I see nothing in it that any man need be ashamed of and I speak now, not as a Catholic, but as a citizen of this country. I have made a longer speech than I intended and I apologize to the House for so doing, but I thought it was my duty to make this statement, and I trust that in doing so I have not been apologetic for a course which I think was perfectly legitimate and proper.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). I do not understand why the Minister of Justice has brought my name into this discussion. He referred to my being in company this afternoon with the Hon. Mr. Leblanc, a member of the Quebec legislature and ex-speaker of that body, who happened to be here and who was kindly offered a seat on the floor of the House. And the Minister of Justice availed of this incident to introduce my name into the beginning of his speech, and to say that we wanted to make an attack upon His Excellency. The Minister of Justice also said that the leader of the opposition had thought it well to make an apology for the remarks he made this afternoon, but I do not know that the leader of the opposition made any apology, and I do not understand that he had any to make. The question which the leader of the opposition brought before the House, is a most important one, and in what I shall say now I will be as candid as the Minister of Jus-

tice. I have a great deal of sympathy for my hon. friend the Minister of Justice.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I need it all.

Mr. BERGERON. Perhaps he does not want my sympathy.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do.

Mr. BERGERON. I am sincere in the statement that I have a great deal of sympathy for the Minister of Justice. I understand he has had a great deal to do with the preparation of the measure which is now before the House, and it has been stated here that interviews have taken place with His Excellency, and that there were conferences with His Excellency and either the Premier or the Minister of Justice. That statement has not been denied and let me say at once, that even if it is true I do not see that any blame is to be connected with it. But, if the Prime Minister has thought fit to consult His Excellency on a question which he knew would interest His Excellency, or if the Minister of Justice has done so, I would like to know when that consultation took place. Did they consult him before they introduced clause 16 of the original Bill. I believe they must have done so. That was the clause I was ready to accept myself. If they consulted him then did they consult him afterwards when the Minister of the Interior forced the government to withdraw clause 16 and present the amended clause now before us.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. May I ask my hon. friend a question ?

Mr. BERGERON. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Does my hon. friend say there is very much difference between the two clauses ? Does he agree with the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) on that point ?

Mr. BERGERON. I will not say that I agree with the member for Jacques Cartier, or that I disagree with him. I will speak for myself and according to my own judgment, pronounced in a very modest way, I will say that I think there is a great deal of difference between the two.

An hon. MEMBER. What is the difference ?

Mr. BERGERON. I think there is a great deal of difference, but I am not allowed to discuss the merits of the Bill now, although I may have the opportunity to do so later on, because I imagine there will be some more amendments. I have sympathy with the Minister of Justice because in 1896 he took to heart the conduct of the Liberal party at that time. I hope the Minister of Justice was sincere in what he said and in what he wrote in 1896, and which in my view explains the position he now takes in regard to this measure. In 1896 the Minister of Justice was a candidate in the county of Quebec, and like a great many of the Quebec Liberal members he made a great many pledges. On the 6th of June, 1896, he wrote a letter addressed to the administrator of the archdiocese of Quebec, that letter I have here in French and translate it as follows :—

> Being sincerely disposed to put aside all party spirit and all question of men for the triumph of the cause of the Catholics in Manitoba, I the undersigned, pledge myself if I am elected to conform to the mandement of the bishops altogether and to vote for a Bill which will render to the Catholics of Manitoba the justice to which they are entitled by the judgment of the Privy Council, as long as that Bill will have the approval of my bishop. If Mr. Laurier comes into power and does not settle that question at the first session according to the mandement of the bishops, I pledge myself either to withdraw my support from him or to resign.

That letter is signed 'Charles Fitzpatrick.'

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Has the bishop to whom that letter is addressed ever condemned me for anything I have done as a result of that ?

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend had better settle that with his bishop. This brings us to the question at issue; this is why there is a delegate here, so that the bishop cannot condemn the Minister of Justice, and I understand now why he is so anxious that the delegate should stay here. He would rather be in the hands of that delegate—for whom I have the deepest respect—than in the hands of his bishop in Quebec, who would remind him of the letter written in 1896. We might as well admit at once that the action of the Liberal party in 1896 was the initiation of the question which we are discussing in this House to-day.

Mr. Speaker, this is a heritage of the Liberal party that we are having to-day. We have heard my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), and my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, with his beautiful voice, speaking of having peace in Canada, and my hon. friend the Minister of Justice says that religiously we have peace in Canada. These hon. gentlemen have a most extraordinary way of bringing peace to the country ; peace with the bishops and clergy, by having here a delegate from Rome, who says to them, Gentlemen, not another word; peace for the minority of Manitoba by not giving them what they wanted, and leaving them still under the foot of the majority of that province. That is the kind of peace the right hon. gentleman gave to them after promising in Quebec that he would do more for them than the remedial Bill would do. Would we have in Canada to-day His Excellency, of whom so much has been said, if the minor-

ity in Manitoba had been granted their due in 1896? If my right hon. friend, sitting on this side of the House, had not proposed the six months' hoist to the remedial Bill, and done everything in his power to prevent it passing, would His Excellency have been in Manitoba consulting with Archbishop Langevin and the minority there, to obtain for them that justice which they have been claiming since 1896? The Minister of Justice was to resign if that justice were not obtained, but he has not resigned; but by the Bill at present before the House he hopes to redeem the peace of his conscience. My hon. friend says there is no harm in having a Papal delegate here. I will not say there is any harm, but there was no necessity for a delegate here, if my right hon. friend and his party had not created such a turmoil among the people in 1896, and afterwards. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice tries to show an analogy between the trip of Archbishop Taché in 1870 and the residence in Canada of His Excellency. There is a great difference. In 1870 there was an uprising in the province of Manitoba; we were threatened with revolution; we were threatened with the loss of all the provinces in the Northwest; and we could not do anything. We had not the soldiers or muskets or cannon with which to put a stop to that uprising. There was only one way of settling the trouble; that was by the persuasion of Archbishop Taché, then the Bishop of St. Boniface, whose wisdom was held in immense respect by the people of that part of the country. Sir John Macdonald, as a great politican and statesman, knew that it was the only way to settle that difficulty, and he was not ashamed to adopt it, although he was the Premier of Canada and a Protestant, because he was working for the best interests of the country. He therefore turned his eyes towards Rome, where Archbishop Taché was at the time, and invited him to come here, not in the interest of one religion or another, but in the interest of Canada.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not so bad for the hierarchy.

Mr. BERGERON. Archbishop Taché came, and he accomplished what he came for; and many promises were made to him then.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, many promises were made to him and to his people, and he afterwards regretted what had happened, and expressed that regret very often before he died.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Who made the promises?

Mr. BERGERON. It does not make any difference whether they were made by a Conservative administration or by a Liberal administration. Archbishop Taché is dead, but the people living there are the successors of those to whom the promises were made. Suppose they were made by a Conservative administration; was it the duty of the Liberal party later on, and principally in 1896, to do everything in their power to prevent the Conservative administration from fulfilling its promises to Archbishop Taché? Some of those promises were that the minority would be allowed to have separate schools, that they would have the use of the French language, that they never would be troubled, that if they would allow the legislative council to be abolished, they would never have anything to fear from the majority of the province of Manitoba.

Mr. MACDONALD. Might I ask my hon. friend a question? He asserts that promises were made at that time by his Conservative friends. Why does he not ask his Conservative friend, Mr. Rogers, in Manitoba, to redeem them to-day?

Mr. BERGERON. I will give the answer. The remedial Bill, which was read the second time in this House, is still hanging. The question has never been decided; it is in the Privy Council; and if the right hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Justice wanted to do what they promised in the province of Quebec, they would bring back the remedial Bill in favour of the minority in Manitoba. That is why Mr. Roblin cannot do it. It is impossible for him to do anything of the kind to-day.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Why?

Mr. BERGERON. Because the remedial Bill is standing at the second reading.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Therefore he cannot interfere?

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend speaks of the analogy between the visit of Archbishop Taché and the residence in Canada of the ablegate. Now, why have we a delegate here? I said a moment ago that it was a heritage of the Liberal party.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Do I understand my hon. friend to be against Canada having a delegate?

Mr. BERGERON. It does not make any difference to me personally. It only makes a difference to those who have some matters of conscience to settle with their bishops; I have not. My hon. friend from Pictou, when speaking this evening, had in his hand a book which I presume was a report of the Supreme Court. It had been given to him after six o'clock, and I imagine I know the gentleman who gave it to him.

Mr. MACDONALD. Let me say that no hon. gentleman gave me that book. I have read that case long ago. I am suffi-

ciently acquainted with my profession to have studied some of these questions. I went to the library and got the book.

Mr. BERGERON. Naturally, I accept the word of my hon. friend; but I am very much surprised if the hon. gentleman in the county of Pictou followed what took place in the county of Charlevoix in 1877.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Every law student knows the case of Brassard vs. Langevin by heart.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that so ? Well, that is something new. Who will say that we have not to deal with a very religious party? They are au courant with all matters in the province of Quebec. The Charlevoix election took place in 1875 or 1876. Before that we did not hear of any trouble. We had bishops and priests—good bishops and good priests ; at least, everybody thought so and said so. Although I was young then, I do not remember hearing any fault found with the clergy of our province. In that election in Charlevoix it seems there were some indiscretions committed by the clergy. They were called undue influence. The Liberal party at that time, indeed the Liberal party of this country has never been an orthodox party, and my right hon. friend knows it. The Canadian Club of that time, in the 60's and the Club St. Jean Baptiste of Montreal, knew something about it. They belonged to the old Liberal school of France, they were far from being religious, and they have preached their ideas in the province of Quebec, and that is why the Liberal party were distrusted by the people of Quebec. They had clubs like the Institute Canadien and other institutions of that kind, where they were not at all bashful in expressing their opinion about the clergy from the bishops down. No wonder then that the population of Quebec, being a religious population, distrusted them and were unwilling to confide their interests in their hands. That explains why they were in opposition for so many years. But during that election they took hold of this question of undue influence and brought it before the courts and succeeded. It is true it was proved that some curés had gone out of their way, had been over zealous. But, Sir, we read every Monday morning in the newspapers of Protestant ministers who have been over zealous in their remarks. I do not blame the Anglicans for that, I do not blame the Presbyterians, nor the Baptists, nor the Methodists, as a body. I do not hold them responsible because one or two ministers are too enthusiastic. So probably some of the Quebec curés were indiscreet. The election was voided, and another election took place, and again a Conservative was elected.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that was the beginning of our having Papal delegates here. The Liberal party at that time, or some of their representatives, made a demand upon the Holy See for a delegate. It was most extraordinary for people who did not believe much in bishops or priests to make a demand upon the Holy See for a delegate to come over here and find out whether they were as good as the Conservatives. Bishop Conroy came here as a delegate to supervise the bishops in the province of Quebec, and to investigate the disputes. Bishop Conroy was well received, received with open arms, the Catholic population of Quebec treated him very well, in fact he was so well treated, he found everything so good and so nice that he made a report that the Liberals were very good people, were very religious people, indeed they were as good as the Conservatives, and there was no reason why they should not be entrusted with the affairs of the country as well as the Conservatives.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. And he died after he made that report, and was not replaced.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Surely he has gone to heaven.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, I hope he has, because if he had to carry the sins of the Liberal party with him, he needed to go to some place where he could lay them down. We did not hear much more about these things until the Manitoba affair. We all know that when our friends were in opposition the country was filled with fads. We don't hear about them now. We do not hear about Patrons of Industry, we do not hear about prohibition any more, nor any other of these side issues. Because they were not able to fight their opponent with a serious policy, they had recourse to things of that sort. When the Manitoba school difficulty came up, what a God-send it was to them. And how did it come about ? Our friend, the late Dalton McCarthy, had gone to Manitoba and spoken there very eloquently. He told these people what they should do, and his propaganda took well. The Manitoba government took hold of it, and I have no doubt in my own mind that my right hon. friend had nothing at all to do with it, or any of his friends. The Manitoba government was over ears engaged in some railway deals, and they had to divert public opinion if possible. They saw that Mr. McCarthy had had great success in preaching against separate schools and against the official use of the French language, and they took hold of his teachings themselves. In 1890 they abolished the separate schools and the French language. They did more than that. As I said the other day, they kept $14,000 worth of the property of Roman Catholics, they have got it yet, they have never given it back to the Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba. From 1890 to 1896 what did we see ? What a spectacle there was in this country ! The Minister of

Customs said that their party was above these things, that their party would not go so low as to seek to raise national or religious prejudices. Why, Sir, that has been their stock in trade, they never had any other policy than that. What policy have they to-day, what fiscal policy have they ? Is it not the same policy that they opposed for 18 years in opposition, the policy of the Conservative party which they have changed a little, but the principle is the same ? What policy have they upon provincial autonomy, or any other question ? So they went to the country. In the province of Quebec they used to say that it was impossible for the minority in Manitoba to obtain a redress of their grievances because, forsooth, the Prime Minister, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, was an Orangeman ; while in the province of Ontario they said that the Prime Minister was bound hand and foot to the hierarchy of the province of Quebec. This was the way they treated that question throughout Canada.

But, during all that time the Conservative party were endeavouring to do justice with a sincere desire to end this question in a way to render justice to the minority in Manitoba. They brought the question before the courts, it went to the Supreme Court and then to the Privy Council, where it was decided that the law was intra vires of the province of Manitoba, as they had passed the law themselves and had changed that law, but it was declared later on by the Privy Council that the minority had a grievance, and that the Dominion government, according to the British North America Act, must come to the relief of the minority. Then when the Remedial Bill was presented to parliament, what did we see ? We saw the friends of those gentlemen opposite—many of them have now disappeared from the House—opposing that Bill with all their might, speaking against time, knowing that parliament must dissolve on the 24th of April. They followed the lead of my right hon. friend who had proposed the six months hoist, knowing that he was defeating the Bill, knowing that that law was good, but knowing also that he was helping his party to obtain power. That was the way that he obtained his great name among the Protestants, which he has held for so many years, the name of being a tolerant man, of being above prejudice, the name of being so liberal minded that he had put his foot upon the hierarchy in the province of Quebec. But that was not the language used in Quebec. In Quebec, his French name and his eloquence were enough to help him and his friends into power, and in that way he succeeded in overthrowing the Conservative government. Well, after he came into power what did we see ? On the opening of the new parliament in the month of August, 1896, in the debate on the address, he talked about the traditions of the Liberal Conservative party. Nobody has ever talked about the traditions of the Liberal party, they had none to boast of. Sir Charles Tupper, who was then in opposition, declared that he had gone down to defeat because he thought that he was right in standing by the constitution of Canada in attempting to render justice to the minority of Manitoba. What did Sir Charles Tupper say? He said: My hon. friend is now in power: he has a big majority ; let him bring down a Bill to render justice to the minority in Manitoba, and I pledge myself and my friends behind me to help him. There are the traditions of the party. This was not because Sir Charles Tupper believed in separate schools or because the majority of those behind him believed in them, but because it was the law of the land ; it was because it would render justice, and because, as has been said before, it would be an act of cowardice on the part of any majority not to render justice to a minority, whatever that minority might be.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I was in the House in 1896 and followed the debate to some extent. As a matter of curiosity will the hon. gentleman point out to me where I can find in 'Hansard' the statement of Sir Charles Tupper to which he has referred?

Mr. BERGERON. I can point it out to my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) and, if he wants me to do so immediately, I will send for 'Hansard.'

Mr. MACDONALD. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) a question? He has made a declaration of policy on behalf of the party behind him. Are we to understand that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) will support him in the course he speaks of ?

Mr. BERGERON. I have been here twenty-four sessions, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) is not smart enough to catch me like that. I am speaking for myself and am stating what happened in 1896.

Mr. MACDONALD. Do I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) to decline to answer that question?

Mr. BERGERON. Certainly; I am not the chief of the party.

Mr. MACDONALD. Oh, I thought you were.

Mr. BERGERON. No, thank God, I am not. I may say that I have sent for the volume of 'Hansard' containing the remarks concerning which the Minister of Justice asked and I will be able to quote them to him because they are in 'Hansard.'

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I take the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Bergeron) word for it.

Mr. BERGERON. It is there. I have quoted it very often in public meetings and elsewhere, for it is worth while to do so. When my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) found himself in power on the

morning of the 24th of June, mainly by the majority from the province of Quebec, the question naturally arose with him: How can I do justice to the minority in Manitoba? I have taken a position and I cannot abandon it; I have a great name as a tolerant man because I sacrificed my compatriots. How, then, can I do it? And somebody whispered to him: Don't be at all alarmed, there is a way of settling it. And a little while afterwards a gentleman was sent to Manitoba to settle that question. Talk about settlement. What happens when a question between two men is to be settled by the intervention of a third? The mediator must meet and talk to both. But, what happened in the Manitoba school question? The gentleman who went from Ottawa to Manitoba went to the Prime Minister of Manitoba, Mr. Greenway occupying the position at that time. A settlement was agreed upon between them. And what was that settlement? That the pupils should be given the opportunity of a half hour's religious instruction after half past three in the afternoon. That is a great way of settling the question of separate schools. Did the delegate who went to Manitoba consult the Archbishop of St. Boniface on that question? Was the minority of Manitoba consulted in order to reach a settlement between them and the Dominion government? Not a word. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) told us about it the other day when he said: We consulted our friends. And who were their friends?

Mr. MORIN. Joe Martin.

Mr. BERGERON. No, not Joe Martin. The man whom the Prime Minister sent to do more for the minority than a Remedial Bill could do—according to what was stated on the hustings of Quebec—went to Mr. Greenway and Mr. Sifton. And these gentlemen showed the settlement to whom? Did he show it to the archbishop or to any Catholic of Manitoba? No, it was shown to Mr. Dalton McCarthy—Mr. Dalton McCarthy, the great friend of the French Canadians and Roman Catholics in the Dominion of Canada—it was to him that the settlement was shown before it was signed by my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for the Dominion of Canada and by the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) for the province of Manitoba. And this was the settlement of the Manitoba school question. And the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) who, I believe, sincerely knows that it has never been settled satisfactorily—it is not surprising to me to see the pains he has taken to at least give justice, according to his view and mine, to the minority in the Northwest Territories. Then what was to be done? A promise had been made to the bishops of Quebec. Talk about the heirarchy. This was a question that interested the hierarchy and the promises had been made to them. I have read just now the promise of one important man in the House, the Minister of Justice. I could read—they are in 'Hansard'—letters from thirty or forty candidates in Quebec who promised the bishops and priests that they would see to it that the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) should render justice as soon as he attained power. Something has to be done, said they, or we shall be chastised for having deceived the bishops.

I have now the volumn for which I sent. I am sorry to detain the House with a quotation, but the Minister of Justice has asked for it. This is the first volume of 'Hansard' for the second session of 1896. I quote from page 57. Sir Charles Tupper is speaking.

> Now, Sir, I do not intend to say more upon that subject on the present occasion, but I will say this : that in the future, as in the past, the cardinal principle with the great party to which I have the honour to belong will be equal justice to all without respect to race or creed.

That is the position of the Conservative party to-day as it was then.

> I am glad to know that the responsibility of this question—an important question, although not so gravely important as I had supposed——

It is quite natural that Sir Charles Tupper should speak in that way after the rebuke that he had received in Quebec.

> ——I am glad to know that the responsibility rests no longer upon my shoulders, but upon those of the hon. gentleman who is now the First Minister of the Crown. I can only say, that I trust and sincerely hope that he will be most successful in obtaining such a settlement of this question as will do justice and give satisfaction to all parties. I can assure the hon. gentleman not only that he has my most cordial wishes for a happy and early and fair settlement of this important question, but that anything that I can contribute to that end will be at all times most cheerfully done.

Is my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) satisfied——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Mr. BERGERON—because I could read a great deal more. But my hon. friend knows how to read and I will send him the volume and he can read it himself.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I would like the hon. gentleman to find in 'Hansard' what he said was there.

Mr. BERGERON. Surely what I have quoted is enough?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Mr. BERGERON. What more could Sir Charles Tupper say?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Where is the promise to support a Bill?

Mr. BERGERON. He could not say any more than that. My hon. friend could not expect a man in the position Sir Charles Tupper then occupied to go further than he did. I am sure that Sir Charles Tupper offered every possible opportunity to my hon. friend to render justice completely to the minority of Manitoba. Now, what is the use of playing on words if the minority of Manitoba did not get their rights.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is not the question.

Mr. BERGERON. That is the question. To-day the minority in Manitoba, in Winnipeg or Brandon or any of the large cities are in a worse position than they were when the Remedial Bill was presented in 1896.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And that is the reason an attack is made on the delegate for attempting to get a remedy.

Mr. BERGERON. Not at all, I am not making an attack. That is the proof that it is not settled, when there are pour parlers between the Manitoba government and His Excellency, the representative of the Holy See. That is the proof the question is not settled although my hon. friend has said in his letter he would resign and not give support to the right hon. gentleman if it was not settled. Where is he with his promises ? He sits there and where is the minority of Manitoba when they are obliged through their archbishop and their friends in the House to come down here and try to get a settlement ? The Minister of Justice has put the question to me : Has my bishop done anything to me ? My hon. friend was too cute to wait until the bishop would chastise him ; he was too cute, he went over to Rome, he went to the fountain. It is easier to deceive Rome than to deceive the bishop of Quebec who was nearer. Rome was far away and I declare here that the Holy See was deceived in the Manitoba settlement. I have once shown here by a document sent over to Rome that the Holy See was deceived.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend went there with Mr. Russell. We engaged Russell as a lawyer instead of the legal firm we had employed before. We were told when we voted $9,000 for Russell's services afterwards and when we asked why they had dispensed with the services of the other firm: Oh, they were too old. Russell went there, he did the work and charged $9,000. Nobody could see what he had done, besides going to Rome and asking for that settlement of the Manitoba school question. Then what happened ? We had the visit of Monseigneur Merry Del Val. Talk about having ambassadors in Canada ! The Conservative party, although at the head of this country for years and years, never contemplated the introduction here of a delagate from Rome on any where else. The Conservative party had confidence in their bishops and in the clergy of the province of Quebec and they still have confidence in the clergy and bishops. My hon. friend went to Rome with Russell and at that time they had the assistance of Monsignor Proulx and Chevalier Drolet, a Papal Zouave who had had experience in Rome. They went to Rome and on Chevalier Drolet's return he was interviewed, and I need not say that that interview was well prepared. In that interview he was asked :

Some hon. MEMBERS. (Translation.) In French.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, I shall read it in French first.

(Translation).

Q. To whom did you make representations in Rome ? How did you proceed ?

A. First, I went to the congregation of the Propaganda ; but I found, on arriving there that the Cardinal Prefect of that congregation, under whose purview we are as a mere mission country, had been successfully forestalled by the five bishops who had come in succession to the Eternal city, since the general elections of June 23, up to my arrival on October 12. I had the honour to be received in audience by the Cardinal Prefect, eight or ten times, but the Red Pope—as the powerful president of that congregation which embraces all countries outside of Europe, is designated in Rome—had accepted with such implicit faith the representations made by the bishops of the ecclesiastical province of Quebec and Manitoba, that I was not a little surprised to hear at my last interview, Cardinal Ledochowski address me as follows in all seriousness.

And now, this is very important.

'Why does this Mr. Laurier, whom you represent as a Catholic, refuse to comply with the mandate of the Queen, ordering him to restore at once separate schools in Manitoba as they existed previous to 1890, when a good Protestant like Mr. Tupper offers to do so if returned to power ?'

What is the English of this ? Chevalier Drolet says that when he arrived in Rome he found that a great deal of work had been done by five bishops of Quebec who had already been there between the 23rd of June, the day of the elections and the 12th of October, the day he arrived there. These had already conferred with Cardinal Ledochowski, the head of the congregation and Cardinal Ledochowski asked why it was that Mr. Laurier whom they represented to him as such a good Catholic refused to obey the command of the Queen which command meant the immediate re-establishment of separate schools in Manitoba when a Protestant like Mr. Tupper declared himself ready to give justice to the minority if he was still in power or if he was put in power. Mr. Drolet goes on to say that Cardinal Ledochowski was a very old man which explained why the cardinal would not believe him but would

believe the bishops. Later on he says that after he had been many times to see Cardinal Ledochowski he was told to go to Cardinal Rampolla. It is no use going over all these things at this late hour to show the work which was done by the emissaries of the government or their friends, by Mr. Drolet and later on by the Minister of Justice and by Mr. Russell and all the work that was done to find a way of preventing the bishops in Canada from telling the right hon. gentleman that he had deceived them. Then Monseigneur Merry del Val was sent here ; he came here as a delegate and went throughout the country and my impression is that he was sadly deceived and that he made a report along that line. He had been deceived but that did not prevent them—because in Rome they are very slow before rendering a judgment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, it takes a long time before they make up their minds, but they very seldom make a mistake. When the judgment was rendered it was shown that the settlement of the Manitoba school question was inefficient, incomplete and——

Mr. MORIN. Not accepted.

Mr. BERGERON. Inacceptable, that is what it is, and it has remained in that state ever since. Never did any bishop or priest in Canada ask to have this delegate from the Holy See. It seems to me that it would have been very important that these high dignitaries of the church should have been consulted unless that dignitary was brought out here to hold them in check and to prevent them from expressing their opinions as they used to do before. I find here :

> Is it the episcopate that has asked for the delegate ? No, the episcopate is united and being above political parties it is working towards the acquisition of our rights and the triumph of our principles.

Monseigneur Merry Del Val was not here very long. He was replaced by His Excellency Monseigneur Falconio. Monseigneur Falconio was only in the country for a short time. He was replaced by the present delegate. I have not a word to say against the fact that he is the delegate here. It does not make any difference to me personally, but I believe the presence of the delegate here is humiliating to the Canadian episcopate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes ; I believe that if you consult our bishops, not only in the province of Quebec, but everywhere throughout the Dominion of Canada, you will obtain that answer, and I say it is due to the course which has been pursued by the right hon. leader of the government. I repeat again that if the right hon. gentleman and if the Liberal party had rendered justice to the minority of Manitoba in 1896, or rather if they had not prevented the Conservative party from rendering justice at that time, there would have been no occason for a delegate in this country.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) has said that it was a humiliation to the bishops and priests of Canada to have a delegate in this country. Will he submit the name of any bishop or priest who regards the presence of the delegate as a humiliation ?

Mr. BERGERON. I will repeat the assertion, and I will ask my hon. friend (Mr. A. Johnston) to bring a letter from any bishop or priest saying that what I have said is not true.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. When the first delegate came to this country, I think he was received with great pomp by the bishop of Quebec.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend will surely not place himself in any disagreeable position. He knows that His Excellency has the respect, esteem and affection of all the bishops in this Dominion, and if that were not the case they would not long remain in their sees, because he is the representative of His Holiness ; but between having a respect for his personality and yielding obedience to him, and being happy and glad to see him here, there is a difference. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) spoke this evening about coercing Manitoba. If my hon. friend had been in the province of Quebec in 1896, he would not have heard such language as that used by his friends. They never spoke about coercion in Quebec. I would ask my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) if it is a matter of rendering justice where justice is due, he would refrain from what some people call coercion, but what my hon. friend and myself would call an act of justice. It is an operation. It is sometimes painful to perform an operation, but you have to do it so as to save the body.

Mr. BOURASSA. Is the hon. gentleman asking me a question ?

Mr. BERGERON. Yes.

Mr. BOURASSA. I will give him my reply. The position I took in 1896 in my election was this, and I am just as much a friend of the minority in Manitoba as I was then. I am just as convinced as my hon. friend is that the minority in Manitoba does not enjoy that to which it is entitled, but what I said in 1896, and what I still say, is that the manner in which the Conservative party had played with the Manitoba school question for ten years had made it perfectly impossible to expect anything from the application of the Remedial Bill passed by this parliament, and that, as did my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, I expected more from the policy of concilia-

tion than from the policy of coercion. That is the position that I took in my county in the presence of the parish priests, and it was supported by the people as well as the clergy of my county.

Mr. BERGERON. I suppose my hon. friend is very sincere in what he says. Will he allow me to say that I think he is entirely mistaken ?

Mr. BOURASSA. I am simply saying that is my opinion.

Mr. BERGERON. I am saying to my hon. friend that he is sincere, but that he is entirely mistaken. He will admit that the minority of Manitoba have not the rights to which they are entitled ?

Mr. BOURASSA. Certainly ; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) was very unhappy in his remarks. He made a fine speech. I heard a number of my hon. friends say that he made a beautiful speech, but when he spoke of the bishops of Quebec as being Tory machines he made an awful mistake. Let me say again, because we cannot say it too often, that although there may have been abuses in some places, for instance, in the county of Charlevoix, which has been referred to, there are the most damnable things in this book which have been sent to Rome and which are not true. But, on the whole, our bishops in Quebec are men of a great deal of prudence. They are learned men. They are chosen with a great deal of care. They are wise, and they are men of delicate sensibilities. There is a bishop in the county I have the honour to represent, and he has never dropped me a letter or expressed a desire to see me as to the vote I may give or as to the position which I intend to take upon this question. Some people may think that I am getting hot upon this question of the Manitoba schools. I have been the victim of it. In 1900 the gentleman who presented himself against me in the county of Beauharnois was an English Protestant. You know this gentleman ; you have seen him here. He was a thorough Conservative until 1896 ; but he went against the Conservative party in 1896, because the Conservative party wanted to render justice to the Catholic minority of Manitoba. There are many English votes in that county, and they were cast for that gentleman when he was a candidate in 1900. I believe that these people voted for him sincerely and honestly, and naturally they elected him, because our people do not separate upon national lines. There are many priests in my county, and I say here, upon my honour as a member of parliament, that never has a bishop or priest in the county of Beauharnois gone to a man and told him that he should vote for me because I was a French Canadian and a Roman Catholic. The result was that many gave their votes for Mr. Loy, an English Protestant. Is this not a conspicuous indication of tolerance and broad-mindedness ? When the hon. member for Pictou spoke of the bishops of Quebec as if they were Tory machines, he made a great mistake.

Mr. BOURASSA. Is it not a fact that the bishop in whose diocese the county which my hon. friend represents is situated did not sign the mandement which was issued by the bishops in 1896 ?

Mr. BERGERON. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. BOURASSA. Well, I know.

Mr. BERGERON. I will take the hon. gentleman's word. I do not know if he signed it or not ; and if he did not, I do not know why he did not sign it. I will take the testimony of my hon. friend. The bishop might have said : Why do you not vote for your own compatriot ? But it was never done. My opponent addressed large meetings of my compatriots, although he could not speak their own language very well.

An hon. MEMBER. He spoke well.

Mr. BERGERON. He may have spoken well on the hustings, but he was not a Demosthenes or a Cicero. I never took advantage of this fact. Our people would listen to him most politely, and never did I ask one man directly or indirectly that he should give me his support on account of my nationality. I was sorry to hear my hon. friend from Pictou—I hope it was a slip of the tongue—call the bishops of Quebec Tory machines.

Mr. BUREAU. Why did not you correct your friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) when he called the Papal ablegate a policeman.

Mr. BERGERON. If my hon. friend (Mr. Bureau) will allow me I will take care of my own conscience. My hon. friend from Three Rivers is not afraid of anything or any body, and he can deal directly with the member for South York. I do not approve of everything the member for South York says or does, but he is not responsible to me.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Before the hon. gentleman goes further—the hon. member for Pictou is not here, and if I remember aright he did not call the bishops of Quebec, Tory machines, but, he quoted from the law reports a statement in which those words were used.

Mr. BERGERON. That may be and 'Hansard' may show it, but I heard the statement that the bishops of Quebec were Tory machines, and I took a note of it. The Minister of Customs spoke about prosperity and the great things that have been done since 1896. That is all very good but all the same it is very painful and regret-

table to see what is going on in the country to-day. There is no question but that this country to-day stands upon a volcano ; a most dangerous question is agitating the people. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say that it is the fault of gentlemen on this side of the House, and I may say that it is the fault of gentlemen on the other side, but there is blame on both sides, if not in the House in the country. I say it is a most unfortunate state of things, and I am sorry to have to lay it at the door of my right hon. friend. It is all due to the policy which he followed in 1896. He let it be spread broadcast throughout the Dominion that he was opposed to the hierarchy and to any clerical influence. He said, or he let it be said that the Liberal party in Quebec had been fighting the clergy ever since that party existed, and that at least they had conquered the hierarchy. The right hon. gentleman obtained a great name for himself in the English provinces because of this and that is why they thought when they saw clause 16 of the original Bill that the Prime Minister had fallen from a very high place. It is that which has created the trouble we now hear of in the country.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. How did the Prime Minister fall down ?

Mr. BERGERON. Because in the English provinces in 1896 the right hon. gentleman was put on a very high pedestal in view of the stand he took, and when he fell he fell from a higher position in their opinion, than in 1896, if he remained with the rest of us who desired to give justice to the minority of Manitoba.

Mr. BELAND. What do you consider to be his fault ?

Mr. BERGERON. The newspapers which were full of compliments to the right hon. gentleman two or three years ago, now publish the most extraordinary statements about him, and say, he is not the man they expected him to be. That is what I call falling, in my estimation.

Mr. BELAND. In your estimation.

Mr. BERGERON. I am not speaking of myself ; I am stating the reason why there is so much turmoil in the country to-day. I tell my hon. friend the Minister of Justice for his own justification, that when clause 16 was put in the Bill, whether with or without consultation with any one, and, I would not blame him if he had consultation, when it was put in the Bill he should not have dropped it. My hon. friends from Quebec who stand behind the Prime Minister were ready to accept clause 16 and now are ready to accept the amended clause which is almost the reverse of what was provided for in clause 16. My hon. friends from Quebec know very well that the amended clause which we are now discussing cannot be a very good clause for the minority when the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) accepts it. The member for Brandon resigned because clause 16 was in the original Bill and now that he accepts the substituted clause it is quite plain that the new clause cannot be in favour of the Catholics of the Northwest. I tell the Minister of Justice that it would have been a great deal better for the country, and it would not be any worse for the minority in the Northwest Teritories, if there had been nothing at all mentioned about schools in the Bill, than that the original clause should have been withdrawn and this one substituted. My impression is, and there are some good lawyers who say so, that the Northwest Territories would have come in confederation with the schools, not the schools they have to-day, but with the schools provided for in the Act of 1875' and which was never repealed, although some ordinances had been placed upon the regulations by the Northwest legislature. If my hon friend had omitted the school clause and allowed the Act of 1875 to come into operation, the country would not have been in the condition it is in to-day ; a condition which is very dangerous. For weeks and weeks we have been talking what ?—talking nationality, talking religion when we have been living together for over 150 years. I hope in the interest of the country this will be the last occasion on which such a discussion will take place. I think this is the last question of the kind that will arise. Surely we are not going to buy another province ? These two are the last that we can organize and I hope this is the last occasion on which we will have such a discussion and that henceforth we shall work like patriotic Canadians, working separately, on different sides of the House, but working sincerely in the united effort to do what we believe to be best in the interests of the country.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT (Bellechasse). Mr. Speaker, at this late hour of the night I do not intend to impose upon the House a very long speech, because it is with a very strong sense of shame and with a feeling of reluctance that I now rise in answer to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) who has just taken his seat. After what has taken place in the province of Quebec since 1896 and when we know what the political record of that hon. gentleman is and when this hon. gentleman has the audacity to stand up in this House as the defender of the episcopate and the clergy of Quebec, I say that I rise to answer him now with a great sense of shame and reluctance. Every one in this House knows and sees through the hon. gentleman's motive at this moment—he wants to apologize to his leader because he is going to vote against his amendment ; and it is a shameful apology that he has given to the House during the last hour. The hon. gentleman thinks

he can swallow himself and cover his tracks from the public eye. The hon. gentleman now stands up as the defender of the episcopate of the province of Quebec; but what did we see this afternoon? We saw him applauding the abuse that fell from the lips of the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean). Thank God, Mr. Speaker, the clergy and the episcopate of the province of Quebec have not fallen so low as to require the defence of the hon. gentleman. The clergy of Quebec stand to-day, as they have always stood, highly respected and loved by every French Canadian and even by every Protestant of the province of Quebec and other provinces. What was the use of the hon. gentleman going so far back into ancient history as to talk about the elections of 1896? Is that the question before the House to-day? He wanted to know what was the reason the Papal ablegate was sent to Canada? No man knows the reason better than the hon. gentleman. He spoke of a certain document to which the name of the hon. Minister of Justice was attached. He knows where that document was prepared. He knows that it was prepared in the city of Quebec by two leading Tories, Mr. Chapais and Mr. L. P. Pelletier, who imposed that document on the episcopate. I remember very well, in the election of 1896, when the hon. leader of this House was in the parish of St. Raphael in my county, when Mr. Landry, Mr. Pelletier and Mr. Chapais came with that document before a couple of thousand of my electors, and asked the right hon. gentleman to sign it. What was his answer? He said: Go with that document to your leaders and get their signatures to it, and come to me afterwards, and I will then tell you what I will do. What was done to get some gentlemen to sign that document? I remember when Dr. Vaillancourt was fighting the battles of the Liberal party in the county of Dorchester adjoining mine, Mr. Pelletier, the great friend of the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), went to Dr. Vallaincourt and said to him, 'if you sign this document, we will allow you to be elected by acclamation.' Dr. Vallaincourt signed it, and the next day or the day after he had an opponent. What was the use of Liberals signing a document? Did we make anything as a party by doing so? Was not the clergy against us from beginning to end in 1896? Did we gain any votes in the province of Quebec by signing that document? On the contrary. What was the reason the people of Quebec as well as the people of every other province rose in their might on that occasion and carried the Liberals into power? It was because homes were deserted and windows and doors barred up, and where there had been happiness before there was nothing but wilderness and desolation. It was because of the strong feeling that the people had that a change had to come. There was distress for the farmers everywhere, and the people could see no prospect under Conservative rule except what had happened for eighteen or twenty years before—our people leaving Canada and going to the other side of the line for the bread which they were unable to earn on their own soil. That was the principal reason. My hon. friend from Beauharnois wants to involve the clergy of the province of Quebec again in political conflicts when we are leaving them alone. When he says there is no analogy between the fact that Archbishop Taché was brought from Rome to Canada and the fact that of the Papal ablegate being brought from Rome to Canada, we all know that there is an analogy in one respect. Archbishop Taché, before he died, left a letter, which is a portion of his will, in which he said that he had come to Canada at the request of the leader of the Conservative party; and he said: 'Promises were made to me, and the cause of my premature death at this moment is that those promises have never been fulfilled, and I have been deceived by the leaders of the Conservative party.' That is where the difference is, and that is where there is no analogy between the two cases. The Pope was not deceived at the time we remonstrated against the straight, direct intervention of the clergy in political contests in the province of Quebec. Though we were Liberals, we were just as good Catholics as my hon. friend, and why were we damned from some pulpits because we voted as Liberals? Why was it that in some of the pulpits some men went so far as to say: 'Hell is red, and heaven is blue; vote for the blue, and you are all right, but if you vote for the rouge, you are damned, and damned for ever.' Was it not time that the people of this country should have some protection from this kind of thing, so that we might vote as free men for the party in whom we had confidence. I am sorry to have to refer to these matters, and I would not have done so if the hon. member for Beauharnois had not dragged them on to the floor of this House. The hon. gentleman says he has been here for twenty-four years; but he forgot what happened between the twentieth and the twenty-fourth years.

Mr. BERGERON. It would have been twenty-eight years then.

Mr. TALBOT. He had time to reflect. One of the strong arguments that elected him in the last election in the county of Beauharnois was that his opponent was a Protestant and an Englishman. I do not say that the hon. gentleman used that argument, but his heelers used it. We saw it and read it in the papers at the time.

Mr. BERGERON. If my hon. friend will allow me, he was not there, but I was there all the time. He can ask his own friends in the county of Beauharnois. Never a word of that sort was said during the whole election.

Mr. TALBOT. The whole campaign in the town of Valleyfield was carried out on that very point.

Mr. MORIN. If the hon. member will allow me, I would like to correct a statement he made. He said that there was an agreement made between Mr. Landry, Mr. Chapais and Mr. Pelletier, and that even they would not live up to the agreement. To be sure, the agreement was made, but Mr. Pelletier, Mr. Chapais and Mr. Landry had nothing to do with it after it was signed. The people of Dorchester were very angry at that, and they said : It is not Pelletier, it is not Landry, it is not Chapais, who will choose the candidate for Dorchester—we will choose him ourselves ; and I was chosen.

Mr. TALBOT. When the document to which I refer was signed and was published and sent abroad to every one of us, my hon. friend from Dorchester was not born politically; so he knows nothing about it. He came at the last minute, like mustard after dinner.

Mr. MORIN. I was not supposed to know what took place before I came into Canada.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT. There is one thing more I wish to say. My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has now gone out of the House. I wished to remind him of a certain speech that he made in the elections of 1900, to show him why the people of Quebec gave the verdict they then gave. In the county of Kamouraska, at St. Pascal, six or seven of these gentlemen came one day, and among them the member for Beauharnois. When speaking he went so far as to treat the Liberals like animals being in a trough, and so deep in the trough that their horns got caught and they could not get out. That is the way he treated the Liberals of Quebec in county after county. Is it any wonder to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberals rebelled against such treatment, and they returned the right hon. gentleman to power with such a large majority ? Sir, I hope this is the last time we shall hear the episcopacy and priesthood of Quebec dragged into discussions of this kind. After all, we were only fighting for our political freedom. Since the Papal ablegate came to this country, and even since Rome has been directly represented in Canada, we have had peace in the province of Quebec, and perfect liberty. to vote just as we pleased, and we have had no more trouble.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). I have a few words to say, even at this late hour. The leader of the opposition is supposed by some hon. gentlemen to have made an apology here this evening. I want to say that I did not so understand him ; because if there is one thing in the leader of the opposition of which I am proud, it is that he is always so guarded in anything he says that it is unnecessary for him to offer any apology to the House afterwards. Now it has been said to-night that, owing to the presence of the Papal ablegate in the province of Quebec, the citizens of that province are enjoying political liberty. I want to say as representing an Ontario constituency that I am very glad to know that the Papal ablegate is having such a good influence in the province of Quebec. I am not going to charge the people of Quebec with being bigots because they cannot agree among themselves, and because they require the presence of a Papal ablegate in order that they may enjoy political liberty. I hope they may long continue to enjoy that liberty. But I wish to say that I entertain different views from the majority of the people of the province of Quebec, though I am glad to say that my father was born in the city of Quebec, and I have a friendly feeling for that province. But I differ from a large number of my friends from that province. I am a Protestant, and I have no hesitation in saying it ; and when I say that I do not think that I am incurring the contempt of any hon. gentleman from Quebec. Now the belief of Protestants, and of the great majority of the electors I represent, is this : We say that in the administration of state affairs in this country the government has no right to act as I hold the First Minister has done in this particular instance. Will any man say that I am a bigot because I make this declaration ? That is my right, that is my privilege. I want to say in making that statement that I can place my finger on dozens of supporters of the government who entertain the same views, and so does the large bulk of the constituents who elected them.

I want to point out to the right hon. gentleman that at the last Dominion election the gentlemen who form his cabinet were elected on the principle of representative government. Now as a Protestant my faith teaches me to find fault with the right hon. gentleman for refusing, or at all events for neglecting, to consult with the representatives of the people who were in his cabinet, the ministers of the Crown, on this important and vital question, namely, the educational clauses of this Bill. The leader of the opposition and other members on this side of the House, have asked a straight and practical question, that is of vital moment to me as a Protestant, and of vital moment to the people I represent, who are largely Protestants ; the right hon. gentleman has been asked the question calmly and squarely, whether or not he had con-

sulted with the Papal ablegate with respect to the educational clauses of this Bill, and he has refused to answer that question. In view of that fact I am justified, on behalf of the people I represent, in saying to the right hon. gentleman that they do not approve of his course because it is against their religious faith, and we do not believe in that system of administering the government of this country. That is my position, and in making that statement I do not think my Quebec friends can take offence. Possibly, they believe that the first Minister has done quite right in consulting the Papal ablegate, I have no fault to find with them for that, they have a perfect right to their opinions and a right to express them, as I have a perfect right to express contrary opinions.

Now, much has been said about Bishop Taché and Mr. Ewart. I was in Manitoba when Bishop Taché was there, and I know something of the arrangement that was entered into with the minority in the province of Manitoba. When the Mackenzie government were in power, delegates came from Manitoba to Ottawa for the purpose of securing more money to conduct their government. The answer Mr. Mackenzie gave was this: Go back to your own province and see if, by wiser economy, you cannot administer your affairs more economically, then I may be in a position to grant you more financial assistance. The chief fault Mr. Mackenzie found with them was that they had two chambers, they had a legislative council and he thought a new province like that ought to abolish the legislative council, and he promised if they would exercise economy in that matter, he would be willing possibly to assist them financially. I was a government employee there at the time, and I remember the promise made squarely to the minority of the province, as represented in the legislative council that if they would vote themselves out of existence they would continue to exercise all the rights they had had up to that moment. Mr. Davis, who was prime minister, ex-Attorney General Clarke, who had been defeated during the session and others, pledged themselves that the minority should continue to exercise their rights for all time to come. But when the Manitoba school question came up in this House, I was here, and representing a strong Protestant constituency. I voted in favour of remedial legislation. And I want to tell my hon. friends from Quebec, that, while many of my constituents found fault with me for voting in favour of the legislation, I told them straightforwardly that if they elected me again and Sir Charles Tupper's government was sustained and reintroduced remedial legislation for Manitoba, I would vote for it as I had done before, to protect the rights of the minority. When hon. gentlemen opposite accuse the leader of the opposition and his supporters of being unwilling to give the minority in Manitoba their rights, I want to tell them that one stands here who is ready to vote to secure the rights of any minority in this country, Catholic or Protestant. I was astonished to hear the ex-Minister of the Interior the other night utter these words, which I find reported on page 3253 of this year's 'Hansard':

> Therefore, in 1896 when this settlement was made—and it was a settlement that hon. gentlemen opposite had refused to accept—although it was a settlement which led my right hon. friend the leader of the government out of a great difficulty and made his path smooth, yet the settlement has never been combated or criticised by any member of this House from that time up to the present moment.

There has never been a session since 1896 when reference has not been made to the Manitoba school question. How the ex-Minister of the Interior could have made such a statement I cannot conceive. I can only assume it as conclusive evidence that he is not well posted on what takes place in this House.

It is true that reference was had, as has been said, to Archbishop Taché and Mr. Ewart. We, as Protestants, do not object to that, for both Archbishop Taché and Mr. Ewart were citizens of this country. If the Conservative Prime Minister chose to consult them he had a perfect right to do so. The present Prime Minister would have the right to do the same. But we draw a distinction here—the papal delegate is not a citizen of this country. There are Catholic bishops who have the welfare of the church at heart as well as the Papal delegate, and if the Prime Minister, after consulting his cabinet, wishes to consult any of them, we have no fault to find. But when he goes outside, we believe, as Protestants, that he has gone beyond the proper line.

Now, I would like to say to hon. gentlemen opposite who differ with me in the matter of religion that it is not well to be too sensitive as to the way members express their views on this question. The question comes before us, as we believe, not in proper course. Had this Autonomy Bill been brought in minus the educational clauses, the people of the Northwest Territories would have continued to enjoy the same privileges in education that they now have, unless those privileges were curtailed by the legislature we might create. But, if the legislature made such changes we believe they would be within their rights. And I am prepared to vote against any interference with their freedom in educational matters.

Just a word or two with regard to the accusation that hon. gentlemen on this side are backward in expressing their views on this question. There are gentlemen on this side who do not agree with me on

the questions involved in this Bill. They hold their views honestly, and have a right to hold and to express them. And they have expressed their views frankly. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) made one of the best speeches of the session in explaining his views on this question, though those views were not the same that I hold. Is he to be found fault with because he has honestly stated his position? Certainly not. And the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), who offered this criticism, it seems to me, has not shown much courage in speaking out on this question. When the Bill was introduced with section 16, as it originally was, he made the statement:

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have not spoken on the Bill yet.

Mr. INGRAM. Then, why should he find fault because some on this side have not spoken and say they lack courage?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not understand what my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) is talking about.

Mr. INGRAM. If the hon. gentleman will read 'Hansard' to-morrow, he will find that he spoke of men on this side of the House as not having courage to speak out. He told them to come from behind the leader of the opposition and express themselves.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think I did say something like that.

Mr. INGRAM. I think the country would have been better satisfied if the Minister of Justice himself had spoken on the measure. He has a great deal to do with this Bill:—And I am bound to say that hitherto the hon. gentleman has always handled legislation he had in charge in a manner to reflect credit upon himself and upon the government. But I think, he has been a little careless, perhaps, in not making a speech a little earlier that might have——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Is there any chance of converting my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram)? If so, I will speak at the very next sitting of the House.

Mr. INGRAM. I am bound to say that there is not the slightest chance. Let me point out to the Minister of Justice the fact that clever lawyers on his own side have spoken on the Bill, but these clever lawyers do not agree. If the Minister of Justice himself had stated first what these clauses did contain, we might have been saved some of the exhibitions we have had in this House in connection with the Bill, and perhaps we should not have had the slurring allusions which we have had from the ex-Minister of the Interior and others concerning the Minister of Justice.

Motion (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjourn negatived.

PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY IN THE NORTHWEST.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 69) to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta, and the amendment of Mr. R. L Borden, thereto.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY (North Simcoe). I suppose at this late hour, one would hardly be expected to resume this debate. The debate of to-day has thrown considerable light on surrounding circumstances in connection with the Bill, and I think perhaps, if we have a chance of digesting what has been said to-day, it may shorten the remarks of to-morrow. I would therefore ask the hon. the Prime Minister to allow me to again move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BARKER. Before the House adjourns, I would like to remind the hon. gentleman that on Friday last he said he would look into the question as to whether or not there was any correspondence with the government of Ontario as to the extension of the boundaries of that province. It was said that there was correspondence of the late government of Hon. G. W. Ross and his colleagues.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. About the boundaries of Manitoba and Ontario?

Mr. BARKER. In regard to any extension of Ontario.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, there has been no correspondence.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 2.05 a.m., Friday.

Erratum Slip for Commons Hansard Index, 1905.

NAMES.

Mr. Foster :—G.T.P. Ry., Winnipeg Terminals, Cor. *re* (remarks) 6311 (iv), should read 9812 (v).

Mr. Préfontaine :—Midland Govt. Dock, Tenants, Rent, &c. (Ans.) 5482, should read 5428 (iii).

SUBJECTS.

Public Works :—Ottawa Buildings, Elevator Attendance ; in Com. of Sup., 1667 (i), 6916 (iv), 9551 (v), should read 1667 (i), 6816 (iv), 9551 (v).

Supply, Railways, I.C.R. :—Campbellton Improvements, 1963 (i), should read 1968 (i).

Supply, Railways, I.C.R. :—Increased Accommodation, 2031 (ii), 6429 (iv), 9391, 9432 (v), should read 2031 (ii), 6429 (iv), 9391, 9482 (v).

INDEX

FIRST SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT, 1905.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist ; *, without remarks or debate ; Accts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass.; Assurance ; B., Bill ; B.C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway ; Com., Committee ; Co., Company ; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Consider ; Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence ; Deb., Debate ; Dept., Department ; Depts., Departments ; Div., Division ; Dom., Dominion ; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General ; Hse., House ; H. of C., House of Commons ; Incorp., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance ; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved ; Neg., Negatived ; N.B., New Brunswick ; N.W.T., North-west Territories ; N.S., Nova Scotia ; O.C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario ; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island ; P.O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques. Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp., Special ; Stmnt., Statement ; Sup., Supply ; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn ; Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y.N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

Adamson, Mr. A. J., *Humboldt.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5114 ; (election of members) in Com., 5776 (iii); (distribution of seats) 8740 (v).

Western Life Insurance Co.'s Incorp. B. 108, 1°*, 2184 (ii); in Com., 4684 (iii).

Alcorn, Mr. G. O., *Prince Edward, Ont.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4375; in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7960 (iv).

Bay of Quinte, Lighthouse *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).

Criminal Code (summary appeals) Amt. B. 45 (Mr. Porter) on Amt. (Mr. Bureau) *re* Race Courses, 5137 (iii).

Immigration Association in Prince Edward County (remarks) in Com. of Supply, 7706 (iv).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1205 (i).

SUPPLY :

Immigration (interpreters) 7706 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (life-saving awards) 2624 (ii).

Ames, Mr. H. B., *Montreal, St. Antoine.*

'Acadia' Str., Disposition of Fittings, &c., (Ques.) 1849 (i).

Acetylene Gas Lights, Number, Annual Saving, &c. (Ques.) 1592 (i).

Adulteration of Food, Inspection *re* (remaks) in Com. of Sup., 1723 (i).

Advances by O.C., Total Amount, &c. (Ques.) 267 (i).

Ames, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*

Alberta Steam Service, Number of Navigable Miles, &c. (Ques.) 6904 (iv).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co., Claims of Damages, Amounts paid (Ques.) 2063 (ii).

——— (remarks) 7021 (iv).

——— Rep. of Mr. Mothersill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9382 (v).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4504 (iii); in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8006 (v) ; on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7789, 7829, 7880, 7930, 7951 (iv).

Bissonnette, vs. Crown, Illegal Stamping of Letters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 194 (i).

Boots and Shoes, Imports and Exports, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7216 (iv).

Bout de l'Isle, Repentigny and Charlemagne Ferry Service (Ques.) 9696 (v).

British American Fish Corporation, Contract *re* N. Western Lakes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2897 (ii).

Buoy Contracts, Tenders, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2742 (ii).

Butter in Cold Storage, Shipped by Allan SS. Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 881 (i).

'Canada'-'Cape Breton' Collision, Resignation of Capt. Salmon, (M. for cor.) 384 (i).

———'Statement of Case', (M. for ret.*) 2067.

———(remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2625 (ii).

Caplin and Paspebiac Ry., Payments *re* Subsidy, (M. for ret.) 3203 (ii).

Ames, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
Carbide purchased for Lighthouses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2710, 2743 (ii).
——— Quantity and Price (Ques.) 914 (i).
Copyright Act *re* Photographs, Amt. Legislation, &c. (Ques.) 1849 (i).
Dental Institute: *See* 'Franking Privilege'.
Electoral Lists in N.W.T., Names of Qualified Electors, &c. (Ques.) 7422 (iv).
Fishing Bounties Distribution, Rep. *re* Frauds (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2911 (ii).
Fort William Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6730 (iv).
Franking Privilege, Abuse of, *re* Circulars from Dental Institute (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1807 (i).
Govt. Steamers, Coal Supply (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2605 (ii).
——— Supplies, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2620 (ii).
——— circular *re* supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6464 (iv).
See 'Marine.'
Grain Survey Board, Recommendation from Montreal Board of Trade (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7230 (iv).
——— Pets., Memorials, &c., *re* (M. for copies) 1763 (i).
——— Toronto and Montreal, Appnmts. *re*, Names, &c. (Ques.) 910 (i).
Hamilton Cove, Que., P.O., Mail Service and Revenue (Ques.) 7421 (iv).
Harbour Buoys, Contracts with Companies *re* Placing, &c. (M. for ret.*) 917 (i).
Hodgins, Jonathon, Resignation from Montreal Harbour Commission (Ques.) 151 (i).
Hospital Dues for Sick Mariners Fund (remarks) in Com of Sup., 2687 (ii).
Immigration Arrangements for a Refund, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9322 (v).
Immigration Property, Montreal, Leased by Govt. (Ques.) 913 (i).
'Lady Laurier' Govt. Str., Repairs *re* Accident (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2597 (ii).
Lemieux, Jos., Appnmt. *re* Lightship Service, Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 1762 (i).
Lighthouse Supply Depots (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2709 (ii).
Lowe, Mr., Refusal *re* Ship 'Neptune' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6472 (iv).
'Lurcher' Lightship, Accident to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2855 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2752 (ii).
Mail Distributing Stations, Montreal, Purchase of Site, &c (Ques.) 915 (i).
'Maisonneuve,' Expenditure, &c, Duties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2744 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1849 (i).

Ames, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Circulars *re* private Tenders, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1399 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 4753 (iii).
See 'Govt.,' &c.
Molson's Bank Amt. (B. 14) 1° m., 317; in Com., 1755 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Appnmt. of Members (Ques.) 150 (i).
Montreal, Free Port, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7317 (iv).
——— Raising of Sunken Elevator, &c. (Ques.) 151 (i).
——— Removal of Shoals, &c (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7319 (iv).
——— Sheds, Cor. between P. W. St. George and Mar. Dept., *re* (M.) for copies, 689 (i).
——— Steel Sheds, Approval of Plans, &c. (Ques.) 151 (i).
——— Steel Freight Sheds, Rep. of Mr. Geo. S. Green *re* Plan, &c. (M. for copies*) 3204 (ii).
——— Sheds, Claims of P. Lyall & Sons, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1397 (i).
——— (Ques.) 687 (i)
Montreal Inland Revenue Building, Addition and Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1120 (i).
Montreal Post Office, Charges *re* Registered Letters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 183 (i).
——— Illegal Stamping of Letters for Election Matters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 194 (i).
——— Pneumatic System, Installation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1135, 1136 (i).
——— St. Catherine St. Branch, Unsanitary Condition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 182 (i)
——— Stealing of Cheques, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 198 (i).
Naval Militia, Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2909 (ii).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contracts *re* Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9323 (v).
Ocean and River Service, Removing Obstruction, &c. (Ques.) 151 (i).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 2540 (ii).
Protection to Women, Children, Pet. *re* Wife Beaters and Criminal Code (Ques.) 591 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners' Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. Prefontaine) in Com., 1243 (i).
St. George, Mr. P. W., Emplymt by Govt., (Ques.) 152 (i).
St. John, Halifax and W. Indies Mail Subsidies, Res. from Montreal Corn Exchange (read) 7178 (iv).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, in Com. of Sup., 2482 (ii).

Ames, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*

——— Aids to Navigation, 2858; Res. of Montreal Board of Trade (read) 2859 (ii).

——— Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 2461 (ii).

St. Louis, Capt., Reinstatement, Certificate *re* (Ques.) 591 (i).

Salmon, Capt., Resignation, &c. (M. for cor.) 384 (i).

See 'Canada,' &c.

Salmon Hatcheries and Provincial Fishing Leases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2905 (ii).

Seamen's Act Amt. B: 147 (Mr. Prefontaine) in Com., 7425 (iv).

Sorel Shipyards, Dredge Building, &c. (remarks in Com. of Sup., 6448 (iv).

——— Purchase of Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2486 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Adulteration of Food (Act violations, &c.) 1723 (i).

Canals—Trent (dredge engine) 9381 (v).

Chinese Immigration (salaries) 981 (i).

Fisheries (hatcheries) 2905; (inspectors' salaries) 2890 (ii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6401 (iv), 9323 (v).

Inspection of Staples (grain inspection) 7230 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies) 2705; (aids to navigation) 2758, 2858; (buoy contracts) 2742; (engineers' salaries) 2761; lightships, maintenance) 2706; (Marconi stations) 2869; (pilotage) 2760; (salaries) 2703; (submarine signals) 2877 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G. B. and Canada) 881; (Quebec and Natashquan) 967 (i); (St. John and W. Indies) 7088, 7178 (iv).

Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 2687 (iv).

Miscellaneous (Pacific Cable grant) 7239 (iv).

Ocean and River Service ('Aberdeen' boilers) 6465; (Arctic expedition) 6472; (examination of masters and mates) 2623; (govt. steamers) 2596; (icebreakers) 6464; (steamers, maintenance) 6464; (wrecks investigations) 6466 (iv).

Penitentiaries—(contract supplies) 479; (general expenditure) 476 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Richibucto) 6814 (iv); N.W.T. (Strathcona Horse barraks) 1637; Que. (Montreal Inland Rev.) 1120; (Montreal P.O., improvements) 1127; Montreal P.O., pneumatic system) 1136 (i); (Quebec hospital) 9547 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Cow Bay) 7401; (Inverness Mines) 7405; (Janvrin's Island) 7406; (Larry's River) 7407; (Mabou bridge) 7408; (Mahone bay) 7408; (Meteghan) 7413; (Port Hood) 7414; (West Arichat) 7419 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Barachois de Malbaie) 7287; (Bic wharf) 7288; (Canton Fabre) 7288; (Chambord wharf) 7289; (Chicoutimi) 7377; (Descente des Femmes wharf) 7307; (Doucet's Landing) 6850, 7299; (East Templeton wharf) 7303; (Grand Machins) 7304; (Grande Piles dam) 7329; (Lake St. John dredging) 7306; (Little Pabos) 7307; (Mont Louis wharf) 7310; (Montmorency wharf) 7312; (New Carlisle wharf) 7312; (Nicolet pier) 7313; (Notre Dame du Portage wharf) 7314; (harbour works) 6727; (Repentigny wharf) 7314; (Rimouski pier) 7320 (iv); (St. Lawrence channel) 2461 (ii); (St. Lawrence channel, suction dredge) 6447 (iv); (St. Mary's current) 814 (i); (St. Maurice dredging) 7326 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 9385; (Indiantown branch) 9482; Miscellaneous (Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. investigation) 9382 (v).

Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 7216 (iv).

Trading Stamp Abolition, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 7684 (iv).

Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 726 (i).

Wrecking Plants in St. Lawrence Channel, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2479 (ii).

Yukon Ter. Reforms, on M. (Mr. Thompson) to M. for Sup., 7041 (iv).

Armstrong, Mr. J. E., *East Lambton.*

Adulteration of Jams, &c., Prosecutions *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1710 (i).

Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 2437 (ii).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5457, 5486; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4767 (iii); in Com. (distribution of seats) 7729; (lands vested in Crown) 5986 (iv).

——— School Clause Amts.(remarks) in Com., 5867 (iii).

Bank Notes, Printing, &c. (renarks) in Com. of Sup., 6252 (iv).

Bell, Dr., and Director of Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9305 (v).

Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1073 (i).

Cold Storage, *re* Atlantic Steamers on M. for Sup., 8183 (v).

——— Thermograph Records, &c. (Ques.) 2774 (ii).

Experimental Station in Niagara District, Cor., &c., Inquiry for, 7677 (iv).

Fessenden Wireless Tel. of Canada Co.'s incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6381 (iv).

Galena Oil Co., President's Name, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2254 (ii).

Geological Reports, Distribution, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sep., 9621 (v).

Grand Bend Pier, Delay in Building, &c. (Ans.) 1344 (i).

Grimsby, Establishment of Farm, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6166 (iv).

House of Commons, High Temperature, Regulation of (remarks) 9303 (v).

I.C.R., Advertising Car, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2257 (ii).

Armstrong, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Freight Diversion and Traffic Arrangements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2233 (ii).
——— Purchases *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2182 (ii).
Jams, Preserves, &c., Adulteration of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1710 (i).
Japan Exhibition, Trade Increase *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6273 (iv).
Kitchen, Mr., Contract for Murray Harbour Branch Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2138 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c., Total Vote (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9617 (v).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2138 (ii).
Niagara Fruit Growers' Association, Cor., &c., Inquiry for, 9395 (v).
Oils for Illuminating Purposes, Testing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7617 (iv).
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contracts, Tender of Conmee & Bowman, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4478 (iii).
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1322 (i).
Railway Commissioners B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1619 (i).
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at London and Oxford Elections (M.) to adjn., 7331 (iv).
Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 103 (Mr. Tobin) on M. for 2°, 2297 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery, Cost of Establishment, &c., on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Ret., 2082 (ii).
St. Joseph Pier, Lake Huron, Delay *re* Completion (Ques.) 2774 (ii).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 338 (i).
SUPPLY :
Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1701, 1710 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c (exhibitions) 6273 ; (experimental farms) 6166 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (enlargement) 6294; (Mill street paving) 6301 (iv).
Canals—St. Lawrence (shoals) 6289; St. Peters (dredging) 6303; Soulanges (construction) 6290 (iv).
Canals—Trent (Holland River) 9374 (v) : (lowering floor of lock) 6302 ; (surveys) 6292 (iv).
Canals—Welland (electric plant) 1231 (i) ; (long level deepening) 6291 (iv) ; (Port Colborne elevator) 1322 (i).
Civil Govt. —Interior (mines branch) 6265 (iv).
Customs (collectors' salaries) 409 (i).
Dom. Lands (homestead inspectors) 9261 (v) ; (inspectors salaries, &c.) 6419 ; (maps, printing, &c.) 6426; (surveys, maps, &c) 6406 (iv).
Legislation—H. of C. (telephone evidence translation) 9621 (v).
Miscellaneous (tariff commission) 9614 (v).

Armstrong, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additions to H. of C.) 9544 (v); (elevator attendance) 1667 ; (H. of C. improvements) 1565; (lighting) 1667; (Royal Mint) 609; (steel shelving) 1564; (telephones) 1669 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Grand Bend) 7553 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 7613; (clerical assistance) 7620; (Ottawa river works) 7613 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges (N.W.T., Battle river) 7590; (Bryson) 7586; (colonization roads) 7594; Ottawa (repairs) 7585 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—B.C. (Kamloops) 7610; Mar. Provs. (Bay St. Lawrence) 7608; N.W.T. (working expenses) 7633; Que. (Bersimis, &c.) 7609 (iv).
Quarantine (cattle) 2314 (ii).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, construction, &c.) 2287, 2298 (ii), 9498 (v); P.E.I. (agents' houses) 2180; (Murray Harbour and bridge) 2138 (ii).
Thermograph Records, Cold Storage on Steamers, &c (M. for ret.*) 2778 (ii).
See ' Cold Storage.'
Transportation Commission, Progress *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6447 (iv).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) in Com., 717, 1774 (i).
Ventilation in House of Commons, &c (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).

Avery, Mr. M., *Frontenac.*
Ballot Box Frauds in Dom. Elections, on M. (Mr. Porter) to Com. of Sup., 9211 (v).

Barker, Mr. Saml., *East Hamilton.*
Apples, Packing for Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 739 (i).
Auditor General's Resignation and Audit Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6529 (iv).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 9659; 9671 (v).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5354; (Alberta boundaries) in Com., 5616, 5635 (iii); (Crown Lands) 8173; (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8052 (v); on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7774, 7953 (iv); (election of members) in Com., 5769; (H. of C. representation) in Com., 5751 (iii); (lands vested in Crown) in Com., 6006 (iv); (laws, courts, &c.) in Com., 5932; (Lt. Gov.'s powers) in Com., 5782 (iii); (school clause amt.) 7173 (iv).
——— on M. for 3°, Amt. (Rupert's Land) 8864 (v).
Autonomy (Saskatchewan) B. 70, sec. 12 (distribution of seats) in Com., 8750; (Rupert's Land) Amt. 8761 (v).
Ballot Box Frauds, on M. (Mr. Porter) to Com. of Sup., 9225 (v).
Bank Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8689 (v).

Barker, Mr. Saml.—*Con.*
Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Denial *re* Election Speaking, 557 (i).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4237; on M. for 3°, 4413 (iii).
Canada Eastern Ry. Co., Purchase, &c., on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Ret., 735 (i).
Canada Life Assurance Co., Ref. to in Com. on B. 108, 4684 (iii).
Canadians detained at U.S. Borders, Letter (read) 5920 (iii).
Circulars issued by Mr. Cote *re* Census Returns (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 1098 (i).
Coal for Govt. Rys., from N. S. Mines, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 2191 (ii).
Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4267 (iii).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) in Com., 4972 (iii).
Dredges, Working Expenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 805 (i).
Dundonald Park and Ottawa Improvement Commission (remarks) in Com. on B. 180, 8687 (v).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 2106, 3212 (ii).
Fessenden Wireless Tel. Co. of Canada incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6381, 6609 (iv).
Fishing Leases granted to F. H. Markey, in Western Lakes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2903 (ii).
Gillies Brothers Limited B. 95 (Mr. A. A. Wright) in Com., 2763 (ii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4123, 4205; on M. for 3°, 4228 (iii).
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) on M. for 3°, 7853 (iv).
G.T. Pacific, &c., Agreements with National Transcontinental Ry. Act (Ques.) 2776 (ii).
——— Terminals, Plans deposited with Dept. on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret. 2822, 2825 (ii).
Great Northern Ry. of Canada B. 71 (Mr. J. T. Shell) in Com., 4259 (iii).
House of Commons, Supplies, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6615 (iv).
Inland Revenue Act (guarantee bonds) Amt B. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8678 (v).
I.C.R. and C.A. Ry. Act (running rights) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 4194 (iii); in Com., 6152, 7584 (iv).
I.C.R. and G.T.R. Arbitration, &c. (remarks) 69 (i).
I.C.R., Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1956 (i).
——— Reply to Financial Statement (Mr. Emmerson) 7446, 7467 (iv.).
——— Rolling Stock, Estimate of Cost, &c., in Com. of Sup., 9506 (v).
Japanese Trade with Canada, Discrimination *re* Canadian Manufactures, Quotation from 'Industrial Canada' (read) 6654 (iv).

Barker, Mr. Saml.—*Con.*
Killam, Judge, Appnmt. as Chairman of Ry. Commission (remarks) on M. for Com. on Res., 521 (i).
Locomotives built and purchased for I.C.Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1966 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, Letter of Mr. Rogers sent to Prime Minister (remarks) 4023 (ii).
Murray & Cleveland, Claims for Extras *re* Galops Canal : in Com. of Sup., 1221 (i).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2135, 2165 (ii).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9478 (v).
Northwest Territories B. 160 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8768 (v).
Ontario Boundaries Extension, Cor. with Ross Govt., Inquiry for, 3590, 4078 (ii).
Ontario Fire Ins. Co.'s incorp B. 105 (Mr. Boyce) in Com., 2772 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2716 (ii).
Ottawa City Act Amt. B. 180 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8687 (v).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 4969, 5738 (iii).
Pearson, Geo., Relief B. 153 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 7623 (iv).
Pitblado, Isaac, Relief (B. 185) 1°*, 7906 (iv).
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Bowman & Conmee's Tender, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4472, 4667 (iii).
Port Colborne Breakwater, Elevator, &c., Cor., Papers, &c. (M. for copies*) 2067 (ii).
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1292 (i).
Provl. Govt. in N.W. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Works under Contract, Supervision Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7590 (iv).
Ry. Act (crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 3236 (ii).
——— (express companies) Amt B. 4 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for Adjnmt., 3247 (ii).
Railway Commissioners, Appnmt. of Chairman B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com., 521; in Com. on Res., 580 (i).
Railway Surveys in Joliette Co., Instructions, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2066 (ii).
Returning Officers, Forms and Instruction *re* Dom. Elections (M. for copies*) 697 (i).
——— Instruction *re* Form of Oaths, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7348 (iv).
Rivière Ouelle Spur Line (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1981 (i).
Royal Mint, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 618 (i).
Russian Priests canvassing for Conservatives (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9264 (v).
Seamen's Act B. 147 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 7434 (iv).

Barker, Mr. Saml.—*Con.*
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1204 (i).
Sidings and Spur Lines, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 1970 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9346 (v).
Spirits in Bond, Age Limit, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8683 (v).
Submarine Signalling Bells: in Com. of Sup., 2874, 2885 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c.—Experimental Farms (bulletins) 6928 (iv); (Patent Record) 1473 (i).
Canals—Galops (enlargement) 1220 (i) ; Trent (Holland river) 9360 ; (surveys of dams) 9377 (v); Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1292; (surveys) 1234 (i).
Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 77, 90; Customs (salaries) 79; Privy Council (salaries) 72; Sec. of State (salaries) 76 (i).
Customs (expenses) 262 (i).
Fisheries (inspectors' salaries) 2885 (ii).
House of Commons (Sergeant-at-Arms, salaries) 6610 (iv).
Indians—Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6517, 6520 ; Man. and N.W.T. (live stock) 6540; N.B. (medical attendance) 6516; (seed grain) 6516 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7515 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoys) 2729 (ii); (lighthouse repairs) 6638 (iv); (submarine signals) 2874 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 981 (i).
Miscellaneous (secret service) 6958 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (schools of navigation) 2645 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Glace Bay) 1035; (Halifax, Dom. building) 1037; (Shelburne) 1044; (Sydney P.O.) 1045; Ottawa (Royal Mint) 607; Que. (Chicoutimi) 1106; (Grosse Isle) 1108 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers Generally (dredging) 805 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Baddeck) 7396; (Bridgewater) 7398; (Carlos Breakwater) 7398; (Cow Bay, Port Morien) 7401; (Inverness Mines) 7405; (Margaree) 7410 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Cobourg) 7549; (Collingwood) 7550; (Hamilton harbour) 7556; (Lake Temiscaming) 7559; (Little Current) 7560; (Midland) 7561; (Otonabee River) 7564; (repairs, &c.) 7555; (Sarnia) 7564; (Spanish river) 7565 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Ste. Famille wharf) 7390; (St. Fidele) 7391 ; (St. François de Sales) 7391 ; (St. Fulgence) 7392 ; (St. Louis Feeders) 7385 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Dom. colonization roads) 7601 ; (traffic bridges) 7592 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (additional sidings, &c.) 1970 (i); (bridge strengthening) 9386 (v); (Campbellton) 1968 ; (capital expenditure) 1956 (i); (double tracking) 9390; (engine houses) 9389 (v); (general vote) 7446, 7467 (iv); (Memramcook accommodation) 1977 (i); (Moncton accommodation) 9391 (v); (Newcastle improvements) 1967 (i); (Pictou accommodation) 9390 (v) ; (rolling stock) 2037 (ii), 9501 (v); (St. Fabien subway) 1981 (i); (St. John accommodation) 9389 (v); (St. Moise station) 1976; (semaphores) 1986; (steel rails, fastenings, &c.) 1988 (i), 2038 (ii).
Railways—P.E.I. (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2041, 2135 (ii).
Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Zimmerman) in Com., 4259 (iii).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. D. Ross) on M. for 2°, 4701 (iii); in Com., 8315, 8637 (v).
Western Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4686 (iii).
Woodl'l, Seymour, Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ques.) 2191 (ii).

Barr, Mr. J., *Dufferin.*
Apples, Packing for Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 677 (i).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3921 (ii); (laws, courts, &c.) in Com., 5933 (iii); (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8518; on M. for 3° on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 8837 (v).
Cement : in Com. on Ways and Means, 8992 (v).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 1001; in Com., 644 (i).
Chesley Postmastership Vacancy, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 9081 (v).
Citizens' Bank of Canada (B. 133) 1°*, 4271 (iii); in Com., 5973 (iv).
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9425 (v).
Dredges, Hiring, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6842 (iv).
Franking Privilege, Use of Stamp *re* Documents, &c. (remarks) 5134 (iii), 5963, 6834, 6961 (iv).
House of Commons, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1568 (i).
Immigrants, Number arriving in 1904, &c. (Ques.) 1148 (i).
Immigration of Skilled Labour and Toronto Labour Council, on M. (Mr. Foster) 7510 (iv).
Inland Revenue Act (guarantee bonds) Amt. B. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8681 (v).
Jams, &c., Adultaration of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1712 (i).
Lump-jaw in Cattle (remarks) on Conc., 6917 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9470 (v).
Officials dismissed by Mr. Whitney (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iv).

Barr, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3135 (ii).
Parole System for Convicts (remarks) in Com of Sup., 471 (i).
Post Office Regulations *re* Distribution of Packages sent to Postmasters, Cor., &c. (read) 6834 (iv).
See 'Franking', &c.
——— Packages, Inquiry for, 6961 (iv).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'
Royal Mint, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 618 (i).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 335, 1167 (i).
Shelburne Postmaster, Dismissal, &c., Cor. *re* (M. for copies) 595 (i).
Shelburne P.O. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1043 (i).
Spirits in Bond, Age, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8681 (v).
SUPPLY:
Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1700 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Can. exhibits at Imperial Institute) 1838 (i); (experimental farms) 6166; (bulletins) 6928 (iv); (Year Book) 1475 (i).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 9058; (patent branch) 9057 (v); Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 6266 (iv).
Dom. Lands (maps, printing, &c.) 6425 (iv).
Excise (methylated spirits) 1691; (travelling expenses) 1689 (i).
Geological Survey (salaries) 9249 (v).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6388 (iv).
Indians—Ont. and Que. (Treaty No. 9) 9336 (v).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (keepers' salaries) 2697 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Canals Celebration, Sault Ste. Marie) 9621; (International Congress, Reception at Quebec) 9622 (v).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, maintenance) 2618; (schools of navigation) 2640 (ii); (winter mail service) 6467 (iv).
Penitentiaries (parole system) 471 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (St. John quarantine) 1053 (i); N.W.T. (Edmonton) 9550 (v); N.S. (Shelburne) 1043 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additions, &c.) 9544 (v); (H. of C. improvements) 1568; (Printing Bureau, addition) 1575 (i); (Rideau Hall, grounds) 9551 (v); (Royal Mint) 618 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Apple River wharf) 1731.
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bracebridge) 7547; (Grand River dredging) 6873; (Collingwood) 7549; (Little Current) 7560; (Midland) 7561; (Ottawa locks) 7561; (Owen Sound) 7561 (iv), 9600 (v); (Penetanguishene) 7563 (iv); (Saugeen) 9602 (v); (Wiarton) 7569 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (McPherson's cove) 1735 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (compensation to Jos. Paul) 6463; (Doucet's Landing) 6849; (Maskinongé river) 6842.
Quarantine (Grosse Isle steamer) 1838; (William's Head) 1841 (i).

Barr, Mr. J.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Steamboat Inspection (salaries) 2695.
Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 1696; (standards) 1695 (i).
Telephone System, Investigation, &c., on M. (Sir Wm. Mulock) for Sel. Com., 2684.
Temiscamingue, Establishment of Experimental Farm (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6167 (iv).
Thessalon Postmaster, Mr. J. B. Dobey, Irregularities, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6203 (iv).
Trading Stamps: *See* 'Criminal.'

Beauparlant, Mr. A. M., *St. Hyacinthe.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4395 (iii).

Beland, Mr. H. S., *Beauce.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3906 (ii).
Maple Product, Adulteration of, Prevention by Govt. (Ques.) 1340 (i).

Belcourt, Hon. N. A., *Ottawa.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3498 (ii); in Com. (school clause amt.) 7160 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8461; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8298; (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) dual language, 8570 (v).
See 'Manitoba.'
Cabinet Ministers-ex, Annuity B. 203 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 9739 (v).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) on Sen. Amts., 7625 (iv).
Dundonald, Earl of, Cor. O. C's., &c., *re* Dismissal (M. for copies*) 3205 (ii).
House of Commons, Duties of Clerks *re* (remarks) 9077 (v).
Imperial Guarantee and Accident Insurance Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 98) 1°*, 2043; in Com., 2770 (ii).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6670 (iv).
L'Union St. Joseph du Canada incorp. (B. 151) Pet. presented, 2490, 2491 (ii); 1°*, 5783 (iii).
McGillicuddy, Mr. D., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6602 (iv.)
Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation (remarks) 4015 (ii).
Militia Infantry Corps, Reduction of, &c. (Ques.) 7019 (iv).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2057 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1890 (i); in Com., 2533, 2537, 2958, 3199; on Amt. (Mr. Stewart) to M. for 3°, 3395 (ii).

Belcourt, Hon. N. A.—*Con.*
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s (B. 92) 1°*, 2005 (ii) ; in Com., 4965, 4968 (iii).
Owen, Thomas David, Patent Relief B. 177 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 8652 (v).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Ry. Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 570 (i).
'Renegade Liberals,' &c., Ref. to in speech on Autonomy Bill, 3527 (ii).
Secretary of State, Deptl. Employes, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 8655 (v).
SUPPLY :
House of Commons (sessional clerks) 6596 (iv).
Treadgold Concessions, Instructions to Commissioners (remarks) 7101 (iv).
Yukon Reforms *re* Condition of Govt. (remarks) on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 7085 (iv).

Bennett, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5262 (iii) ; (lands vested in Crown) in Com., 6033 (iv).
Autonomy Bill, Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2576 (ii).
Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Conspiracy, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. on B. 36, 541 ; Cor. (read) 543 ; Tel. (read) 546 (i).
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers (remarks) on Orders of the Day, 3586 (ii).
Canadian Cattle, British Embargo (remarks) 457 (i).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 650 (i).
Coal Contracts *re* Penitentiaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 478 (i).
Coldwater and Lowering Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ques.) 1848(i), 2594 (ii).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Payments by Govt. *re* Bounty (Ques.) 6653 (iv).
Collingwood Public Dock, Tenders *re* Conroy Bros. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6572 (iv).
Conmee & Bowman, Dredging Contract *re* Port Arthur and Ft. William, Advertisements for Tenders, &c. (M.) to adjn., 4458 (iii).
See 'Ft. William,' 'Dredges,' &c., 'Port Arthur,' &c.
Dredges built by Govt. at Toronto (remarks) 2456 (ii.
Dredging Plant, &c., imported into Canada, Valuation, &c. (Ques.) 5425 (iii).
Dredges imported and Entries at Customs (remarks) *re* Answer to Question, 5595 (iii).
Dukis Indian Reserve, Sale of Timber, &c. (Ques.) 3202 (ii).
Exchequer Court Judgeship, Appnmt. of (remarks) 5209 (iii).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*
Fort William and Port Arthur Dredging, Number of Tenders, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6729 (iv).
See 'Conmee,' &c.
Gas Plant at Parry Sound, Establishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2725 (iv).
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale, &c., to Mr. F. W. Grant (remarks) 6479 (iv).
——— on Explanation (Mr. Grant) 6737 (iv).
Grain carried and exported through Govt. Elevators (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1917 (i).
Grand Trunk Railway Co.s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3885 (ii).
Hope Island Timber Cutting, Inquiry for Papers, 2759 (ii).
I.C.R., Traffic Arrangements with other Rys. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1917 (i).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6658, 6666 (iv).
Killam, Judge, Appnmt. of as Chairman of Ry. Commission (remarks) on M. for Com. on Res., 541 (i).
Kingston Penitentiary Supplies, Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 477 (i).
Levis, Purchase of Land for I.C.R. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6668 (iv).
McCraney, Mr., Charges *re* Frauds *re* Census (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 650 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 3968 (ii).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6808 (iv).
Midland Govt. Dock, Tenants, Rent, &c. (Ques.) 5428 (iii).
——— Protest *re* Govtl. Action (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9557 (v).
Midland Harbour Range Lights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2734 (ii).
——— on Statement of Dep. Min. (remarks) 2853 (ii).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5591 (iii).
Parliament Grounds Paving Contract, on M. (Mr. Hughes) to adjn., 5792 (iii).
Parry Sound, Buoy Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2858 (ii).
——— Gas Plant, Purchase of Property (remarks) 2725 (ii).
Penetanguishene Dredging, Owner's Name, &c. (Ques.) 2063 (ii).
Plunkett, Geo., Contract *re* Coal for Penitentiaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 479 (i).
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Conmee & Bowman's Tender (M.) to adjn., 4645, 4676 (iii.)
——— Advertisement for Tender, &c. (M.) to adjn., 4458 (iii).
——— Tenders *re* (remarks) 5963 (iv).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*
Postal Service, Patronage *re* Boots for Mail Carriers (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6229 (iv).
Pound Net Licenses issued (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2892 (ii).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Ry. Commissioners (appnmt. of chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com. on Res., 541 (i).
Sbaretti : *See* 'Manitoba,' &c.
'Sequin,' Str., Purchase by Govt. (Ques.) 3834 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Trent (Holland river) 9361; (surveys) 9356 (v).
Dom. Lands (Banff Park Waterworks) 9306 (v).
Fisheries (inspectors' salaries) 2892 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoys) 2730; (gas lights) 2725 (ii).
Pentitentiaries (Kingston) 477 (i).
Post Office (mail service) 9611 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (St. Boniface) 9549 ; N.W.T. (Edmonton) 9550 ; (Saskatoon) 9550 (v).
Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Neepawa) 9549; (Orillia) 9549; (Owen Sound) 9547; Ottawa (post office fittings) 9551 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.S. Battery Point) 9552 ; (Phinney's Cove) 9557 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Crowe's Landing) 9600; (Honora wharf) 9597 ; (Manitoulin wharf) 9597 ; (Midland harbour) 9601; (Rama wharf) 9602; (Rosseau wharf) 9600 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Anse à l'Ilot) 9591 ; (Beauce wharf) 9591; (Grande Rivière de Beaupré) 9592; (Lake Megantic) 9591; (Riviere aux Renards) 9592; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 2456 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 1912 (i); (Indiantown branch) 9482 (v).
Thessalon Postmaster, Irregularities, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6227 (iv).
Victoria Harbour Mail Contract (Ques.) 2191 (ii).
Watson, Customs Collector at Collingwood, Superannuation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 408 (i).
Waverly Postmaster, Duties and Residence, &c. (Ques.) 5427 (iii).
——— (remarks) 5807 (iii).
Wire Fencing : *See* 'N.W.T.'

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois.*
Acetylene Gas Invention of Mr. Painchaud, *re* Safety (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6308 (iv).
Adulteration Act Amt. (B. 197) 1°*, 9179 (v).
Anthracite Coal and Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. Galliher) to present Pet., 4550 (iii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 892 (i).
Atlas, Samples furnished by Interior Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9308 (v).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
Audit Act Amt., Govtl. Intention (remarks) 6112 (iv).
Auditor General's Rep., on Inquiry for (remarks) 97 (i).
Autonomy Bill, 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5443, 5480 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3462 (ii); (Alberta boundaries) in Com., 5601 (iii); (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) dual language 8547, 8568 (v); (school clause amt.) 7134 (iv); 8387 (v); (Senate representation) 5675 (iii); on M. for 3° (Amt.) Schools, 8831; Neg. (Y. 7; N. 138) 8832 (v).
Autonomy Bill Circular, signed by T. Brown, Sec. of Public Instruction, Printing, &c. (remarks) 3009 (ii).
See 'Sbaretti,' 'Saskatchewan.'
Banking Act Amendment (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 607 (i).
——— (remarks) 6112 (iv).
Bank Notes, Supervision *re* Printing and Circulation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6254 (iv).
Beauharnois Canal Water Power, Negotiations *re* procuring for Electric Lighting, &c. (Ques.) 1504 (i).
——— utilization of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6307 (iv).
——— Waterways, Opening of Feeders: in Com. of Sup., 7380 (iv).
Bicquet Lighthouse Keeper, Name, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3202 (ii).
Bic Wharf, Purchase of Land from P. Ross, &c. (Ques.) 1850 (i).
Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 179 (Mr. Turriff) on M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 8653 (v).
Cabinet Ministers-ex, Annuities B. 203 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9792 (v).
Cacouna Wharf, Expenditure *re* Work, &c. (Ques.) 7096 (iv).
Canadian Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Com., 9007 (v).
Catholic Mutual Benefit Association B. 93 (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com., 2770 (ii).
Caughnawaga Indians, Medical Attendance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 225 (i).
Chateauguay River Dredging (remarks) in Com, of Sup., 6847 (iv).
Château Richer, Public Works, Dates of Payment, &c. (Ques.) 3202 (ii).
——— Montmorency Wharf, Expenditure by Govt. (remarks) 1015 (i)
Collingwood Govt. Dock, Tenders *re* Conroy Bros. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6576 (iv).
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9429 (v).
Curran Bridge and Sorel Bridge Scandals, Ref. to on Nixon Charges, 8142 (v).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
Debates, French Edition, Delay in Translation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 239 (i).
Debates, Official, 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 5034 (iii).
——— on M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com., 9809 (v).
Dismissals from Public Offices, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).
Divorce Bills, Vote *re*, &c. (personal explanation) 6377, 6405, 6571 (iv).
Doutre, Mr. Alex., Dismissal and Reinstatement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 142 (i), 6247 (iv).
Edmonton Electoral District, Galician Vote, &c. (remarks) 4201 (iii).
Electoral Atlas, Distribution to Members (remarks in Com. of Sup., 6897 (iv).
——— New Edition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) on M. for 1°, 987 (i).
Extradition Cases by U.S., Before Commissioners, Montreal (Ques.) 3937 (ii).
Fessenden Wireless Tel. of Canada Co.'s incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6380, 6607 (iv).
First Minister's Salary, B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3°, 9790 (v).
Foreign Coin Circulation, Prevention *re* (remarks) 8776 (v).
Fort William and Port Arthur Dredging, Number of Tenders, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6730 (iv).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 52 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 2113 (ii), 9199 (v).
Gaynor-Greene Extradition, Charges against Mr. Lafontaine, &c. (Ques.) 3937 (ii).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 9399 (v).
G.T.P. Commission, Appnmt. of Hon. S. N. Parent (remarks) 699 (i).
G.T.P. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7626 (iv).
Harbours and Boards of Commissioners, Names, &c., (Ques.) 1063 (i).
Harbour Commissions, Control of by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6725 (iv).
Harper, Geo. Dance, Relief B. 154 (Mr. T. G. Johnston) on M. for 3°, 6377 (iv).
House of Commons, Accommodation, Doorkeepers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6600 (iv).
——— Rooms for Members, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 238 (i).
Imports and Exports, Duties paid, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) for Ret. 3204 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 7421 (iv).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
Judges of Provincial Courts Act (salaries) Amt. B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9794 (v).
Lachine Canals, Nuisances of Whistles, &c. (remarks) 9284 (v).
Letter Carriers, Bonuses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 215 (i).
——— Uniforms, Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup 207 (i).
Lewis, Edward Norman, Relief B. 142 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 5137 (iii).
Library of Parliament, Enlargement of Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6944 (iv).
Lighthouse Keeper at Bicquet, Name, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3202 (ii).
McGillicuddy, Mr. D., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6602 (iv).
McGill University, School of Transportation, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9381 (v).
Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr Sbaretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 4052 (ii).
Marconi Stations in Operation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6625 (iv).
Martin, Eli, Emplymt. in Customs Dept. (Ques.) 7097 (iv).
Military School for Montreal, Selection of Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7009 (iv).
Militia Act (permanent force) Amt. B. 170 (Sir Frederick Borden) on M. for 2°, 7267 (iv).
Militia Officers, and Independence of Parlt. Act, Suggested Amt. (remarks) 5137 (iii).
Militia Staffs of Officers, Reduction in Number, &c. (Ques.) 5315 (iii).
'Montcalm,' Str., Experiments *re* Icebreaking (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6626 (iv).
Montreal Customs, Dep. Collector, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 256 (i).
Montreal Dom. Exhibition, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9608 (v).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 192 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 9288 (v).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 779 (i).
Montreal Inland Revenue Buildings Addition, Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1123 (i).
Montreal Post Office, Illegal Stamping of Letters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 196 (i).
——— Improvements, New Station (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 222 (i).
——— Rep. of Supt. of Health (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 203 (i).
Nixon, Mr., Dom. Lands Agent, Charges against, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8142 (v).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9322 (v).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5584 (iii).
N. W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 8 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 460 (i).
Northwest Territories B. 160 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8765 (v).
Ottawa Buildings, Concentration of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3180 (ii).
Pacific Bank of Canada B. 175 (Mr. Galliher) on M. for 2°, 7625 (iv).
Parent, Hon. S. N., Appnmt. to G.T.P. Commission (remarks) 699 (i).
Parole System for Convicts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 467 (i).
Patent Medicines, Inspection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1725 (i).
Pearson, Geo., Relief B. 153 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 7623 (iv).
Plains of Abraham, Number of Acres purchased by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
Postmasters as Political Partisans (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6247 (iv).
Printing Bureau, Enlargement of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6897, 6948 (iv).
'Protestant School', Ref. to Mr. Fielding's Speech, 3482 (ii).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Accounts Com., Meetings, &c. (remarks) 7100 (iv).
Public Works and Marine Depts., Line of Demarcation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6841 (iv).
Public Works under Contracts, Supervision, Drawback (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7588 (iv).
Quebec Drill Hall, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1145 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 1243 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Transfer to Marine Dept., 771 (i).
Railways Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6145 (iv).
Railway Passes, Certificate of Identification for Members (M.) 7249 (iv).
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7346 (iv).
Richibucto Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6731 (iv).
Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 169 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6967 (iv).
Ste. Famille Wharfage Dues, Abolition of (Ques.) 1150 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1149 (i).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
St. Francois and Quebec SS. Subsidy, Request *re* (Ques.) 1504 (i).
St. James Division Branch Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 218 (i).
St. Lawrence River Channel, Charges *re* 'J. I. Tarte' Dredge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2463 (ii).
St. Timothée Wharf, Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7305 (iv).
Saskatchewan B. 70, in Com. on Res., 8701 (v).
Sbaretti's, M'gr., Explanation *re* Man. Boundaries, Letter of Mr. Fitzpatrick to Bishop of Quebec (read) 4053 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Indemnity B. 201 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9791 (v).
Sorel Dredge Building, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 794 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9345 (v).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dom. exhibitions, B.C.) 9608 (v).
Adulteration of Food (patent medicines) 1725 (i).
Canals—Beauharnois (repairs) 6307 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (culvert St. Therese Island) 6301 (iv).
Canals—Cornwall (lock repairs) 9381 (v).
Canals—Lachine (Côte St Paul bridge) 6294 (iv) ; (electric appliances) 9354 (v); (enlargement) 6295 ; (Hanault, O. L., payments) 6299 ; (lock gates suspension) 6301; (Mill St. paving) 6301 ; (power house flume) 6299 ; (repairs) 6306 (iv) ; (St. Gabriel basin) 9378 (v) ; (wall underpinning) 6298 ; (widening tailrace) 6299 (iv).
Canals—St. Ours (landing wharf) 6302 (iv).
Canals—Trent (staff on dams) 9383 (v).
Charges of Management (Receiver General's Office) 6249 (iv), 9053 (v).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (archivist) 9054 (v); (salaries) 92 ; (Aud. General's Dept. (salaries) 77, 91 ; Finance (salaries) 119 ; (High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 120; Indian Affairs (salaries) 116; Justice (fees, witnesses and jurors) 135 (i) ; Post Office (contingencies) 6247 (iv) ; (salaries) 95 ; Public Works (salaries) 94 (i) ; Sec. of State (Civil Service Examiners) 6249 (iv); (purchase of books) 75 (i).
Customs—(contingent expenses, &c.) 256 ; Yukon (living allowances) 411 (i).
Dom. Lands (surveys, maps, &c.) 6406 (iv).
Dominion Police (salaries) 138 (i).
Excise (contingencies) 6724 (iv).
Fisheries ('Petrel,' protection service) 6630 (iv).
Geological Survey (salaries) 9249 (v).
House of Commons (contingencies) 250 ; (debates) 239 (i) ; (leather trunks) 6606 (iv); (salaries) 238 (i) ; (sessional clerks) 6597; Library (books) 6944 (iv).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6385 (iv).
Indians (land management fund) 236 ; Ont. (blankets, clothing) 225; (medical attendance) 225; Quebec (Oka band) 235; (St. Regis lockup) 237 (i).
Justice—Yukon (court fees, &c.) 137; (judges' allowances) 126 ; (law books, &c.) 136 ; maintenance of prisoners) 135 (i).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7511 (iv).
Legislation—Franchise Act (voters' lists) 6897, 6954 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (revolving lights) 2704 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Mexico) 895; (Can. and S. Africa) 974; (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 945; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 948 (i).
Marine Hospitals (St. John, N.B.) 6628 (iv); (sick seamen) 2686 (ii).
Militia (Advisory Board) 436 (i); (permanent force) 9110 (v); (Royal Military college) 7000 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Pacific cable grant) 7276 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (hydrographic surveys) 6625 (iv).
Penitentiaries (parole system) 467 (i).
Pensions (Fenian Raid) 6956; (Militiamen, 1885) 6957 (iv).
Post Office (Compassionate allowance *re* Patrick Gallery) 6628; (inspector W. A. Cairns' salary) 6629; (mail service) 6629 (iv); (ry. mail clerks) 139 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (improvements) 6735; N.B. (Richibucto) 6731 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (London drill hall) 6732 (iv).
Public Buildings, Ottawa (additions to H. of C.) 9544 (v); (Archives) 603 (i); (elevators) 9551 (v); (museum) 765; (Royal Mint) 606 (i).
Public Works — Buildings — Que. (Grosse Isle) 1109 (i), 6734 (iv); (Levis) 1112; (Longueuil) 1114; (Magog) 1114; (Montreal barracks) 1118; (Montreal Inland Rev.) 1119; (Montreal military buildings) 1126; (Montreal P. O. improvements) 1127; (Montreal P. O. pneumatic system) 1135; (St. John's) 1143; (Valleyfield) 1144 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Fort Lawrence) 6838; (L'Ardoise breakwater) 6839; (Port Hawkesbury) 6837 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur) 787; Que. (Anse aux Beaufils) 7285; (Anse aux Gris Fonds) 7285; (Anse St. Jean) 7286; (Baie des Peres, Lake Temiscamingue) 7287; (Barachois de Malbaie) 7287; (Bic wharf) 7288; (Canton Fabre) 7288; (Chambord wharf) 7289; (Chateauguay dredging) 6847, 7322; (Chateau Richer) 7290; (Descente des Femmes wharf) 7307; (Desjardins wharf) 7298; (Doucet's Landing) 6849, 7298; (eastern channel) 7330; (East Templeton) 7301; (Fraserville harbour) 7323; (Gatineau Point) 7303; (Grand Piles dam) 7327 (iv); (Que. harbour improvements) 770 (i), 6724 (iv); (Isle St. Therese) 7376; (Lake St. John dredging) 7306; (Laprairie ice piers) 7306; (Lavaltrie wharf) 7306; (Little Rapids dam) 6839 (iv); (Louise embankment) 770 (i); (Magdalen Islands) 7308; (Maskinonge river) 6842; (Mille Vaches) 7310; (Mistook wharf) 7310; (Mont Louis wharf) 7310; (Montmagny wharf) 7311; (Montmorency Falls) 7311; (Montmorency wharf) 6852; (Nicolet pier) 7313; (Notre Dame du Portage wharf) 7314; (Ottawa river) 7376; (Peel Head bay) 7314; (Riviere du Lievre) 7325; (Riviere du Loup) 7325; (Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere) 7390; (Ste Famille wharf) 7390; (St. Fidele) 7391; (St.

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—*Con.*

Francois, Orleans) 7391; (St. Francis de Sales) 7392; (St. Jean, Orleans) 7393 (iv); (St. Lawrence channel) 2463 (ii); (St. Louis river) 7379; (St. Louis river feeders) 7381; (St. Maurice dredging) 6851, 7326; (Saguenay dredging) 7377; (Sorel ice piers) 6841; (Terrebonne) 7394; (Yamaska river) 7394 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Transportation, &c. (Georgian Bay surveys) 7637 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (balances, &c.) 7629; (clerical assistance) 7626; (Deep Waterways Commission) 6894; (engineers, &c.) 6895; (technical books) 7627; (transportation commission) 7627 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges—N.W.T. (Battle river) 7588; (Shellmouth) 7592 (iv).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (Gatineau River) 7630 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Que. (J. C. Taché, special service) 6897; Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 6896 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, construction, &c.) 2287 (ii); I.C.R. (working expenses) 9384; Miscellaneous (school of transportation) 9381 (v).
Senate (contingencies) 6620 (iv).
Yukon Ter. Govt. (additional allowance to Maj. Wood) 9250; (local council grant) 9250 (v).

Trading Stamps: *See* 'Criminal Code'.
Uniforms for Letter Carriers. Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
Uniforms for Militia, Rules *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 438 (i).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 719 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8639 (v).
Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 8696, 9544 (v).
Yukon Customs Officials, Living Allowances (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 411 (i).
Yukon, Reforms *re* Condition of Govering, &c. (remarks) on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 7066 (iv).

Bickerdike, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*

Aids to Navigation, *re* St. Lawrence Channel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2891 (ii).
American Currency circulated in Canada, Prevention *re* (Ques.) 3010 (ii).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4360 (iii).
Bills from the Senate (M.) to place on Orders, 9278 (v).
Canadian Agency (B. 77) 1°*, 1671 (i); in Com., 9077; M. to ref. back to Banking and Commerce Com., 9078 (v).
Embargo on Canadian Cattle in G.B., on M. (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) to conc. in 6th Rep. of Committee, 9003 (v).

Bickerdike, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Montreal Harbour Commission, Permanent Sheds, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for copies, 162 (i).

St. Lawrence Channel, Aids to Navigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2891 (ii).

South Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 149) M. to place on Order Paper, 9278 (v).

Black, Mr. J. B., *Hants.*

Adulteration of Food, Centralization of Samples (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1717 (i).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5109 (iii);

——— Edmonton Election (remarks) in Com., 5893 (iii).

——— Ref. to Speech *re* 'Doukhobors and Englishmen' (remarks) in Com. on B., 5901 (iii).

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 106) 1°*, 2184 (ii); in Com., 4971; 3° m., 5113 (iii); on Sen. Amts., 7625 (iv).

G.B. and Her Colonies, Inter-Imperial Parlt., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2390 (ii).

Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6657 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1717 (i).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1361 (i).

Blain, Mr. R., *Peel.*

Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., on Res., 737 (i), 2416; in Com., 2848 (ii).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3284 (ii); (lands vested in Crown) in Com., 5997; (subsidy to provs.) in Com., 6096 (iv).

——— School Clauses, Explanation *re* Amts. (remarks) 5820 (iii).

Binder Twine Industry at Kingston Pen. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 485 (i).

Canada Eastern and I.C.R., Accounts *re* Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1928 (i).

Canadian Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Com., 9007 (v).

Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 997; in Com. on B., 634, 1069 (i).

Census Enumerators, Appnmt of (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 1073 (i).

Circulars issued by Political Associations *re* Census, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 1097 (i).

Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8221 (v).

Cornwall Canal Employees during Election Campaign (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1229 (i).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Corry Block, Rental paid by Govt. (remarks) in Com of Sup., 6821 (iv).

Dredges, Working Expenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 804 (i).

Dundonald Park and Ottawa Improvement Commission (remarks) in Com. on B. 180, 8686 (v).

Geological Survey Museum, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 761 (i).

Georgian Bay Islands, Sale to F. W. Grant (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6505 (iv).

Glace Bay, N.S., Purchase of Site for Building (Ques.) 9697 (v).

Glanders, Spread of among Horses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6690 (iv).

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4218 (iii).

Halifax and Esquimalt Garrisons, Defence of by Canada (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9115 (v).

Immigration, Contract with North Atlantic Trading Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7705 (iv).

Immigration Literature, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7710 (iv).

Indians, Medical Inspection, Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6553 (iv).

I.C.R., Freight Rates and Traffic Arrangements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2237 (ii).

——— Locomotives, Purchase of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1964 (i).

Lumber for Govt. Use, Prices, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1514 (i).

'Lurcher,' Lightship, Accident *re*, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2852 (ii).

Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6770 (iv).

Marconi Wireless Tel. System, on Govt. Boats (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2615 (ii).

Marine Insurance, Reduction of Rates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2865 (ii).

Murray Harbour Branch Ry. and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2143 (ii).

North Hastings Census Enumerator, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1077 (i).

Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2051 (ii).

Oshawa Harbour Revenue (Ques.) 1504 (i).

Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).

Ottawa City Act Amt. B. 180 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8686 (v).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3196 (ii).

Passenger Stations and Freight Sheds, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 1977 (i).

Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Conmee and Bowman's Tender, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4662 (iii).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Time for Tenders (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6877 (iv).

Port Burwell Dredging Contract, Purchase of Dredge, &c. (Ques.) 8656 (v).

Port Colborne Elevator: in Com. of Sup., 1326 (i).

Port Credit Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6871, 7555 (iv).

Port Hood, N.S., Breakwater, Estimated Cost, Approval, &c. (Ques.) 5132 (iii).

Poultry, Experimental, on Farms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6183 (iv).

Provl. Govt. in N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'

Ry. Act, 1903 (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 303 (i).

Railway Commission Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1524, 1537 (i).

——— Report (remarks) 6139 (iv).

——— Salaries paid, Private Secs., &c. (Ques.) 687 (i).

Royal Mint, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 608 (i).

Salmon, Capt., Rep. *re* Accident to 'Lurcher' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2878 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1169 (i); on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to M. for 3°, 1884 (i).

Standard Gauge Ry., Cost of Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2181 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Can. exhibits, Imperial Institute) 1838 (i); (experimental farms) 6183; (experimental farms bulletins) 6927; (live stock records) 6686 (iv); (quinquennial census, N.W.T.) 9609 (v).

Canals—Lachine (electric installation) 1240 (i).

Canals—Miscellaneous (arbitrations, &c.) 1508; (litigation) 1523; (repairs) &c.) 1546 (i).

Canals—Welland (bridge building) 1234; (electric plant) 1231; (Port Colborne elevator) 1326; (stone protection) 1498; (surveys) 1520 (i).

Dom. Lands (homestead inspectors) 6407 (iv).

Fisheries (fishery commission) 9173 (v); (inspectors' salaries) 2878 (ii).

Geological Survey (assay apparatus) 8671 (v).

Immigration (agents, G.B., &c., salaries) 6392, 7693; (contingencies) 7710; (interpreters) 7705 (iv).

Indians—B.C. (industrial schools) 6556; (medical attendance) 6555; (travelling expenses) 6556 (iv).

Indians—Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6537 (iv).

Indians—N.B. (medical attendance) 6517; (salaries) 6516 (iv).

Indians—N.S. (general vote) 6515 (iv).

Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7511 (iv).

Legislation (voters' lists) 6899, 6955 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 2865 (ii).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (wrecking plant) 958 (i).

Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 2686 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 6513 (iv); (permanent force) 9115 (v); (transports, &c) 6513 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 2609 (ii); (ice breakers, repairs) 9304 (v); (life-saving stations) 2635 (ii).

Penitentiaries (Kingston) 477; (parole system) 469 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vancouver) 1642 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—General (clerk of works) 1648 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 1633 (i); (Winnipeg customs) 9549 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 1018; (Sydney Mines) 1045 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont.—(Cobourg armoury) 1554; (Guelph armoury) 1557; (Owen Sound) 9548 (v); (St. Mary's) 1578; (Sandwich) 1579; (Toronto P.O., pneumatic tube system) 1591 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (improvements) 9549 (v); (museum) 755; (post office reconstruction) 1573 (i); (rents) 6821 (iv); (Royal Mint) 608; (telephones) 1669 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Lachute) 1111; (Levis) 1112; (Magog) 1114 (i).

Public Works—Dredging—General (vessel repairs) 7576; (P.E.I. plant) 7576 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Anderson, &c. lakes) 7573; (Columbia river) 7574; (Fraser channel) 7574; (Golden) 7574; (Langley) 7575; (Revelstoke) 7574; (Thompson river) 7575; (Victoria) 7576 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Dipper harbour) 7498; (Mud cove) 7500; (Petit Rocher) 7500 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Frude's Point) 9582; (Glace Bay) 9578 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bayfield pier) 7546; (Blanche river) 7547; (Cobourg 7549; (Collingwood) 6880, 7550; (Depot Harbour) 7552; (Grand river dredging) 6873 (iv); (Honora wharf) 9597 (v); (Lake Temiscaming) 7559; (Meaford) 7560; (Newcastle pier) 7561 (iv); (Oshawa harbour) 9600 (v); (Owen Sound harbour) 6886; (Point Edward dredging) 6869 (iv); (Port Arthur) 799 (i); (Rama wharf) 9602 (v); (repairs, &c.) 7555; (Sarnia) 7564 (iv); (Saugeen) 9602; (Stokes Bay) 9598 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Chateau Richer) 7295; (Doucet's Landing) 6849; (East Templeton) 7303 (iv); (Grosse Isle) 1109 (i); (Lake St. Peter piers) 6460; (Little Rapids dam) 6840; (Magdalen Islands) 7309; (Maskinonge river dredging) 6846; (Montmorency wharf) 6852; (New Carlisle wharf) 7312; (St. Lawrence channel, suction dredge) 6452; (St. Maurice river dredging) 6852 (iv).

Public Works — Telegraph Lines — B.C. (C.P.R. account) 9604; N.W.T. (Qu'Appelle-Edmonton) 9604; Que. (Descente des Femmes) 9604 (v); Yukon (Ashcroft and Dawson) 6896 (iv).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Quarantine (cattle) 6690; conc., 6917 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (construction) 9498 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (book-keeping, &c.) 1928; (locomotives) 1964 (i); (locomotive machinery) 6429 (iv); (Memramock accommodation) 1977; (St. Cyrille, diversion of line) 1970; (steel rails) 1996 (i), 2038 (ii); (ties, &c.) 6430 (iv).
Railways—Miscellaneous (extra clerks) 1521 (i).
Railways—P.E.I. (Cardigan branch) 2175; (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2130 (ii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance, &c.) 1537 (i).
Steamboat Inspection (salaries) 2695 (ii).
Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 9039 (v).
Yukon Govt. (salaries, &c.) 7718 (iv).
Water Meters Inspection B. 188 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8676 (v).
Wireless Telegraphy Regulation B. 186 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 9032 (v).
Wrecking Plant, 'Lord Strathcona,' in Com. of Sup., 958 (i).
Year-Book Statistics, &c (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 997 (i).

Bland, Mr. L. T., *North Bruce.*

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 6179 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Kincardine) 7558; (Saugeen) 7565; (Wiarton) 7569 (iv).

Bole, Mr. D. W., *Winnipeg.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5497 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4784 (iii).
Canadian Pacific Ry. Co's (B. 56) 1°* 985 (i).
Criminal Code Amt. (B. 23) 1° m., 450 (i).
Dominion Annuity Co.'s incorp. (B. 82) 1°*, 1745 (i); in Com., 2767; 3° m., 2768 (ii).
Half-breed Scrip, Charges, &c. (personal explanation) 7812 (iv).
Lebonk and Thunder Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 61) 1°*, 1241 (i).
Manitoba School Fund, Amount paid, Amount claimed (Ques.) 379 (i).
Northern Bank (B. 104) 1°*, 2184 (ii).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2047 (ii).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick, K.C.M.G. (Minister of Militia and Defence) Kings, N.S.

Ammunition, Inspection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).
Armouries, Construction of Generally (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 423, 1650 (i).
Cadets, Equipping and Practice, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9119 (v).
Camps of Instructions, Indemnity *re* Casualties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9148 (v).
Cavalry Corps, Establishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9126 (v).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick—*Con.*

Director of Operations *re* Militia Council (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 418 (i).
Dress Regulations for Militia (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 438 (i).
Halifax and Esquimalt Defences, Control by Can. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1403 (i).
——— Possession by Dom. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9114 (v).
Halifax and Esquimalt Naval Stations, Continuance of (remarks) 9678 (v).
Halifax Fortifications, Retention of Imperial Troops (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6510 (iv).
Highland Cadet Corps, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) 7814 (iv).
Inspector General of Militia (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 437 (i).
Judge Advocate General, Appmt. of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 425 (i).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6660 (iv).
——— Charges of Mr. S. Hughes (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9710 (v).
Lindsay Drill Hall, Erection of (Ans.) 271 (i).
London Drill Hall, Sale of old Site (Ans.) 8384 (v).
London Militiamen at Niagara (remarks) in Connection with London Election, 7251 (iv).
——— Telegrams (read) 7331 (iv).
Medical Officers and Independence of Parlt. Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 418 (i).
Medical Officers *re* Militia Districts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 417 (i).
Militia Council, Appnmts. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 415, 416 (i).
——— Constitution, Duties, &c. (regulations read) 420 (i).
——— Memoranda, &c., Papers laid on Table, 9073 (v).
——— Memorandum *re* General Policy, Quotations (read) in Com. of Sup., 9116 (v).
Military Hospital, St. Johns, Que., Contract *re* Repairs (Ans.) 5687 (iii).
Military School, Selection of Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7010 (iv).
Military Sites, Armouries, &c., Control of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 428 (i).
Military Training Camp, Central, Site, &c. (Ans.) 268 (i).
——— Camp at South Simcoe, Establishment of (remarks) 9713 (v).
Militia Act (permanent force) Amt. B. 170 (prop. res.) 6905; in Com. on Res., 6984; 2° m., 7263 (iv); on M. for 2°, 9179, 9195 (v).
Militia Armouries, &c., Supervision of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 423, 1650 (i).
Militia, Canadian Garrisons, Defence of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9107 (v).
Militia and Defence, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 4549 (iii).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick—*Con.*
Militia Estimates, Delay in bringing down, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) 9099 (v).
——— General Statement : in Com. of Sup., 9105 (v).
Militia Force, Reduction of (explanation) on M. for Sup., 6992 (iv).
——— Reduction of, (Ans.) 7019 (iv).
Militia Officers gazetted *re* Examinations (Ans.) 8886 (v).
Militia Orders *re* Civil Servants (remarks) 1261 (i).
Militia Staffs of Officers, Reduction in Number, &c. (Ans.) 5315 (iii).
Miltimore, J. M., Permission to attend Cavalry School, Toronto (Ans.) 6384 (iv).
Minnedosa Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9171 (v).
Naval Militia for Canada, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 1346 (i).
Ninety-Fifth Battalion, Reduction, &c. (Ans.) 909 (i).
Ottawa Drill Hall, Increased Accommodation, &c. (Ans.) 271 (i).
Permanent Force, Recruiting Points, &c. (Ans.) 5977 (iv).
See 'Militia Act (B. 170).'
Portland Cement, Prices paid, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 435 (i).
Rifle Range in Cape Breton (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9170 (v).
Ross Rifle Factory, Erection of Tank on Plains of Abraham (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 431 (i).
Royal Military College Act (salaries) Amt. (B. 169), prop. res., 6904 ; in Com. on Res., 6966 ; 1°*, 6984 ; in Com., 7262 (iv).
Royal Military College Graduates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9118 (v).
Sherbrooke Armouries, Provision for Militia (Ans) 266 (i).
S. A. Veterans and King's Medals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9160 (v).
SUPPLY :
Civil Govt.—Militia (contingencies) 9068 ; (salaries) 9067 (v).
Militia (annual drill) 441 (i), 6512 (iv) ; (armoury, Montreal) 9161 (v) ; (arsenal) 445 (i), 6513, 7012 (iv), 9170 ; (Esquimalt) 9170; (general statement) 9105 ; (Louisbourg Fort) 9170 (v) ; (pay and allowance) 415 (i), 6510 (iv) ; (permanent force) 9113 (v); (rifle, &c., grants) 444 (i) ; (Royal Military College) 7000 (v), 9170 (v) ; (stores) 6513 (iv) ; (surveys) 439 (i) ; (transport, &c.) 6513 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—General (armouries) 1650 (i).
Sussex Rifle Range, Inspector *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7011 (iv).
Toronto Drill Shed, in Com. of Sup., 1658 (i).
Woodstock Rifle Range, Purchase of Land (Ans.) 5132 (iii).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick—*Con.*
Worthington, Col., Militia Allowance and Independence of Partl. Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9148 (v).

Borden, Mr. R. L., *Carleton, O.*
'Agnes Donahue,' Schr., Seizure by Uruguayan Govt. (remarks) 1507 (i), 6106 (iv).
Alberta, Prov. of : *See* 'Autonomy B. 69.'
Allan SS. Co. Cold Storage System, Stmnts. of Mr. E. D. Smith (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 877 (i).
Amherst Pier, N.S., Contract *re* Construction (Ques.) 4371 (iii).
Amherst Ry. Accommodation, Application *re* Wharf Connection (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9520 (v).
Anglo-American Convention respecting Property (remarks) *re* Cor.. 1068 (i).
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 738 (i), 2440 (ii).
Auditor General and Audit Act, on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 9666 (v).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Additional Copies, Letter from Mr. McDougall to Sec. of State (read) 4271 (iii).
——— Inquiry for, 1151 (i).
Autonomy for Alberta, B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 1459 (i) ; on M. for 2°, 2926, 2963 (ii) ; (amt.) 2979 (ii) ; Neg. (Y. 59 ; N. 140) 5400 (iii), 8092 (v).
——— on M. for Com., 5423 (iii).
——— in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5435, 5485, 5498 (iii).
——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5601 ; (arbitration *re* assets) 5946; (B.N.A. Act, 1867 to 1886) 5672; (B.N.A. Act) 5719 (iii) ; Amt., 8526; (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) dual language, 8557, 8627 (v) ; (C.P.R. lands) 6062 (iv); (distribution of seats) Amt., 8004, 8011 (v); (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7917 (iv); (election of members) in Com., 5810; (H. of C. representation) in Com., 5752; (Hudson Bay Co. rights) 5955 (iii), 8169 (v); (lands vested in Crown) in Com., 5946 (iii), 5986 (iv), 8171, 8260 (v); (laws, courts, &c.) in Com., 5813, 5931 (iii), 6101 (iv), 8170, 8240 (v); (legislative assembly) 5815; readjustment of representation) in Com., 5753 (iii); (school clause amt.) 7103 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8389, 8420; on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8494 ; on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8285, (amt.) 8292; (seat of govt.) 8248 (v); (Senate representation) in Com., 5675 (iii).
——— on Schedules (Athabasca) 8163; (Cardston) 8149; (Edmonton city) 8161; (Gleichen) 8153; (Lacombe) 8156; (Leduc) 8157; (Lethbridge) 8150; (Macleod) 8150; (Medicine Hat) 8148; (Peace River) 8163; (Pincher

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Autonomy for Alberta, B. 69—*Con.*
Creek) 8153; (Ponoka) 8156; (Red Deer) 8155; (St. Albert) 8163; (Saskatchewan) 8161; (Strathcona) 8157; (Sturgeon) 8162 (Wetaskiwin) 8157 (v).
——— on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Scott) C.P.R. lands, 8793 (v).
——— on M. for 3°, 8796; Amt. (schools) 8804, Neg. (Y. 41; N. 109) 8816 (v).
Autonomy for Saskatchewan B. 70 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5424 (iii); (amt.) 8698; Neg. (Y. 37; N. 90) 8699; in Com. on Res., 8701 (v).
——— in Com. (distribution of seats) 8704, 8739; (laws, courts, &c.) 8759; (schools) Amt., 8759, 8884; (Senate representation) in Com., 8703 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Scott) to M. for 3°, 8874 (v).
——— in Com. *re* Schedules (Moosejaw) 8758 (v).
Autonomy B. 69, Alberta Boundaries, Population *re* Saskatchewan (remarks) 5919 (iii).
——— Approval by Cabinet, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2263 (ii).
——— Mr. Bulyea's Interview *re* Subsidies to Rys, &c. (remarks) 4202 (iii).
——— Census of Town and Rural Population, &c., Inquiry for Estimates, 8092 (v).
——— Constitutionality of, Changes *re* (remarks) 2192 (ii).
——— Debate *re* Absence, &c (personal explanation) 2043 (ii).
——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 6736, 6836 (iv).
——— Edmonton Election and Toronto Election, Tests *re* Feeling of Country (remarks) 5886 (iii).
——— Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Min., on M. for Sup., 2493 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Rets. (remarks) 2594 (ii).
——— Meridian Divisional Line (remarks) 8635 (v).
——— Official Report of Division (remarks) 5430 (iii).
——— Papers *re*, Inquiry for, 3008 (ii).
——— Responsibility, &c. (remarks) 2321 (ii).
——— Pets. circulated in Quebec, &c., Denial *re* Charge, 2570 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) *re* Mr. Belcourt's Charges, 3521 (ii).
——— Saskatchewan Boundaries, Addition to (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5621 (iii).
——— conference *re* boundaries (remarks) 8268 (v).
——— Schedules *re* (remarks) 4375, 5423, 5815 (iii).
——— Schedules, Preparation of, &c. (remarks) 4750 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Autonomy Bills, Schedules *re* Saskatchewan (remarks) 5474 (iii).
——— School Clauses, Change, Explanation *re* (remarks) 5673 (iii).
——— School Clause, Explanation *re* Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5818 (iii).
——— printing, &c. (remarks) 2761 (ii).
——— School Clause, on Explanation (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 5985 (iv).
——— School Clauses Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5840; Quotations from Regina 'Leader, 5851 (iii).
See 'Manitoba,' 'Orangemen,' 'N.W.T.'
Ballot Box Frauds in Dom. Elections, on M. (Mr. Porter) to Com. of Sup., 9219 (v).
Banking Act Amendment, Legislation *re* (remarks) 2441 (ii).
Bell, Dr., Appnmt. as Director of Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9303 (v).
Bills from the Senate, on M. (Mr. A. Johnston) to place on Order Paper, 8096 (v).
Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 179 (Mr. Turriff) on M. to ref. back to Committee, 8652 (v).
Brunet, Mr., Ry. Commissioner, Resignation of (remarks) 5036 (iii).
Budget, The, Inquiry for, 2685 (ii), 4920 (iii).
Cabinet, ex-Ministers, Annuity B. 203 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 9735 (v).
Cabinet Changes from 1904 (remarks) 1336 (i).
Cabinet Vacancies, and Absence of Ministers (remarks) on Orders of the Day, 3555 (ii).
——— Interior Dept., Information *re* (remarks) 3362 (ii).
——— (remarks) *re*, 4085. 4201 (iii).
Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase, &c., on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Ret., 736 (i).
Canada Life Assurance Co., Ref. to in Com. on B. 108, 4690 (iii).
Canadian Fast Mail Service, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to adjn., 9779 (v).
C.P.R. Tax Exemptions, Interpretations *re* (Ans.) 731 (i).
See 'Autonomy,' &c.
Cement, in Com. of Ways and Means, 8987 (v).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 1013; in Com., 625, 1080, 1469 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) *re* Resolutions 631 (i).
Census in Man. and N.W.T., Taking of (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 1080 (i).
Clarke, Mr. E. F., Late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 2042, 2109 (ii).
Cold Storage, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8202 (v).
——— Statements of Mr. E. D. Smith *re* (remarks) 874 (i).
Collingwood Govt. Dock, Tenders *re* Conroy Bros. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6580 (iv).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Colonial Conference, Par. in Montreal 'Star' *re* Tariff Discussions (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7098 (iv).
Colonial Stock Act and Provincial Trust Investments, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 9698 (v).
——— Inquiry for, 9540 (v).
Commerical Agencies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9037 (v).
Committees, Sel., Com., Addition of Name (remarks) 624 (i).
——— Appnmt. of Mr. Bristol (remarks) 5210 (iii).
Companies Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 8528 (v).
Consumption : *See* 'Tuberculosis.'
Conventions between United Kingdom and U.S. *re* Personal Property (remarks) *re* Cor., 1068 (i).
Cornwall Canal Employees during Election Campaign (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1228 (i).
Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4271 (iii).
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 1°, 9075; in Com., 9411; on M. for 3°, 9524 (v).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Passenger Rates, Ref. to Ry. Commission (remarks) 6836 (iv).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 4550 (iii).
——— Rep. of Com. and Internal Economy (remarks) 9802 (v).
Demers, L. J., M.P., Decease of (remarks) 5140 (iii).
Discrimination in Freight Rates *re* Allan SS., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 888 (i).
Dobey : *See* 'Thessalon.'
Dominion Annuity Co.'s incorp. B. 82 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 2768 (ii).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) in Com., 4971 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 189) 1° m., 8775 (v).
——— (issue of writ) Amt. (B. 194) 1° m., 9073 (v).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. Bills, Consideration during Recess (remarks) 9812 (v).
Dom. Lands Act, Yukon Regulations, on M. (Mr. Oliver) to approve, 9787 (v).
Dredges employed at Port Arthur, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 790 (i).
Easter Adjournment (remarks) 4375 (iii).
——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4750 (iii).
Edmonton Election, Date of Contest, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5892 (iii).
Election of Members to Vacant Constituencies (B. 194) 1° m., 9073 (v).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Estimates, Delay in bringing down and efficient Criticism, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) 9094 (v).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 1400 (i), 3205 (ii).
Facer Steel Car Co.'s Patent Relief B. 27 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 1339 (i).
Fessenden Wireless Tel. of Can. incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6607 (iv).
First Minister's Salary (B. 201) in Com. on Res., 9726 (v).
Fiscal Year, Change of Date to March 31 (remarks) in Discussion of Estimates, 9095 (v).
Fishery Inspectors, N.S., Delay in appointing (remarks) 9687 (v).
Fisheries Protection Service, Neglect of Overseers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6632 (iv).
Fog Horn Nuisance at Toronto Island (remarks) 9287 (v).
Fort Lawrence, N.S., Pier, Name of Contractors, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 5034 (iii).
Franchise Act (1898) Amt. B. 52 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 2113 (ii), 9198 (v).
Franking Privilege, Use of Stamp, &c. (remarks) 5135 (iii).
Geological Survey Director, Delay in appointing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9303 (v).
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale to Mr. F. W. Grant (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6485 (iv).
Gillies Brothers, Limited B. 95 (Mr. A. A. Wright) in Com., 2764 (ii).
Glanders among Horses, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6707 (iv).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3361 (ii).
Govt. Steamers, Coal Supply (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2609 (ii).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 9400 (v).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3649, 3880 (ii), 4126, 4202 ; on M. for 3° (remarks) 4228 (iii).
G. T. Ry. Arbitration B. 199 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9529 (v).
G.T.P. Ry. B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7623, 7625 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry., Plans deposited with Dept. of Rys., on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 918 (i).
——— Survey of Route, Moncton to Winnipeg, Information *re* (remarks) 6134 (iv).
Guarantee Bonds : *See* 'Inland Revenue,' &c.
Half-breed Scrip Investigation, Appnmt. of Counsel (remarks) 8529 (v).
Half-breed Scrip to Non-residents (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6504 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 6566 (iv).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Halifax Garrisons, Explanation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9128 (v).
Halifax Fortifications, Retention of Imperial Troops (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6510 (iv).
Halifax and Esquimalt, Naval Stations, Continuance of (remarks) 9677 (v).
——— Control by Canada (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1404 (i).
Halifax Lightship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2708 (ii).
Halifax, New Public Building, Contract *re*, in Com. of Sup., 1037 (i).
Herring and Fishing Industry, Rep. of Commission, Inquiry for, 4552 (iii).
Immigration, Fraudulent Representations B. 120 (Mr. Logan) in Com., 9700 (v).
——— (remarks) *re* Bill, 8177 (v).
See 'North Atlantic,' &c.
Imperial Guarantee and Accident Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2771 (ii).
Indian Harbour Wharf, Pet. *re*, Inquiry for Copy, 8178 (v).
Inland Revenue Act (guarantee bonds) Amt. B. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8677 (v).
Insurance Cos., Legislation *re*, &c. (remarks) 9690 (v).
I.C.R. and C.A. Ry. Act (running rights) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 4187 (iii) ; in Com., 6139, 7584 (iv).
I.C.R., Appointments, *re* Train Service, of unworthy Persons (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9520 (v).
——— Freight Diversion and Traffic Arrangements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2219 (ii).
——— Freight Rates, Increases, &c. (remarks) on Explanation of Min of Rys., 6119 (iv).
——— Snow Blockade, Delay in Service, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2028 (ii).
——— Train Service, Stalled by Snowstorms, Tel. (read) 695 (i).
Interior, Appnmt. of Mr. Oliver as Minister (remarks) 4201 (iii).
Internal Economy Committee (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6612 (iv).
——— Rep. *re* Proceedings (remarks) 9076 (v).
Japan Trade Relations with Canada, on Stmnt. (Mr. Fisher) 7914 (iv).
——— Treaty, Inquiry for 8385 (v).
'J. I. Tarte' Dredge, Defective Boilers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2466 (ii).
Johnston, T. G., Late, M.P., Decease of (remarks) 8694 (v).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) Act Amt. B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9742, 9750 ; in Com., 9794 ; on Amt., 9797 (v).
Judicial Vacancies, Length of, Appmnts, &c. (remarks) 7423 (iv), 8002 (v).
Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Kentville Rifle Range, Purchase of Property (remarks) 6661, 7584 (iv).
——— Rep. *re* Evidence (remarks) 8698 (v).
'Lady Laurier,' Govt. Steamer, Investigation *re* Accident (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2600 (ii).
Land Titles Act (1894) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 9082 (v).
Lewis, Edward Norman, M.P., Relief B. 142 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, and in Com., 5136 (iii).
London Militiamen and London Election (remarks) 7253, 7331 (v).
See 'McKenzie,' &c.
'Lurcher,' Lightship, Accident to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2756 (ii).
McDonald, Mr. J. L., Indian School Teacher, N.S., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 6514 (iv).
McKenzie, Mr. D. D., Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill, on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. Johnston) 8477 (v).
Mackenzie and Dauphin, Man., Ret. Officers, Special Officers (remarks) 1336 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Demands *re* Separate School Question, by Mgr. Sbaretti, 3848 (ii).
——— Former Pets. *re* (remarks) 4084 (iii).
——— Mr. Jackson's, Speech *re* Settlement (remarks) 4843 (iii).
——— Mgr. Sbaretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 3938 (ii).
——— Mgr. Sbaretti's Explanation, 'Race and Religious Cry', Charges by Mr. Paterson (reply) 4037 (ii).
——— Reply to O.C. of March 21st, 1905, from Man. Govt. (remarks) 3744 (ii).
See 'Autonomy,' &c.
Manitoba Election Returns, Voters' Lists returned to Clerk of Crown (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1405 (i).
——— Duties of Returning Officers (remarks) 1506 (i), 4678 (iii).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6797 (iv).
Melfort Mail Service, Charges *re* Delays, &c., Cor., &c. (read) 9789 (v).
Meteorological Observatory, Removal to Ottawa (remarks) 9800, 9810 (v).
Midland Harbour Range Lights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2738 (ii).
Militia Medical Officers, Disqualification as Members of H. of C., Cor. asked for, 8997 (v).
Militiamen at London, Elections, Voting, &c. (remarks) 7253, 7331 (iv).
Ministerial Changes, Mr. Aylesworth's Position, &c. (remarks) 1336 (i).
See 'Cabinet'.

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Montevideo, Imprisonment of British Seamen (remarks) 2689 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Claims of P. Lyall & Sons (remarks) *re* Question, 696 (i).
Moosejaw and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 20 (Mr. Scott) in Com., 2715, 2762 (ii).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9082 (v).
Murray Harbour and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2153 (ii).
Musquodoboit Postmaster, Dismissal (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6224 (iv).
Nixon, Robt., Charges against (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9331 (v).
——— on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8109 (v).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9323 (v).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9448 (v).
——— Tel. *re* Contract, &c. (remarks) 8182 (v).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2052, 2324 (ii).
Northwest Territories Representation Act Amt. (B. 156) in Com. (amt.) 8769; Amt. (agents) 8770; Amt. *re* Govt. employees, 8771 (v).
Northwest Territories B. 160 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 8764; in Com., 8765; on M. for 3°, 9408 (iv).
N.W.T. Govt. Officials, Interference in Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9721 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2718 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 9817 (v).
Orangemen, Attack *re* 'Yellow Dog,' Quotations from Quebec Papers (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 8354 (v).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 2545, 3172, 3191; (amts.) 3199, 3201 (iv).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 4965 (iii).
Owen, Thomas David, Patent Relief B. 177 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 8652 (v).
Oxford, N., Issue of Writ, &c. (remarks) 6135 (iv).
Papal Ablegate: *See* 'Manitoba Boundaries.'
Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5798 (iii).
Pilotage Commission, Sydney Harbour, Benefit Fund for Pilots, &c. (remarks) 9036 (v).
Poonamalie Dam, Pet. *re* Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9381 (v).
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Conmee and Bowman's Tender, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4476, 4670 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4673 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Port Arthur and Ft. William Fog Alarms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6645 (iv).
Port Arthur and Fort William Telephone System, and Board of Ry. Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Cor., 1394 (i).
Prorogation, Date of, &c. (remarks) 9790, 9811 (v).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Works under Contract, Supervision Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7589 (iv).
Public Works Minister, Resignation of, &c. (remarks) *re* Rumour, 5035 (iii).
——— Appnmt. of Minister (remarks) 5961 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, *re* G.T.P. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2295 (ii).
Railways and Canals Dept., Dep. Minister, Retirement of, &c. (remarks) 9678 (v).
Railway Belt Lands, B.C., Settlement of, Cor. *re* (read) 9295 (v).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5011 (iii).
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at Elections, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7333 (iv).
Returning Officers, for Mackenzie and Dauphin, Man., Special Reps., Inquiry for, 1336 (i).
Rets. and Repts., &c., Inquiry for, 1242 (i), 2263 (ii).
Roads and Road Allowances *re* Alberta and Saskatchewan B. 195 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 9525; on Sen. Amts., 9819 (v).
St. Lawrence River Ship Channel, in Com. of Sup., 2466 (ii).
Saskatchewan, Prov. of: *See* 'Autonomy B. 70.'
Sbarretti, Mgr.: *See* 'Manitoba Boundaries.'
'Scotia,' Str., I.C.R., Certificates of Engineers, &c. (remarks) 8385 (v).
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 2116 (ii).
Seamen's Act (shipping masters) Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 7425 (iv), 9031 (v).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1162, 1187 (i).
Settlers' Effects, Duty *re*, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8997 (v).
Seymour, D. G., Complaints *re* obtaining Homestead Patent (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9033 (v).
——— Complaints *re* Location of Homestead Entry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9294 (v).
Ships' Safety B. 21 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 731 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9341, 9387; on Senate Amts., 9815 (v).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Statutes Revision, Completion of (remarks) 745 (i).

——— Indexing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8673 (v).

Stewart, Mr. J. S., Charges against by Mr. Roche, M.P. (letter read) 9613 (v).

Supply B. 206 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9801 (v).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Chambly (macadamizing road) 9378 (v).

Canals—Galops (channel completion) 1230 (i).

Canals—Lachine (Atwater Avenue bridge) 1240 (i).

Canals—Trent (Holland river) 9367 (v).

Canals—Welland (bridge building) 1234; (Port Colborne, deepening) 1232; (Port Colborne, elevator) 1327; (Port Colborne, entrance) 1231; (surveys) 1236 (i).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salary increases) 9070; Public Works (salaries) 9071; Railways and Canals (private sec.) 9065; Sec. of State (salaries) 9071; Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 9034 (v).

Customs (remission of duties *re* army and navy goods) 6724, 6813 (iv).

Dom. Lands (Banff Park waterworks) 9306 ; Mines Branch (smelting ores) 9303; Miscellaneous (maps, &c.) 9308 (v).

Excise (contingencies) 6724 (iv).

Fisheries (bait freezers, Mar. Provs.) 9620 (v ; (bounty distribution) 6636 (iv); (dogfish experiments) 9173; (fish curing) 9173; (fishery commission) 9172 (v); (inspectors' disbursements) 6632 (iv).

Geological Surveys, (surveys, &c.) 8669 (v).

Govt. of N.W.T. (general vote) 9622 (v).

Immigration (seed grain supply) 9307 (v).

Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (provisions) 9338 (v); N.S. (general vote) 6514 (iv).

Justice, Administration of (B. C. judges) 9683 ; (N.W.T. judges) 9683 ; (Three Rivers judgeship) 9682 (v) ; Miscellaneous (litigation matters) 7247 (iv).

Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7544 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 2759 (ii); ('Arctic' patrol boat) 9177 (v); (engineers' salaries) 2760 (ii); (ice boats) 9177 (v); (lighthouse repairs) 6641 (iv) 9036 ; (light-keepers' salaries) 9176 (v) (lightships maintenance) 2708 (ii); (NW.M. Police patrol boat) 9178 (v); (pilotage) 2760; (signal service) 2760 (ii); (wrecking plant, Mar. Provs.) 9177 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and G.B.) 967; (Can. and Mexico) 897 (i), 9681 (v) ; (G.B. and Canada) 865 ; (Manchester Line) 932; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 928 : (St. John and Halifax) 923 ; (St. John and Minas) 926 (i); (St. John, &c., and W. Indies) 7192 (iv), 8691 (v) ; (Victoria and San Francisco) 906 ; (wrecking plant) 960 (i).

Marine (hospitals) 9172 (naval militia) 9178 (v) (shipwrecked seamen) 2688 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 6512 (iv); (depots) 9114 (v); pay and allowance) 6510 (iv);; (permanent force) 9127, 9155 (v).

Miscellaneous (Bank of Commerce, Yukon, compensation) 9615 (v) ; (consolidation of statutes) 7247 (iv), 8673 (v) ; (printing &c.) 6723 (iv); (Public Accounts evidence)

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Miscellaneous—*Con.*

9616; (Sabbath Day legislation) 9684; (tariff commission) 9614 (v).

Northwest Mounted Police (pay of force) 8658 ; (Yukon) 8665 (v).

Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 2600; (hydrographic surveys) 2679 (ii), 6623 (iv); (ice-breakers, repairs) 9035 (v); (meteorological service) 2679; (schools of navigation 2640 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 849, 1021; (Halifax detention building) 1037 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additions, &c., (H. of C.) 9546 (v).

Public Works—Dredges (new plant) 9171 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Salmon river) 7575 ; (Thompson river) 7575; (Victoria) 7576 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours anad Rivers—N.S. (Apple river) 7395; (Baddeck) 7396; (Barachois) 7396; (Breton Cove) 7397; (Clark's Harbour) 7398; (Cow Bay, Port Morien) 7399; (Culloden) 7401; (Fort Lawrence) 6838 (iv); (Glace Bay) 9578 (v); (Inverness Mines) 7403; (Judique) 7407; (Larry's River) 7407; (Mahone Bay) 7408; (Margaree) 7411; (Meteghan) 7413; (New Campbellton) 7413; (Port Hawkesbury) 6838 ; (Scott's Bay) 7416 ; (Victoria Beach) 7419 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood) 7549 (iv) ; (Port Arthur) 784 : (Port Colborne) 815 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Lake St. Peter piers) 6462 (iv) ; (St. Lawrence channel) 2448, 2466 (ii) ; (St. Lawrence channel, suction dredge) 6437 (iv) ; (Sorel deep water wharf) 9593 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Transportation, &c. (Georgian Bay surveys) 7637 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (arbitrations, &c.) 7611 ; (cement testing) 7613 ; (Ottawa river survey) 7612 ; (surveys) 7611 ; (transportation commission) 7628 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Dom. (traffic bridges) 7592 ; N.W.T. (Battle river) 7587 ; (colonization roads) 7595 ; Ottawa (repairs) 7585 ; Que. (Bryson) 7586 (iv).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (Gatineau river) 7630 ; (working expenses) 7632 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraphs—B.C. (Kamloops) 7610 ; (Vancouver, Salt Springs) 7610 ; Mar. Provs. (Bay St. Lawrence) 7606 ; N.W.T. (Edmonton and Qu'Appelle) 7633 ; (working expenses) 7633 ; P.E.I. (working expenses) 7632 ; Que. (Bersimis, &c.) 7609 (v).

Public Works—Transportation Commission (expenses) 8692 (v).

Quarantine (organized districts, salaries) 2303 (ii).

Railways—G.T.P. (salaries, &c.) 2293 ; (surveys, construction, &c.) 2282 (ii), 7496 (iv); (terminals, &c.) 9500 (v).

Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 9387 (v) ; (double tracking) 2027 (ii), 9391 (v) ; (expenditures) 2219 (ii) ; (general vote) 7476 (iv); (Halifax deep water dredging) 2026 ; (Halifax terminals) 2032 (ii) ; (rolling stock) 9520 (v) ; (St. Lambert, &c., double tracking) 2183 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Railways—P.E.I. (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2153 (ii), 8692 (v).
Senate (contingencies) 6621 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 9037 (v).
Supreme Court, N.S., Vacant Judgeship, Delay *re* Appnmt. (remarks) 5036, 5209 (iii), 6837 (iv).
Sutherland, Hon. James, Decease of (remarks) 5317 (iii).
Telegraph Lines in Can., Total Mileage (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7609 (iv).
Telephone Lines, Pet. *re* Control, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1244 (i).
Thessalon Postmaster Dismissal, Investigation, &c. (remarks) on M. to adjn., 6652 (iv).
——— Mr. J. B. Dobey, Irregularities, &c., on M. for Sup., 6209, 6221 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Cor., 3203 (ii).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3653, 4683; on M. for 3°, 4965 (iii).
Trachoma Hospital, Halifax, Disposal of to Govt. (remarks) 2303 (ii).
Trading Stamps : *See* 'Criminal Code,' &c.
Transcontinental Commission, Appnmt. of Chairman (remarks) 7916 (iv).
——— Personnel and Duties, &c. (remarks) 9679 (v).
——— Progress, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6438 (iv).
——— Reps. *re* (remarks) 9687 (v).
——— Rep. *re* C.A. Ry. (remarks) in Com. on B. 45, 4225 (iii).
See 'G.T.P.', &c.
Treadgold Concessions Inquiry, Instructions to Commissioners (remarks) 7101 (iv).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1379 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Perley) to conc., 9522 (v).
Union Labels B. No. 10 (Mr. R. Smith) in Com., 702, 918 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8650 ; on M. for 3°, 8824 (v).
Veterans of 1886 and 1870, Grant of Lands (remarks) 6048 (iv).
Voters' List *re* Edmonton Election, Preparation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).
Water Meters Inspection B. 188 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8674 ; in Com., 9410 ; on Sen. Amts,. 9816 (v).
Western Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4689 (iii).
Wire Fencing, Contract *re* Erection of, N.W.T. Boundary Line, on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5580 (iii).
——— on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5692 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 5808, 5961 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Wireless Telegraph Regulations B. 186 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 9032 (v).
Worthington, Col., Militia Allowance and Independence of Parlt. Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., Cor., &c (read) 9149 (v).
Wrecking Plant 'Lord Strathcona,' in Com. of Sup., 960 (i).
Yukon Commissioner, Vacancy and Appnmt. (remarks) 5036 (iii).
Yukon Election, Cor. (read) *re* Ret. Officer, 1254 (i).
——— Delay in Opening Ballot Boxes (remarks) 987 (i).
——— Ret. of Member (remarks) *re* Telegrams, 1066 (i).
——— Returning Officer, Information *re* (remarks) 1152 (i).
Yukon Territory Orders-in-Council, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 9725 (v).
Yukon Reforms *re* Condition of Country (remarks) on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 7035, 7081 (iv).

Bourassa, Mr. H., *Labelle.*
Autonomy for Alberta, Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3252 (ii) ; (B. N. A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) dual language, 8581 (v).
——— in Com. (schools) on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7141 (iv), 8299 ; (Amt.) 8341 ; on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8426, 8464 ; on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8522 (v).
——— on M. for 3°, Amt. (schools) 8835 ; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to sec. 16 (schools) 8813 ; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 8845 ; Amt. to Amt. dual language, 8845 (v).
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) Debate in Com. on School Clause (personal explanation) 7175 (iv).
——— on M. for 3° (personal explanation) *re* Not Voting, 8865 (v).
Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) in Com., sec. 16 (schools) Amt., 8759 (v).
Man. Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Memorandum *re* Separate Schools, 3863 (ii).
——— on M. to adjn., 3986, 4066 (ii).
Telephone Lines, Pet. *re* Municipal Control (remarks) 1250 (i).

Boyce, Mr. A. C., *West Algoma.*
Aliens employed on Govt. Works at Sault Ste. Marie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1412 (i).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 4433 (iii).
Autonomy Bill, Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2581 (ii).
Bank Notes, Supervision *re* Printing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6255 (iv).
Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Conspiracy, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. on B. 36, 537 (i).

Boyce, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Boyd, Geo. A., Emplymt. by Govt. at Sault Ste. Marie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6881 (iv).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1074, 1099 (i).
Dobie, W. J. B., Dismissal from Thessalon Post Office (M. for cor.) 3202 (ii),
See 'Thessalon.'
Fishing Regulations in Ont., Conflict with Dom. (remarks) 4751 (iii).
Fitz-Simons, Jane Marie, Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 6379 (iv).
Ft. William Station, Plans *re* deposited with Ry. Dept. (remarks) 2009 (ii).
Georgian Bay, Lake Huron, &c., Fisheries, Request *re* Investigation of (Ques.) 5479 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry., Plans of Terminals, Copies Deposited in Ry. Dept. (M. for ret.) 917 (i), 2816, 2836 (ii).
——— Plans *re* Termini, &c. (Ques.) 1150 (i).
——— Surveys, Reps. in Ry. Dept., &c. (remarks) 2009 (ii).
——— Terminus at Port Arthur, Approval of Location (remarks) 6138 (iv).
Hay Imports from U.S., Quantity, Duties collected, &c. (Ques.) 1064 (i).
Kentvale Postmaster, Sureties, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 5977 (iv).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6658 (iv).
Killam, Judge. Appnmt. as Chairman of Ry. Commission (remarks) on M. for Com. on Res., 537 (i).
Lake Superior and Sault Ste. Marie Cos., Purchase of Steel Rails, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1995 (i).
Leach, R. E. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1151 (i).
McDermot, Clara Bidwell, Relief B. 152 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 6279, 6357 (iv).
Meadow Creek Ranching Co., Patent *re* Lands (Ques.) 6476 (iv).
Municipal Telephone System, Present Status of Port Arthur and Fort William Application (Ques.) 595 (i).
Ontario Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 105) 1°*, 2184 ; in Com., 2772 (ii).
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Conmee & Bowman's Tender, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4462, 4465 (iii).
——— Time for Tenders (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6875 (iv).
Port Arthur and Fort William, Application *re* Telephones (Ques.) 595 (i).
——— Cor. *re* Application to Board of Ry. Commissioners (M. for copy) 1386, 1391 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 2203, 2685 (ii).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'

Boyce, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Railway Commissioners, Appnmt. of Chairman. B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com. on Res., 537 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Bonded Warehouse *re* Soft Coal, Establishment of (Ques.) 5688 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Contractors, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1407 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Dry Dock, Construction, Total Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 5426 (iii).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1189, 1791 ; on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) to M. for 3°, 1873 (i).
SUPPLY :
Canals—St. Peters (dredging) 6303 (iv); Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 1335, 1406 (i); Welland (claims *re* injuries) 6306 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Acton Vale) 1106 (i); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Blind River dredging) 6870; (Grand River dredging) 6873; (Sault Ste. Marie harbour) 6881 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (steel rails, &c.) 1995 (i).
Telephone Lines, Pet. *re* Municipal Control (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1253 (i).
Telephone and Telegraph Lines, Govt. Construction, &c., Ques. wthdrn., 6105 (iv).
Thessalon Postmaster, Appnmt. and Sureties (Ques.) 6105 (iv).
——— (M. for cor.) 3202 (ii).
——— on M. for Sup., 6192 (iv).
——— (remarks) on M. to adjn., 6649 (iv).
——— Salary Warrants, Inquiry for 6239 (iv).
Voters' Lists, Algoma East and West, &c., Revision, &c. (Ques.) 594 (i).
Voters' Lists for Unorganized Ters., Cor. *re*, Instructions, &c. (M. for copies*) 1397 (i).

Boyer, Mr. G., *Vaudreuil.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5169 (iii).
Castonguay, A. B., Cause and Report *re* Dismissal (Ques.) 6653 (iv).

Brabazon, Mr. G. H., *Pontiac.*
Georgian Bay Canal, Surveys, Engineers, Reps., &c. (Ques.) 192 (i).

Bristol, Mr. E., *Centre Toronto.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden to M. for 2°, 5140 (iii).

Broder, Mr. A., *Dundas.*
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 2430 (ii).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4846; in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5537 (iii).
Ice Jam in St. Lawrence River, Govt. Action *re* (remarks) 699 (i).
Lefebvre, A. P., Postmaster at Markstay, Investigation *re* Dismissal (Ques.) 7096 (iv).
St. Lawrence Ice Blockade, Damages *re* (remarks) 280 (i).

Broder, Mr. A.—*Con.*
'Scout,' Str., Explosion of Acetylene Gas, Investigation *re* (remarks) 4842 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, plans, &c) 9490 (v).
Williamsburg and Cornwall Canal Water Power Leases, Dates, Rentals, Claims, &c. (Ques.) 4809 (iii).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P. (Minister of Inland Revenue), *Rouville.*
Adulteration of Jams, &c., Prosecutions *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1711 (i).
Alexandra Bridge, Ottawa, Lighting, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7586 (iv).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5211 (iii) ; in Com., sec. 2 (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) (dual language) 8558, 8599 (v) ; in Com. (school clause amt.) 7131 (iv) ; on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8333 ; on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8393; on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Léonard) 8857 (v).
Beauharnois Canal, Waterways, Opening Waterways, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 7380 (iv).
Bills from the Senate, on M. (Mr. A. Johnston) to place on Order Paper, 8096 (v).
Bout de l'Isle, Repentigny and Charlemagne Ferry Service (Ans.) 9696 (v).
Canadian Agency B. 77 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for Com., 9049; in Com., 9077 (v).
Caplin and Paspebiac Ry., Payments *re* Subsidy, on M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 3203 (ii).
Cast Iron, Furnished Marine Dept. at Sorel (Ans.) 2328 (ii).
Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4265 ; on M. for 3°, 5139 (iii).
Cullers, Abolition of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7580 (iv).
Debates, Official, and Internal Economy Com., Reps. *re* (remarks) 9802 (v).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) in Com., 4975 (iii).
Election Officers : *See* 'Returning.'
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3207 (ii).
Fairford River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7570 (iv).
Fertilizers, Inspection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1726 (i).
Fishermen for Cod Fisheries, P.E.I., Immigration from Ireland and Scotland (Ans.) 586 (i).
Fish Hatcheries, N.B., Number of Fish, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 590 (i).
Gas and Electric Light Inspection, Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1692 (i).
——— Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1760 (i).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 9398 (v).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4202 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7621 (iv).
Greece's Point Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7302 (iv).
Halibut Fisheries, B.C., American Encroachments (Ans.) 585 (i).
Imports and Exports. Duties paid, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) for Ret., 3204 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. (B. 176) 1° m., 7421 (iv); in Com., 8676; on Sen. Amts., 9411 (v).
Inland Revenue Dept., Rep. (presented) 51 (i), 4085 (iii).
Internal Economy Board, Rep. of Proceedings (remarks) 9076 (v).
International Bridge and Terminal Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 87 (Mr. Grant) on Sen. Amts., 9695 (v).
Lobster Canneries, Licenses, Applications, &c., N.B., District No. 1 (Ans.) 584 (i).
Lobsters, Legal Length in Bay of Fundy, Changes *re* (Ans.) 584 (i).
McDermot, Clara Bidwell, Relief B. 152 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 6352 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries, Mgr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 3985 (ii).
Maple Products, Adulteration of (Ans.) 1341 (i).
Metric System, Adoption of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1694 (i).
Moncton Harbour Master, Appnmt. of Mr. D. Robertson (Ans.) 2329 (ii).
Montreal Harbour, &c., Dues and Charges, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7316 (iv).
Montreal P.O., St. Catherine St. Branch, Unsanitary Condition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 202 (i).
Naturalization and Aliens Act Amt. (B. 184) 1°*, 7906 (iv).
Patent Medicines, Inspection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1725 (i).
Port Arthur Dredging Contract, on Ques. of Order *re* Relevancy of Debate, on Ms. to adjn. (remarks) 4673 (iii).
Port Credit Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iv).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Works under Contract, Supervision Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7588 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. (B. 37) 1° m., 582 (i).
Ry. Debts : *See* 'Exchequer.'
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at Elections, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7355 (iv).
Richelieu Bridge Dispute, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6960 (iv).
St. Louis, Certificate *re* Reinstatement (Ans.) 591 (i).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

St. Timothée Wharf, Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv).

Seamen's Act Amt. (B. 38) 1° m., 582 (i).

Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. of Sup., 368 (i).

South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9586; on M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 9072; on Sen. Amts., 9816 (v).

Spirits in Bond (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8679 (v).

SUPPLY:

Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1699 (i).

Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (salaries) 89 (i), 9069 (v).

Excise (additional remuneration) 1688; (allowance to customs officers) 1689 (i); (contingencies) 6724 (iv); (Frechette, L. A., translation) 1690; (inspectors' salaries) 1679; (methylated spirits, purchase) 1690; preventive service) 1688; (provisional allowances, B.C., &c.) 1690; (travelling expenses) 1689 (i).

Legislation (voters' lists) 6954 (iv).

Miscellaneous (clerical assistance) 7626 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (generally) 7284; (St. John drill hall) 7503 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Anderson Lake) 7573; (Arrow Head) 7574; (Chilliwack) 7573; (Columbia river) 7573; (Fraser channel) 7574; (Golden) 7574; (Langley) 7575; (Revelstoke) 7573; (Salmon river) 7575; (Thompson river) 7575; (Victoria) 7576; (Williams Head) 7576 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Gimli wharf) 7573; (Lake Dauphin) 7569; (Lake St. Francis) 7572; (Narrows Lake) 7572; (Selkirk) 7573; (White Mud) 7573; (Winnipegosis) 7573 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Cape Tormentine) 7497; (Chance harbour) 7497; (Clifton breakwater) 7497; (Dipper harbour 7498; (Durham wharf) 7498 (Great Salmon breakwater) 7498; (Miscou harbour) 7498; (Mud Cove) 7500; (Petit Rocher) 7500; (Pointe du Chene) 7500; (Quaco harbour) 7501; (Richibucto pier) 7501; (St. John harbour) 7503; (St. John tributaries) 7501; (tidal waters) 7503 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.W.T. (repairs, &c.) 7573 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Apple river) 7396; (Baddeck) 7396; (Barachois) 7396; (Bass river) 7397; (Bay St. Lawrence) 7397; (Bear Cove) 7397; (Beckerton) 7397; (Breton Cove) 7397; (Bridgewater dredging) 7398; (Broad Cove) 7398; (Canning wharf) 7402; (Carlos breakwater) 7398; (Chezzetcook) 7402; (Clark's harbour) 7398; (Country harbour) 7398; (Cow Bay, Port Morien) 7399; (Culloden breakwater) 7401; (Cunningham Point) 7402; (Devil's Island) 7402; (Digby Pier) 7402; (Eel river) 7407; (Freeport) 7402; (Gabarus) 7402; (Georgeville) 7402; (Harrigan cove) 7403; (Indian Harbour) 7403; (Inverness Mines harbour) 7403; (Janvrin's Island) 7406; (Judique) 7407; (L'Ardoise) 7407; (Larry's river) 7407; (Litchfield) 7407; (Little Brook) 7407;

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—*Con.*

(Lunenburg) 7408; (Mabou bridge) 7408; (Main-a-Dieu) 7409; (Mahone bay) 7408; (Malignant Cove) 7409; (Margaree Harbour) 7409; (Margaretville) 7412; (Meteghan cove) 7413; (Mill cove) 7413; (New Campbellton) 7413; (Newport) 7413; (Noel wharf) 7413; (Ogden's Pond) 7414; (Pembroke breakwater) 7414; (Pleasant bay) 7414; (Plympton) 7414; (Port Greville) 7414; (Port Hood) 7414; (Port La Tour) 7415; (Scott's Bay) 7415; (Shelburne) 7418; (Skinner's cove) 7418; (Summerville) 7418; (Three Fathom harbour) 7418; (Victoria beach) 7418; (Wallace harbour) 7419; (West Arichat) 7419; (White Head) 7419; (Wolfville wharf) 7419; (Yarmouth) 7419 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Amherstburg) 7546; (Bayfield pier) 7546; (Beaverton harbour) 7546; (Belle River) 7546; (Blanche river) 7547; (Bracebridge) 7547; (Bronte) 7548; (Cobourg) 7548; Collingwood) 7549; (Depot Harbour) 7552; (Goderich) 7553; (Grand Bend) 7553; (Haileybury wharf) 7556; (Hamilton harbour) 7556; (Kincardine) 7558; (Lake Temiskaming wharfs) 7559; (Little Current) 7560; (Matchedash bay) 7560; (Meaford) 7560; (Midland) 7560; (Newcastle pier) 7561; (Oliphant wharf) 7561; (Otonabee River) 7564; (Ottawa locks) 7561; (Owen Sound) 7561; (Parry Sound) 7562; (Pembroke wharf) 7562; (Penetanguishene) 7563; (Petewawa) 7562; (Point Edward) 7563; (Port Bruce) 7563; (Port Burwell) 7563; (Port Dover) 7564; (Port Hope) 7564; (Port Stanley) 7564; (repairs, &c.) 7555; (Rondeau harbour) 7564; (Sarnia dredging) 7564; (Saugeen) 7565; (Spanish river) 7565; (Thessalon) 7565; (Thornbury) 7565; (Toronto, breakwater) 7567; (Toronto harbour) 7566; (Wiarton) 7569 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse à Beaufils) 7285; (Anse aux Gris Fonds) 7285; (Anse St. Jean) 7286; (Barachois de Malbaie) 7287; (Batiscan channel) 7322; (Belœil guide piers) 7287; (Bic wharf) 7288; (Canton Fabre) 7288; (Chambord wharf) 7289; (Champlain wharf) 7290; (Chateauguay, dredging) 7322; (Chateau Richer) 7290; (Descente des Femmes wharf) 7307; (Desjardins wharf) 7298; (Doucet's Landing) 7298; (eastern channel) 7330; (East Templeton) 7300; (Escoumain wharf) 7303; (Fraserville harbour) 7323; (Gatineau Point) 7303; (Grand Mechins) 7303; (Grande Piles dam) 7326; (Grosse Isle pier) 7305; (Isle St. Therese) 7376; (Lake St. John dredging) 7306; (Lake Temiscamingue) 7287; (Laprairie ice piers) 7306; (Lavaltrie wharf) 7306; (L'Ile d'Alma) 7307; (Little Pabos) 7307; (Lower St. Lawrence) 7308; (Magdalen Islands) 7308; (Maskinongé dredging) 7325; (Mille Vaches) 7310; (Mistook wharf) 7310; (Mont Louis wharf) 7310; (Montmagny wharf) 7311; (Montmorency Falls) 7311; (New Carlisle wharf) 7312; (Nicolet pier) 7313; (Notre Dame du Portage wharf) 7314; (Ottawa River) 7375; (Peel Head bay) 7314; (piers, bridges, &c.) 7305; (Portneuf wharf) 7314; (Repentigny wharf)

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—*Con.*
7314 ; (Rimouski pier) 7320 ; (Rivière Ouelle) 7375 ; (Rivière du Lièvre) 7325 ; (Rivière du Loup) 7325 ; (Rivière Verte) 7390 ; (Sacré-Cœur) 7390 ; (Saguenay river) 7377 ; (St. Alexis pier) 7390 ; (St. André de Kamouraska) 7390 ; (Ste. Anne de la Pocatière) 7390 ; (St. Charles Borromée) 7390 ; (Ste. Famille wharf) 7390 ; (Ste. Fidèle) 7391 ; (St. Francis de Sales) 7391 ; (St. François, Orléans) 7391 ; (St. Fulgence) 7392 ; (St. Gédéon Islands) 7392 ; (St. Jean, Orléans) 7393 ; (St. Louis, feeders) 7380 ; (St. Louis, improvements) 7379 ; (St. Maurice dredging) 7326 ; (St. Simeon) 7393 ; (Terrebonne) 7394 ; (Yamaska river) 7394 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay surveys) 7637 (iv).
Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (new plant) 7578; (working expenses) 7579; Generally (new plant) 7578; (vessel repairs) 7576 ; Man. (snag boat) 7577; (working expenses) 7579; Ont. and Que. (new plant) 7577; (working expenses) 7579; P.E.I. (new plant) 7577 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (arbitrations, &c.,) 7611; (architects, &c.) 7618; (art gallery) 7618; (balances, &c.) 7628; (cement testing) 7613; (clerical salaries) 7620 ; (Ottawa river surveys) 7612; (surveys, &c.) 7611; (technical books) 7627; (telegraph staff) 7620; (transportation commission) 7627 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Dom. (traffic bridges) 7592; N.W.T. (Battle river) 7587; (colonization roads) 7594 ; (Shellmouth) 7591; Ottawa (bridge repairs) 7585; Que. (Bryson bridge) 7585 (iv).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (Gatineau river) 7630; (St. Maurice) 7579; (Upper Ottawa Co.) 7629; (working expenses) 7632 (iv).
Public Works — Telegraphs — B.C. (Kamloops) 7610; (Vancouver and Salt Springs) 7610; (working expenses) 7635 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Dom. (generally) 7636 (iv).
Public Works — Telegraphs — Mar. Provs. (Bay St. Lawrence) 7606 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—N.W.T. (Qu'Appelle and Edmonton) 7633; (working expenses) 7633 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Ont. (Pelee Islands) 7609 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—P.E.I. (Anglo-American Co.) 7632; (working expenses) 7632 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Que. (Bersimis, &c.) 7609 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 7635 (iv).
Senate (contingencies) 6621 (iv).
Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 1696; (inspectors' salaries) 1692; (metric system) 1698; (standards) 1695 (i).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3658 (ii).
Tobacco and Cigars imported from U.S., Duties paid, &c. (Ans.) 5687 (iii).
Tobacco Industry, Inspection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1681 (i).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Toronto Harbour, Eastern Entrance, Fog Signals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7566 (iv).
Water Meters Inspection (B. 188) prop. Res., 8385 ; in Com. on Res., 8674 ; 1°*, 8676 ; in Com., 9409 ; on Sen. Amts., 9816 (v)
Wharf Building, &c., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7316 (iv).
Wharfs in Tidal Waters, Contributions by Provincial Govts., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).

Brown, Mr. J. P., *Chateauguay.*
James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s (B. 150) 1°*, 5783 (iii).
South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 149) 1°*, 5783 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Chateauguay dredging) 7322 (iv).

Bruneau, Mr. A. A., *Richelieu.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4552 (iii).
Cast Iron, Quantity furnished to Marine Dept. at Sorel (Ques.) 2328 (ii).
G. B. and Her Colonies Inter-Imperial Parlt., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2376 (ii).

Bureau, Mr. J., *Three Rivers & St. Maurice.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4861 (iii).
Criminal Code (summary appeals) Amt. B 45 (Mr. Porter) in Com. (amt.) *re* Race Courses, 5137 (iii).
La Compagnie Electrique de Trois Rivieres, &c (B. 57) 1°*, 986 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 3986 (ii)
Orangemen, Attack *re* Quotations from Quebec Papers (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 8351 (v).
St. Maurice Valley Ry. Co. (B. 173); Pet. presented, 6826, 7017 (iv), 1°*, 7175 (iv).
Separate Schools, Circulars issued by Jacques Cartier Club (remarks) on prop., Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2408 (ii).
SUPPLY :
House of Commons—Library (books) 6947 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (eastern channel) 7330; (Grande Piles dam) 7327; (St Maurice dredging) 7326 (iv).

Burrows, Mr. T. A., *Dauphin.*
Fairford River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7570 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Douphin) 7570 ; Roads and Bridges—N.W.T. (colonization roads) 7603 (iv).

Caldwell, Mr. T. B., *North Lanark.*

Budget, on The, 8965 (v).
Facer Car Wheel Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 27) 1°*, 493; in Com., 1285 (i).
Fitz-Simmons, Jane Marie Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 6379 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 4016 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3172 (ii).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 716 (i).

Calvert, Mr. W. S., *West Middlesex.*

Canadian Canals Corporation incorp., (B. 72) 1°*, 1592; 2° m., 1757 (i).
Canada Middlesex Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B 55) 1°*, 908 (i).
Fitz-Simmons, ane Marie Relief (B. 130) 1°*, 4081 (iii) ; in Com., 6377 ; 3° m., 6378 (iv).
Great Northern Ry. of Canada (B. 71) 1°*, 1504 (i).
Hersey, A. T., Relief B. 167 (Mr. T. G. Johnston) in Com., 7624 (iv).
Hudson's Bay and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 109) 1°*, 2184 (ii).
Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Co.'s (B. 84) 1°*, 1788 (i).
London and St. Clair Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 32) 1°*, 493 (i).
McCormack & Sharples, Messrs., Patent Relief B. (M.) to receive Pet., 6558 (iv).
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s (B. 39) 1°*, 625 (i).
Pearson, Geo., Relief (B. 153) 1°*, 5919 (iii) ; in Com., 7623 (iv).
Prior, James Arthur Relief (B. 127) 1°*, 3091 (ii).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s (B. 48) 1° m., 817 (i).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s (B. 110) 1°*, 2184 (ii)

Campbell, Mr. A., *Centre York.*

Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2843 (ii).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5307 (iii).
——— in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7853; (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8444 (v).
Autonomy Bill 69, School Clause Amts., Explantation *re* (remarks) 5819 (iii).
Breakwaters, Wharfs, &c., N.S., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9556 (v).
Budget, on The, 8938 (v).
Canadian Yukon Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 165) 1°, 6232 (iv).
Damen, Wm., Patent Relief (B. 129) 1°*, 3834 (ii) ; (M.) to ref. back to Com., 6379 (iv).

Campbell, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Estimates, Delay in bringing down, Obstruction, &c (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9273 (v).
Fitz-Simmons, Jane Marie Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 6378 (iv).
Freight Rates, Advancement of, Rebate, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1545 (i).
Gold Medal Furniture Mfg. Co. Patent Relief (B. 102) 1°*, 2184; in Com., 3399 (ii).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 9405 (v).
Ideal Manufacturing Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 166) 1°, 6232 (iv).
I.C.R., Freight Rates and Traffic Arrangements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2243 (ii).
——— Freight Rates, Increases, &c. on Explanation of Min. of Rys., 6128 (iv).
McDermot, Clara Bidwell Relief (B. 152) 1°*, 5919 (iii) ; in Com., 6275, 6347 (iv) ; 3° m., 6376, agreed to (Y. 38; N. 13) 6377 (iv).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6805 (iv).
Molson's Bank B. 33 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 755 (i).
Murray Harbour Branch Ry. and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup. 2158 (iii).
Officials dismissed by Mr. Whitney *re* Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6865 (iv).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s (B. 86) 1°*, 1933 (i) ; in Com., 2715, 2717, 2763, 3134 (ii).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Railway Commission, Advancement of Freight Rates, Rebates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1545 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Com., 4984 (iii).
Red Deer Valley and Coal Co.'s (B. 76) 1°*, 1671; 2° m., 1757 (i); in Com., 2325 (ii).
Sterling Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 182) 1°*, 7810 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Trent (Holland River) 9363 (v).
Justice, Administration of (Three Rivers Judgeship) 9683 (v).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7538 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoys) 2733 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Phinney's Cove) 9556 (v) ; Ont. (Sault Ste. Marie wharf) 6885 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2158 (ii).

Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. (B. 99) 1°*, 2108 ; in Com., 3651 (ii), 4680 ; 3° m., 4964 (iii).
Trelawney, A. H. H. S., Relief (B. 198) 1°*, 9278 (v).
Water Meters Inspection B. 188 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 9410 (v).

Carvell, Mr. F. B., *Carleton, N.B.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta boundaries) in Com., 5657 (iii).
Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4263 (iii).
Halifax Fishery Awards, Payment to Provs., Ref. *re* (Ques.) 2065 (ii).
McDermot, Clara Bidwell Relief B. 152 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 6365 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies, Readjustment *re*, Memoranda, &c. (M. for copies) 2100 (ii).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1190 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Woodstock armoury) 1059 (i).

Cash, Mr. E. L., *Mackenzie.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4833 (iii) ; in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7889 (iv).

Chisholm, Mr. T., *East Huron.*
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 744 (i).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2° (remarks) 5090 (iii).
Civil Servants' Guarantees *re* P.O. Dept. (Ques.) 1758 (i).
Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8225 (v).
I.C.R. Capital Account, Total Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2064 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3195 (ii).
Post Office Assessment System, Collections *re* (Ques.) 3671 (ii).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 347 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Montmorency wharf) 6867 (iv).

Christie, Mr. P., *South Ontario.*
McDermot, Clara Bidwell Relief B. 152 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 6282 (iv).
Port Perry Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2190 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 6181 ; (live stock records) 6687 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 7616 (iv).
Whitby Wharf Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2190 (ii).

Clare, Mr. G. A., *South Waterloo.*
Binder Twine Industry at Kingston (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 486 (i).
Cement, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8994 (v).

Clare, Mr. G. A.—*Con.*
Cordage at Kingston Penitentiary, Sale of 58 Tons, &c. (Ques.) 6827 (iv).
——— Plant established at Kingston (Ques.) 2329 (ii).
I.C.R., Supplies of Oils, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2254 (ii).
Labour Union Labels, B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com. on Res., 274 ; in Com., 722 (i).
SUPPLY :
Customs (contingencies) 261 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Wellington St. pavement) 1572 (i).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, construction, &c.) 2290 (ii).

Clarke, Mr. A. H., *South Essex.*
Criminal Code (summary appeals) Amt. B. 45 (Mr. Porter) on Amt. (Mr. Bureau) *re* Race Courses, 5138 (iii).
Exchequer Court, Admiralty Jurisdiction, Number of Actions, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1770 (i).
N.W.T. Boundary Fence, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5695 (iii).
Ry. Act, 1903 (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 306 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery, Cost of Establishing, &c., on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Ret., 2095 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Excise (inspectors' salaries) 1687 (i).
Tobacco Industry, Inspection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1687 (i).
Woodstock and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 80) 1°*, 1671 (i).

Clarke, Mr. E. F., *Centre Toronto.*
Sovereign Fire Ins. Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 26) 1°*, 493; in Com., 1755 (i).

Clements, Mr. H. S., *West Kent.*
Agricultural Exports and Imports to U.S., &c. (Ques.) 909 (i).
——— Duties paid, &c. (M. for ret.) 3203 (ii).
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. of Res., 2418 (ii).
Beet Sugar Industry, Encouragement of (M. for copies of cor.*) 3204 (ii).
Budget, on The, 8957 (v).
Chatham Armoury, Contract, Price *re* Erection (Ques.) 587 (i).
Coatsworth Customs Collector, Revenue and Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 261 (i).
Franking Privilege, Extension of Time after Prorogation (remarks) 9395 (v).
Hog Plague in Essex and Kent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6711 (iv).
Ice Jam on Thames River (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1013 (i).
Imports and Exports, Duties paid, &c (M. for ret.) 3203 (ii).

Clements, Mr. H. S.—*Con.*
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Erection of Wire Fencing (Ques.) 5478 (iii).
——— Fencing Contract, Cor. *re* (read) M. to adjn., 5577 (iii).
——— on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5696 (iii).
Rural Mail Delivery, Cost of, &c., on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Ret., 2095 (ii).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 337, 1181; on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) to M. for 3°, 1881 (i).

SUPPLY :

Customs (expenses) 261 (i).
Excise (inspectors' salaries) 1683 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Chatham armoury) 1551 (i).
Quarantine (cattle) 6711 (iv).
Thames River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6872 (iv).
——— Ice Jam (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1013 (i).
——— Lake St. Clair, &c., Surveys, Completion and Cost (Ques.) 590 (i).
Tobacco and Cigars, imported from U.S., Duty paid, &c. (Ques.) 5687 (iii).
Tobacco Industry, Inspection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1683 (i).
Veterinary Inspectors *re* Hog Plague, Salaries, &c. (Ques) 1933 (i).
Veterinary Surgeons, Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6707 (iv).
Wire Fencing *re* Boundary Line, N.W.T., Erection of, Contract *re* (M.) to adjn., 5578
See 'N.W.T.'

Cochrane, Mr. E., *East Northumberland, Ont.*
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 739 (i).
Ballot Box Frauds in Dom. Elections, on M. (Mr. Porter) to Com. of Sup., 9225 (v).
Binder Twine Industry at Kingston (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 483 (i).
Campaign Literature and Franking Privilege (remarks) 1813 (i).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 643 (i).
Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 190 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9764 (v).
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale to Mr. F. W. Grant (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6487 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry., Surveys, Rep. in Ry. Dept., &c. (remarks) 2017 (ii).
I.C.R. Traffic Arrangements, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2217 (ii).
Murray Canal Inspector, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1512 (i).
Murray Harbour Branch Ry. and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2163 (ii).
Oats, Rolled, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9764 (v).

Cochrane, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Peterborough Immigrant Homes, Inspection, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7696 (v).
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1332 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re* on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5015 (iii).
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 7432 (iv).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 335, 363 (i).
SUPPLY :
Arts—Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6935; Experimental Farms (bulletins) 6926 (iv).
Canals—Miscellaneous (inspectors) 1511 (i).
Canals—Trent (surveys, &c.) 1482 (i); (surveys) 9355 (v).
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1332; (surveys) 1235 (i).
Dom. Lands (homestead inspectors) 9258 (v).
Immigration (agents, G.B., &c., salaries) 7694; (interpreters) 7704 (iv).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (live stock) 6540 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—General (armouries) 1655; N.S. (Antigonish) 1017; (Canso) 1026 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Printing Bureau) 1575 (i); (Rideau Hall maintenance) 9551 (v); Que. (Montreal Inland Rev.) 1120 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse aux Gris Fonds) 7285; (Chateau Richer) 7292; (Lake St. Peter piers) 6459 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, plans, &c.) 9496 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (expenditures) 2218; Halifax terminals) 2034 (ii); (ties, &c.) 6431 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2163 (ii).
Trent Canal Surveys (remarks) in Com of Sup., 1472 (i).

Cockshutt, Mr. W. F., *Brantford.*
Adulteration of Food, Jams, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1718 (i).
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 2423 (ii).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4580; in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5550 (iii); in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7974 (iv).
Autonomy B. 69, School Clauses Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5848 (iii).
Brantford Parade Ground (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1553 (i).
Brantford Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Supply, 219, 860 (i).
Budget, on The., 8936 (v).
Campaign Literature franked by Ministers of Crown (remarks) 1817 (i).
Cement, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8985 (v).
Grass Seeds, Quantity exported (Ques.) 913 (i).
G. B. and Her Colonies, Inter-Imperial Parlt., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2358 (ii).

Cockshutt, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
House of Commons, Improvements in Corridors, &c. (remarks) in Com of Sup., 1566 (i).
Indian Schools Establishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 230 (i).
I.C.R., Freight Rates, Increases, &c., on Explanation of Min. of Rys., 6131 (iv).
Letter Carriers, Brantford, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 217 (i).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6802 (iv).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5590 (iii).
——— on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5716 (iii).
Permanent Force, Recruiting Points, &c. (Ques.) 5977 (iv).
P.E.I. Winter Mail Service, Delays, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2656 (ii).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'
Railway Commission (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1613 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5021 (iii).
Rolled Oats, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8984 (v).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 329, 1155, 1208, 1793 ; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 1868 (i).
SUPPLY :
Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1718 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 6179 (iv).
Indians—Ont., &c. (schools) 230 (i).
Ocean and River Service (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 2656 (ii).
Post Office (mail service) 219 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—General (armouries) 1657; N.S. (Antigonish) 860; Ont. (Chatham armoury) 1553; Ottawa (H. of C. improvements) 1566 (i).
White Lead, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8983 (v).
Wire Fencing : *See* 'N.W.T.'

Conmee, Mr. J., *Thunder Bay and Rainy River.*
Autonomy B. 69, in Com., sec. 16 (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 8356; on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8516 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s (B. 86) on Sen. Amts., 9817 (v).

Costigan, Hon. John, *Victoria, N.B.*
Campaign Literature, franked by Ministers of Crown (remarks) 1822 (i).
G.T.P. Surveys through Madawaska, N.B., Route, &c. (Ques.) 5688 (iii).
Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s incorp. (B. 101) 1°*, 2108 (ii).
Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co., Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 9697 (v).

Crawford, Mr. J., *Portage la Prairie.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4607; in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5562 (iii).
Cement, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8991 (v).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 9407 (v).
Lake Manitoba, Closing *re* Fishing, Cor., Pets, &c. (M. for copies) 9698 (v).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6760 (iv).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3172 (ii).

Crocket, Mr. O. S., *York, N.B.*
Alexander Gibson Ry. Co., Purchase, &c. (M. for ret.) 734 (i).
Armoury at Woodstock, Ownership of Land by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 4920 (iii).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4532 (iii).
Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase, &c., Cor., Number of Officials, &c (M. for ret.) 734 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 4811 (iii).
Canada Eastern Ry., Roadbed Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1978 (i).
'Canadian Citizenship' Political Speech by Min. of Rys. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2214 (ii).
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9435 (v).
Drill Hall, Fredericton, Contract *re* (Ques.) 729 (i).
Fertilizers, Inspection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1726 (i).
Fredericton Military Buildings, Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 728 (i).
Fredericton Post Office, Equipment, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 170 (i).
Fredericton Station Agent, Mr. O. White (M. for cor.) 193 (i).
——— Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 107 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 698 (i).
Govt. Steamers, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 1349 (i).
Harvey, N.B., Customs Collector, Appnmt. of (Ques.) 9696 (v).
I.C.R., Freight Rates, *re* Fredericton Increases (remarks) 6591 (iv).
——— on Explanation of Min. of Rys., 6123 (iv).
——— remarks *re*, 6588 (iv).
——— Traffic Arrangements, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2223 (ii).
Military Buildings, Fredericton, Construction (Ques.) 728 (i).
Pound Net Licenses, Little Current, Cor. between A. E. Dyment, M.P., and Min of Mar. and Fisheries *re* (M. for copies*) 1399 (i).

Crocket, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*

Provl. Govt. in N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'

SUPPLY :

Adulteration of Food (fertilizers) 1726 (i).
Militia (cavalry corps) 9125 (v).
Post Office (provisional allowances) 170 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Campbellton wharf) 1744 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (Memramcook accommodation) 1977; (Moncton accommodation) 1948 (i); (revenue collections) 2223 (ii).

White, Odbur, Dismissal as Station Agent, I.C.R. (Ques.) 107 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2205; Cor., &c. (read) 2206 (ii).

Woodstock Rifle Range, Purchase of Land (Ques.) 5132 (iii).

Daniel, Mr. John W., *St. John City.*

Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Denial *re* Election Speaking, 557 (i).

Bridges, Dr., Resignation as Medical Officer of No. 8 District (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 417 (i).

Budget, on The, 8978 (v).

Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 634 (i).

Dipper Harbour Breakwater, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 912 (i).

Dredging in Mar. Provs., Number of Vessels, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6890 (iv).

Fisheries Industry, Commission *re* Investigation, Recommendations, &c., on M. (Mr. Ganong) 6344 (iv).

Fitz-Simmons, Jane Marie Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com. 6378 (iv).

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4220 (iii).

Halifax Garrison, Defence by Canadian Troops (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9131 (v).

Imports from United Kingdom, Amounts, &c. (Ques.) 267 (i).

Imports under Preferential Tariff, Amount, Value, &c. (Ques.) 152 (i).

I.C.R., Coal purchased, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 910 (i).

——— Freight Arrangements and Traffic Diversion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2226; Letter from C. W. Stewart (read) 2227 (ii).

——— Superannuation Scheme (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2241 (ii).

——— Time Table, Changes and Delays, &c., on M. for Sup., 6827, 6829 (iv).

'Lady Laurier,' Number of Crew at Halifax (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2616 (ii).

Letter Carriers, Contract *re* Boots, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).

Live Stock Record Association, incorp. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5926 (iii).

Magdalen Island SS. Subventions, Res. of Mar. Board of Trade (read) 907 (i).

Daniel, Mr. John W.—*Con.*

Mail Subsidy paid to Star Line *re* St. John River (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 181 (i).

Militia Act (permanent force) Amt. B. 170 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6986 (iv).

——— on Explanation (Sir Frederick Borden) 6999 (iv).

Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5964 (iv).

Preferential Tariff, Imports, Value, &c. (Ques.) 152 (i).

Provident Savings Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 5975 (iv).

Quarantine Officers, Examination of Ships, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2304 (ii).

Royal Military College Amt. B. 169 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6967 (iv).

St. John and Digby Mail Subventions, Res. from Mar. Board of Trade (read) 905 (i).

St. John and St. Martins, N.B., Mail Contract (Ques.) 2776 (ii).

St. John Drill Hall, in Com. of Sup., 1049 (i).

St. John, Halifax and London SS. Subvention, Memorial from St. John Board of Trade (read) 903 (i).

St. John, Halifax and W. Indies Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7183 (iv).

St. Lawrence Navigation, Aids to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 891 (i).

Settlers' Effects, Duty *re* in Com. on Ways and Means, 8997 (v).

Submarine Signal Bells on 'Lurcher' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2873 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (creameries) 6940, 7015; (experimental farms) 6168 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (enlargement) 6294 (iv).
Culling Timber (salaries) 7236 (iv).
Customs (revenue cruisers) 409 (i).
Dominion Police (salaries) 138 (i).
Immigration (medical inspection) 9241 (v).
Inspection of Staples (grain inspection) 7227 (iv).
Justice—Yukon (court fees) 137 (i).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7513 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (submarine signals) 2873 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (France and Can.) 7095 (iv); (G.B. and Canada) 864; (St. John and Digby) 904; (St. John and Halifax) 925 (i); (St. John, Halifax and London) 903 (i), 7087; (St. John and W. Indies) 7176 (iv).
Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 2686 (ii).
Militia (Dom. arsenal) 7012 (iv); (pay and allowance) 417 (i); (Royal Military college) 7004 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Academy of Arts) 7238; (tuberculosis grant) 7248 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 2615; (obstructions, removal) 2647; (schools of navigation) 2643 (ii).
Post Office (letter carriers' boots, &c.) 211; (provisional allowances) 168 (i).

Daniel, Mr. John W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (St. John drill hall) 1049 (i); (St. John drill hall) 7504 (iv); (St. John immigration shed) 1050; (St. John Quarantine) 1052 (i); Richibucto) 6814 (iv); N.S. (Antigonish) 855 (i); Ottawa (heating, &c.) 6816 (iv).

Public Works—Dredging—Dom. (repairs to vessels) 6890; Mar. Provs. (new plant) 6891 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. Chance harbour) 7497; (Quaco harbour) 7501; (Salmon river) 7499; N.S. (Shelburne) 7418 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Deep Waterways Commission) 6894 (iv).

Quarantine (cattle) 2310; (organized districts, salaries) 2302 (ii).

Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, construction, &c.) 2299 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (advertising) 2236; (revenue collections) 2225 (ii).

Transportation Commission, Interim Rep. *re* St. John Harbour, Inquiry for, 2595 (ii).

——— Preliminary Rep. (remarks) 731 (i).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1358 (i).

Wines, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8984 (v).

'W. S. Fielding' Dredge, Completion and Placing, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6891 (iv).

Demers, Mr. L. P., *St John's and Iberville.*

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir W. Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R.L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3450 (ii); on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8839 (v).

Canada Car Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 16) 1°*, 317 (i).

Catholic Mutual Benefit Association B. 93 (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com., 2769 (ii).

Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9436 (v).

Effront, Jean, Patent Relief (B. 33) 1°*, 493 (i).

Fish imported into New York, Prohibition of, Legislation *re* on M. for Com. of Sup., 6188 (iv).

Gold Medal Furniture Co.'s Patent Relief B. 102 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3399 (ii).

Goodwin Car Co. Patent Relief (B. 17) 1°*, 317 (i).

Hersey, Arthur, Relief B. 167 (M.) to employ Stenographer, 8527 (v).

Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3135 (ii).

Ry. Act, 1903 (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 300 (i).

Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at Elections, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7353 (iv).

Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 724 (i).

Derbyshire, Mr. D., *Brockville.*

Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 2425 (ii).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5197 (iii).

Autonomy Bill, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjn., 2203 (ii).

Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 94) 1°*, 2005 (ii).

Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup. 8229 (v).

I.C.R., Freight Rates (remarks) *re* Mr. Taylor's Statement, 6590 (iv).

Postmasters acting as Ret. Officers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6245 (iv).

Rural Mail Delivery, Cost of, &c., on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Ret., 2096 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 6175 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Post Office (contingencies) 6245 (iv).

Immigration (printing, &c.) 7711 (iv).

Desjardins, Mr. S., *Terrebonne.*

Dairy Products, Classification for Export, &c. (Ques.) 7810 (iv).

Doncaster Indian Reserves, Abolition of (Ques.) 7812 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Terrebonne) 7394 (iv).

Tison, R. Aimé, Emplymnt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6475 (iv).

Dyment, Mr. A. E., *East Algoma.*

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 116) 1°*, 2185 (ii).

Algoma Copper Range Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 60) 1°*, 1241 (i).

Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9741 (v).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 114) 1°*, 2185 (ii).

Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Rys. Co.'s (B. 113) 1°*, 2185 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Honora wharf) 9597; (Manitoulin wharf) 9598; (Stokes Bay) 9598 (v).

Elson, Mr. P., *East Middldsex.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5100 (iii).

London Drill Hall, Sale of, &c. (Ques.) 8384 (v).

Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) to M. for 3°, 1875 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (London P. O.) 1563 (i).

Quarantine (cattle) 6690 (iv).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R. (Minister of Railways and Canals), *Westmoreland.*

Agents' Dwelling Houses, I.C.R., Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).

Aliens employed at Sault Ste. Marie on Govt. Works, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1415 (i).

Alien Labour and Ry. Employees : *See* 'Père Marquette.'

Amherst, Wharf Connection *re* I. C. Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9521 (v).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry., Amounts paid for Damages (Ans.) 2063 (ii).

——— Rep. of Mr. Mothersill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9383 (v).

Atwater Bridge, Lachine Canal, Name of Contractor, Price, &c. (Ans.) 7261, 7422 (iv).

Balsam Lake Waterways, Agreement *re* (remarks) in Com., of Sup., 1524 (i).

Beauharnois Canal Water Power, Negotiations *re* for Electric Lighting (Ans.) 1504 (i).

Burritt's Rapids Locks, Dismissals, &c. (Ans.) 8384 (v).

Canada Atlantic Ry., Purchases, on Inquiry for Papers, 2685 (ii).
See 'Ry. Act. B. 132.'

Canada Eastern Ry., Improvement of Roadbed (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1978 (i).

——— Purchase, &c., on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Ret. 734 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 4811 (iii).

——— Total Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1922 (i).

Canada Southern Bridge Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. German) in Com., 1286 (i).

'Canadian Citizenship', Political Speech *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2214 (ii).

Canadian Fast Mail Service (announcement) 9279 (v).

——— on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to adjn., 9782 (v).

Canal Inspectors, Qualifications, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1509 (i).

Cardinal Canal, Claims from Contractors: in Com. of Sup., 1220 (i).

——— Swing Bridge and Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1418 (i).

Carillon Canal Fishway, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 2064 (ii).

Charlottetown Ry. Station, Site, &c. (Ans.) 60 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 4810 (iii).

Coal for Govt. Rys., Purchase from N.S. Mines, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 2191 (ii).

Cornwall Basin Dredging Contract, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 588 (i).

Cornwall Canal, Dredging, Contract *re*, Advertising, &c. (Ans.) 686 (i).

——— Employees during Election Campaign: (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1223 (i).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*

Cornwall Canal, Extra Employees, during Oct. and Nov. (Ans.) 107 (i).
See 'Williamsburg.'

Cote St. Paul Water Power, Lease to J. Frothingham (Ans.) 3360 (ii).

Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4269 (iii).

Culbute Canal, Litigation *re* Flooding (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1522 (i).

Drummond Co. Ry., Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1940 (i).

Elevator at Port Colborne, in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1288 (i).

Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 1401 (i).

Fessenden Wireless Tel. Co. of Canada incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6380 (iv).

Fisheries Industry, Commission *re* Investigation, Recommendation, &c., on M. (Mr. Ganong) 6345 (iv).

Fort Lawrence Pier, N.S., Name of Contractors, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 5034 (iii).

Ft. William Telephone System, on Inquiry for Ret., 2685 (ii).

Fish Transportation from Boston to Montreal via G. T. Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1930 (i).

Fredericton Station Agent, Mr. O. White, Dismissal, on Inquiry for Ret., 698 (i).

——— Dismissal, &c., (Ans.) 107 (i).

Freight Rates on I.C.R.: *See* 'I.C.R.', 'Ry. Rates.'

Galena Oil Co., Purchases from (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2254 (ii).

Gamebridge Masonry Inspector, Imperfect Ret. (remarks) 5600 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Papers (remarks) 8004 (v).

Govt. Railways, Rails laid and disposed of, &c., Number of Tons, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2066 (ii).

Grain exported through Govt. Elevators (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1917 (i).

G.T.P. Ry., Awarding of Contracts, Specifications, &c., Answers (read) to Mr. Foster's questions, 9782 (v).

——— Estimates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2182 (ii).

——— Interim Rep. (presnted) 6310 (iv).

——— Location of Line from Winnipeg (remarks) 9815 (v).

——— Plans *re* Termini, &c. (Ans.) 1151 (i).

——— Plans deposited with Dept. of Rys., on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 917 (i), 2820 (ii).

——— Proposed Route West of Winnipeg, Plans, &c. (Ans.) 730 (i).

——— Surveys, B.C., Information *re* (Ans.) 3009 (ii).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
G. T. P. Ry., Surveys through Madawaska, Route, &c. (Ans.) 5688 (iii).
——— Surveys, Number and Names of Employees (Ans.) 686 (i).
——— Surveys, Quebec and Moncton route, Information *re* (remarks) 228 (i).
——— Surveys, Reps. in Ry. Dept., &c. (remarks) 2009 (ii).
——— Terminus at Port Arthur, Approval of Location (remarks) 6138 (iv).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3879 (ii), 4126, 4218 (iii).
Grenville Canal, Appnmt. of Supt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1509 (i).
——— Lumber for Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1514 (i).
Hay, Free Transportation over I.C.R. (Ans.) 59, 109 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 165 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 919 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1929 (i).
Ice Jam in St. Lawrence river, Govtl, Action *re* (remarks) 700 (i).
I.C.R. and C.A. Ry., Running Rights (B. 132) 1° m., 4186 (iii); in Com., 6139, 7583 (iv).
I.C.R. and G.T.R., Arbitration *re* Traffic Arrangements (remarks) in Com of Sup., 1929 (i).
——— (remarks) 68 (i).
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry. Claims for Damages, Amounts paid (Ans.) 383 (i).
I.C.R., Advertising Car, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2257 (ii).
——— Annual Statement, on M. for Sup., 1886, 1891 (i).
——— Appointments to Train Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9521 (v).
——— Capital Account, Total Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2065 (ii).
——— Chapman, F. B., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1343 (i).
——— Coal carried free to Ottawa in 1902-3 (Ans.) 2192 (ii).
——— Coal, Free Transportation in 1902-3, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 2065 (ii).
——— Coal purchased, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 910 (i).
——— Employees, Messrs. Weldon, &c. Political Partisan (Ans.) 1146 (i).
——— Employees, Pensions, Govt. Legislation *re* (remarks) 9289 (v).
——— Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1950 (i).
——— Financial Statement in Com. of Sup., 7445 (iv).
——— Fish Traffic : *See* 'Fish.'
——— Freight Arrangements and Traffic Diversion, on Cor. of C. W. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2228 (ii).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
I. C. R., Freight Rates, Increase of, &c (Statement) in Reply to Mr. Taylor, M.P., 6112; Cor., &c. (read) 6115 (iv).
——— (remarks) *re* Mr. Taylor's Statement. 6587 (iv).
——— Fuel Inspector, Duties, &c. (Ans.) 451 (i).
——— Locomotives, Purchase of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1964 (i).
——— Parlour Cars, Net Profits, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2254 (ii).
——— Passes issued, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2258 (ii).
——— Passes for Councillors at Quebec (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1925 (i).
——— Private Cars, Number, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2259 (ii).
——— Purchases by Tender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2181 (ii).
——— Receipts and Expenditures, Total Amount (Ans.) 688 (i).
——— Rolling Stock, Estimate of Cost, &c. (read) in Com. of Sup., 9501 (v).
——— Snow Blockade, Delay in Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2029 (ii).
——— Superannuation Scheme (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2241 (ii).
——— Supplies, Purchase of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2246 (ii).
——— Time Table, Changes and Delays, on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 6828, 6830 (iv).
——— Time Tables, Printing in English and French (Ans.) 6827 (iv).
——— Traffic Arrangements with other Rys. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1915 (i); 2215 (ii).
——— Train Service, *re* Snowstorms (explanation) 726 (i).
——— Trains stalled by Snowstorms, *re* Telegrams, &c., 696 (i).
See 'P.E.I.'
James Bay Ry. Co., Maps *re* Location (Ans.) 2191 (ii).
Kitchen, Mr., Contract *re* Murray Harbour Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2138 (ii).
Lachine Canal Water Power at Côte St. Paul, Use by Manufacturers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1518 (i).
——— Water Privilege, Lease to Wm. Parkyn, &c. (Ans.) 5133 (iii).
——— Whistles, Nuisance of (remarks) 9284 (v).
Lévis, Purchase of Land for I.C.R. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6670 (iv).
McAlpine, Mr. E. H., Expenditure *re* Litigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1522 (i).
McGill University School of Ry. Transportation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9381 (v).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
Madoc and Eldorado Ry. Bonus (Ans.) 7261 (iv).
Morell River Ry. Bridge, P.E.I., Complaints *re* (Ans.) 5035 (iii).
Municipal Telephone System, Application before Ry. Commission *re* Port Arthur, &c. (Ans.) 595 (i).
Murray & Cleveland, Claims for Extras *re* Galops Canal: in Com. of Sup., 1220 (i).
Murray Harbour Branch Ry., Amount due Contractors (Ans.) 2064 (ii).
——— Completion, &c. (Ans.) 189 (i).
——— Delegation *re* (Ans.) 265 (i).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2127 (ii), 9482 (v).
New Brunswick Southern Ry., Negotiations *re* Purchase (Ans.) 584 (i).
New London Branch Ry., P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2179 (ii).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5696 (iii).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5738 (iii), 5964 (iv).
Père Marquette Ry. Employees, on Inquiry for Papers, 7916 (iv).
Port Arthur and Fort William Telephone System and Board of Ry. Commissioners' on M. (Mr. Boyce) for copies of Cor., 1393 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 2203 (i).
Poonamalie Dam, Pet. *re* Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9380 (v).
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1288 (i).
P.E.I Ry., Claims for Damages *re* Murray Harbour Branch (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9489 (v).
——— Land Expropriations, Papers laid on Table, 8528 (v).
P.E.I. and Mainland, Steam Communication, Delays in Mails, &c. (remarks) 2204 (ii).
P.E.I. and Murray Harbour Branch, Expenditure up to Jan., 1905 (Ans.) 106 (i).
P.E.I. Ry., Stanley Bridge Branch, Surveys, &c. (Ans.) 267 (i).
P.E.I. and Steam Communication, Delay in Mails, &c. (remarks) 1754 (i).
P.E.I. Ry. Survey, West Cape Branch (Ans.) 590 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Delay to Travellers, &c., Refund of Expenses (Ans.) 4807 (iii).
Quebec Bridge and G.T.P. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2295 (ii).
Ry. Act, 1903 (highway crossing) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 291 (i).
Railways and Canals Act Amt. (B. 53) 1°*, 817; 2° m., and in Com., 1673 (i).
Ry. Act (I.C.R. and C.A.R.) Amt. (B. 132) 1° m., 4186 (iii) ; in Com., 6139, 7583 (iv).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
Railways and Canals, Dep. Minister. Retirement of, &c. (remarks) 9678 (v).
——— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 908 (i).
Railway Commission Board, Maintenance, in Com. of Sup., 1525 (i).
——— Salaries, Private Secs., &c. (Ans.) 688 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Cars (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1538 (i).
——— Number and Names of Employees (Ans.) 684 (i).
——— Official Cars, Legal Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 593 (i).
——— Rep., Non-Production (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6235 (iv).
——— Rep. of Board, Preparation of, &c. (remarks) 2007 (ii).
——— Rep. (presented) 6346 (iv).
——— Rep. on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6136 (iv).
——— Staff Salaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1539 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5005, 5013 (iii).
Ry. Report, Delay, &c. (remarks) 602 (i).
Railway Subsidies in Joliette Co., Salaries, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2066 (ii).
Ry. Surveys, *re* Joliette County, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 1346 (i).
Returns, Delay *re*, on Inquiry for, 1594 (i).
Richelieu Bridge at Sorel, Papers laid on Table, 8268 (v).
Rideau Canal Extension (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1524 (i).
Riviere Ouelle Spur Line (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1981 (i).
Ryan, Heber W., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4458 (iii).
St. Peter's Breakwater, P.E.I., Tenders *re* (Ans.) 5035 (iii).
Sackville Ry. Station, Tenders *re* Erection, &c. (Ans.) 5133 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie Canals, Contractors, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1406 (i).
——— Dredging Contract, U.S. and Canadian Contractors (Ans.) 589 (i).
'Scotia' Str., Certified Engineers, &c. (remarks) 8386 (v).
Sidings and Spur Lines, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 1970 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9341 (v).
Standard Gauge Ry., Cost of Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2181 (ii).
Stanley Bridge, P.E.I., Survey, Total Cost, Claims for Damages, &c. (Ans.) 587 (i).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Beauharnois (repairs) 6307 (iv).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals—Carillon and Grenville (guide piers) 6305 (iv).

Canals—Chambly (bank strengthening) 9378 (v) ; (culvert St. Therese Island) 6301 (iv); (macadamazing roads) 9378 (v.)

Canals—Cornwall (concreting apparatus) 6298 (iv) ; (enlargement) 1219 ; (lock repairs) 1494 (i), 9381 (v).

Canals—Farran's Point (gas plant) 6308 (iv).

Canals—Galops (channel completion) 1230; (enlargement) 1220 ; (leakage) 1492 (i) ; (shoals) 9354 (v).

Canals—Grenville (guide piers) 1500 (i).

Canals—Lachine (Atwater Avenue bridge) 1240 (i) ; (electric appliances) 9354 (v), 1240 (i) ; (enlargement) 6294 (iv) ; (gasoline boat) 1421 (i) ; (Hanault, L. O., Payments to) 6299 ; (lockgates suspension) 6300 (iv) ; (machinery for shops) 1240 (i); (Mill St. paving) 6301 ; (power house flume) 6300 ; (repairs) 6306 (iv) ; (St. Gabriel basin) 9378 (v); (Wall Basin No. 2) 1421 (i) ; (wall underpinning) 6298 (iv) ; (wharf below dock) 1421 (i).

Canals—Miscellaneous (additional remuneration) 1547 ; (arbitrations, &c.) 1508 ; (inspections and surveys) 1509 (i);(remuneration to lockmasters) 9384 (v) ; (surveys) 1520 ; (tolls, repairs, &c.) 1546 (i).

Canals—Murray (repairs) 1495 (i).

Canals—Rapide Plat (enlargement, upper entrance) 6289 (iv).

Canals—Rideau (extension) 1333 (i).

Canals—St. Lawrence (shoals) 6289 (iv).

Canals—St. Ours (booms and piers) 1499 (i) ; (landing wharf) 6302 (iv).

Canals—St. Peters (dredging) 6303 ; (repairs) 6308 (iv).

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 1334, 1402 (i).

Canals—Soulanges (construction) 6290 (iv).

Canals—Trent (construction) 1420; (construction and surveys) 1479 (i); (dredge engine) 9381 (v) ; (Geo. Matthews Co., damages) 6303 (iv) ; (Holland river) 9359 (v) ; (improvements) 1499 (i) ; (lowering floor of lock) 6302 (iv) ; (McLaren's creek bridge) 9379 (v) ; (Peterborough dam) 6303 (iv) ; (staff on dams) 9383 (v) ; (surveys) 6291 (iv), 9354 (v) ; (surveys of dams) 9376 (v).

Canals—Welland (bridge building) 1234 (i) ; (electric lighting power) 9377 (v) ; (electric plant) 1231 (i) ; (long level deepening) 6290 ; (lowering head of lock No. 1) 6309 ; (obstruction, &c.) 1231 ; (Port Colborne, deepening) 1232 ; (Port Colborne, elevator) 1266, 1288 ; (Port Colborne, entrance) 1230; (Port Colborne, level) 1263 ; (stone protection) 1496 ; (surveys) 1234, 1520 ; (Vanderburg, Stephen, claims *re* injuries) 6305 (iv).

Canals—Williamburg (steam plant) 1494 (i).

Civil Govt.—Railways (law clerk) 9066 ; (private sec.) 9062 (v) ; (salaries) 93 (i); (salary increases) 9062 (v).

Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7511 (iv).

Railways—G.T.P. (construction) 9498 (v); (salaries, &c.) 2293; (surveys, construction, &c.) 2277; (surveys, &c.) 2298 (ii), 6427, 7496 (iv); (surveys, plans, &c.) 9490; (terminals, &c.) 9498 (v).

Railways—I.C.R. (additional sidings) 6431 (iv); (additional sidings and spurs) 1970;

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—*Con.*

(advertising) 2236 (ii); (Amherst accommodation) 1983; (Antigonish accommodation) 1967 (i) ; (bridge strengthening) 1912 (i), 9384 (v); (Campbellton) 1968 (i); (Cape Road crossing) 6432 (iv); (double tracking) 1933 (i), 2027 (ii), 9390 (v); (Drummondville improvements) 1960 (i); (engine houses) 9389 (v); (financial statement) 7445 (iv); (grades and curves) 1987 (i); (Halifax accommodation) 9391 (v); (Halifax dredging) 2026 ; (Halifax terminals) 2032; (ii); (increased facilities) 9482; (Indiantown branch) 9482; (locomotive machinery) 6428 (iv); (Memramcook accommodation) 1977; (Mitchell diversion) 1940; (Moncton accommodation) 1946 (i), 9391 (v); (Newcastle improvements) 1967; (original construction) 1912 (i); (Pictou accommodation) 9390 (v); (revenue collections) 2204; (rolling stock) 2037 (ii), 6428 (iv); (rolling stock, statement read) 9501 (v) ; (St. Cyrille diversion of line) 1969 ; (St. Fabien subway) 1980 (i) ; (Ste. Flavie accommodation) 9390; (St. John accommodation) 9389 (v); (St. Lambert double tracking) 2183 (ii); (St. Moise station) 1976; (semaphores) 1986 (i); (station accommodation) 6429 (iv); (steel rails, fastenings, &c.) 1988 (i), 2038 (ii) ; (Sydney accommodation) 1912; (Sydney Mines extension) 1987 (i); (ties, &c.) 6429 (iv); (Truro accommodation) 9391 (v); (water service) 2170 (ii); (working expenses) 9384 (v).

Railways—Miscellaneous (Atlantic and Lake Superior investigation) 9383 (v) ; (engineers, &c.) 1521; (extra clerks) 1521 (i); (gratuities) 2183 (ii); (litigation) 1522 (i); (school of transportation) 9381 (v); (statistics) 1521 (i).

Railways — P.E.I. (air brakes) 2178 (ii); (Bloomfield agent's house) 6432 (iv) ; (Cardigan branch) 2171 (ii); 9482 (v); (Charlottetown, accommodation) 2025 (ii); (Charlottetown, track extension) 6433 (iv); (Freetown agent's house) 2180; (Georgetown station) 2179; (Hillsborough bridge) 2038; (Kensington station) 2178; (M.C.B.) couplers) 2178 ; (Morell bridge swing span) 2177; (Murray branch) 2038; (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2127 (ii), 8692 (v); (Summerside improvements) 2176 ; (Vernon River branch) 2177 (ii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance) 1525 (i).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co., Claims *re* Surveys, &c., 9494 (v).

Transportation Commission, Rep. of Mr. Bertram (read) 1288 (i).

——— Rep. *re* C. A. Ry., Ref. to in Com. on B. 45, 4225 (iii).

——— *re* Waterways (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1288 (i).

Trent Valley Canal, Damages *re* Flooding, Claims of Mr. James Clark, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 1396 (i).

——— Surveys *re* Rice Lake, &c. (Ans.) 153 (i).

Truro Dining Room, I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2256 (ii).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8315, 8639 (v).
Welland Canal, Deepening, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 589 (i).
——— Extra Employees, for Oct., Nov. (Ans.) 453 (i).
——— Water Power Leases, &c. on M. (Mr. German) for Ret., 2099 (ii).
White, Mr. Odbur, Dismissal, on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Cor., 193 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2209 (ii).
See 'Fredericton,' &c.
Williamsburg and Cornwall Canal Water Power Leases, Dates of Rental, Claims, &c. (Ans.) 4809 (iii).
Wire Fencing Contract: *See* 'N.W.T.'
Woodill, S., Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ans.) 2192 (ii).

Ethier, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*
Debates, Official (M.) to conc. in 7th Rep., 9801 (v).

Fielding, Hon. W. S., (Minister of Finance), *Shelburne and Queen's, N.S.*
Adjournment, 24th May, (M.) 6384 (iv).
'Agnes Donahoe,' Schr., Seizure by Uruguayan Govt. (remarks) 6110 (iv).
American Currency circulated in Can., Prevention *re* (Ans.) 3010 (ii).
Anglo-American Tel. Co., Agreement *re* Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7606 (iv).
Ascension Day Adjournment (remarks) 6825 (iv).
Audit Act Amt. (remarks) 6112 (iv).
——— Progress *re* (Ans.) 2190 (iv).
Auditor General and Audit Act, on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 9640 (v).
——— (remarks) 9541 (v).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Inadequate Supply, &c. (remarks 4272 (iii).
——— Inquiry for, 2262 (ii).
Auditor General's Resignation, &c., and Amts. to Audit Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6523 (iv).
Audit Office and Treasury Board, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 1935 (i).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5435, 5479 (iii), on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 2979; amendment to Clause 16 (presented) 2840 (ii).
——— in Com. (compensation *re* lands) 5817; (B.N.A. Act) 5730; (Hudson Bay Co. rights) 5950; (laws, courts, &c.) 6102; (subsidy to provs.) 6091 (iv).
——— Attack on Orangeism (remarks) in Com., 5878 (iii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
——— Changes *re* Financial Clauses remarks) 2046 (ii).
——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 6736 (iv).
——— Official Report of Division (remarks) 5431 (iii).
——— Production of Cor., &c (remarks) 2593 (ii).
——— School Clause Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5830 (iii).
——— 'Yellow Dog,' *re* Quotation from Halifax 'Chronicle' (remarks) in Com., 5879, 5901 (iii).
See 'Lt. Govs.', &c., 'Saskatchewan.' 'N. W.T. B. 160.'
Bank Act Amt. (B. 181) 1° m., 7642 (iv); in Com., 8688 (v).
Banking Act Amts. (remarks) 6112 (iv).
Bank Notes, Circulation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6251 (iv).
Bank Notes lost in Circulation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6261 (iv).
Bills from the Senate, Amendments *re* Clerical Errors, &c. (remarks) 8383 (v).
——— on M. (Mr. A. Johnston) to place on Order Paper, 8096 (v).
Boyd, Mr. Geo. A., Emplymt. at Sault Ste. Marie Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6881 (iv).
Bracebridge Dry Dock, Supt. *re* Construction (Ans.) 6654 (iv).
Budget, The (financial statement) 8888 (v).
——— Resolutions *re* Ways and Means (M.) 8914 (v).
——— (remarks) 2006 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for, 2762 (ii), 4920 (iii), 7100 (iv).
——— Statement *re*, 8763 (v).
Cabinet Ministers Ex-, Annuity Bill (No. 203) M. for Com. on Res., 9702; in Com. on Res., 9733; 1°*, 9739; in Com., 9792; (amt.) 9796 (v).
Cacouna Wharf, Expenditure *re* Works (Ans.) 7096 (iv).
C.A.R. and I.C.R.: *See* 'I.C.R.'
Canada Life Assurance Co., Ref. to in Com. on B. 108, 4691 (iii).
Canadian Fast Mail Service, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to adjn., 9778 (v).
Catholic Mutual Benefit Association B. 93 (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com., 2769 (ii).
Cement, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9765 (v).
Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 49 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 2765 (ii).
Chateauguay River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6847 (iv).
Citizens' Bank of Canada, B. 133 (Mr. Barr) in Com., 5973 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Collingwood Govt. Dry Dock, Payments by Govt. *re* Bounty (Ans.) 6653 (iv).
——— Tenders *re* Conroy Bros. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6572 (iv).
——— Retention of Mr. Conroy's Cheque (remarks) 6654 (iv).
Commercial Agencies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9038 (v).
Cordage Plant at Kingston, Establishment of, &c. (Ans.) 2329 (ii).
Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4260 (iii).
Customs Act Amt. (B. 190) 1° m., 8997; in Com., 9761 (v).
Dams across Rivers, Govt. Policy in Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6839 (iv).
Debates Official, on M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com., 9809 (v).
Dominion Annuity Co.'s incorp. B. 82 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 2767 (ii).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) in Com., 4974 (iii).
Dom. Notes, Printing in English and French (Ans.) 6826 (iv).
Dredging, Cost of hiring Dredges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6842 (iv).
Dredging in Mar. Provs., Number of Vessels, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6890 (iv).
Dumping Clause, Amts. to (remarks) in Com. on B. 190, 9767 (v).
Dundonald Park, and Ottawa Improvement Commission (remarks) in Com. on B. 180, 8686 (v).
Electoral Atlas, Distribution to Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6897 (iv).
——— New Edition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).
Estimates (1905) Suppl. (presented) 6165 (iv).
———1906 (presented) 8718 (v).
——— Further Supplementary, 1906 (presented) 9392 (v).
——— Criticism of (remarks) 9052 (v).
——— Delay in bringing down and efficient Critism. on Amt. (Mr. Foster) 9090 (v). *See* 'Interior.'
Farmers' Bank of Canada B. 124 (Mr. T. Martin) in Com., 4700 (iii); on Sen. Amts. 6609 (iv).
Fessenden Wireless Tel. Co. of Canada: incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6381, 6608 (iv).
First Minister, Salary Increase (B. 201) M. for Com. on Res., 9700; in Com. on Res., 9725; 1° of B., 9726; in Com., 9790 (v); on M. for 3°, 9791 (v).
Fitz-Simmons, Jane Marie Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 6378 (iv).
Fort William and Port Arthur Dredging, Number of Tenders (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6729 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Georgian Bay Islands Sale (remarks) on Explanation (Mr. Grant) 6737 (iv).
Gold of the Yukon purchased by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6264 (iv).
G.T.Ry., Arbitration B. 199 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 1°, 9280 (v).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3650 (ii), 4208 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7626, 7677; on M. for 3°, 7863 (iv).
G.T. Pacific Ry., Agreements with National Transcontinental Ry. (Ans.) 2776 (ii).
——— Plans *re* Terminals, Deposited with Govt., on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 2839 (ii).
——— Surveys, Rep. in Ry. Dept., &c. (remarks) 2016 (ii).
Great Northern Ry. of Canada B. 71 (Mr. J. T. Schell) in Com., 4258 (iii).
Guarantee Bonds: *See* 'Inland Revenue.'
Harbours and Rivers, N.S., Charges against Govt. Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9559 (v).
Hersey, A. H., Relief B. 167 (Mr. T. G. Johnston) in Com., 7682 (iv).
Hudson Bay Expedition, Payments *re* Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6729 (iv).
Immigration Contract: *See* 'North Atlantic.'
Imperial Guarantee and Accident Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2771 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act (guarantee bonds) Amt. B. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8681 (v).
Insurance Cos., Legislation *re*, &c. (remarks in Com. on B. 200, 9689 (v).
I.C.R. and C.A. Ry. Act (running rights) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 4192 (iii).
I.C.R. Employees Pensions (remarks) 9029 (v).
——— (Ans.) 2492 (ii).
Interior Estimates, Obstruction *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9265 (v).
Japanese Trade with Canada, Discrimination *re* Canadian Goods (remarks) 6655 (iv).
——— Trade Relations with Dom. (remarks) 7816 (iv).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9742; (amt.) 9797 (v).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6667 (iv).
——— (remarks) 9706 (v).
Labourers employed by Govt., Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6858 (iv).
Lt. Governors, Alberta and Saskatchewan (B. 193) in Com. on Res., 1°, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 9033 (v).
Loans by Govt., Temporary or Permanent, Total Amount, Rate of Interest, (Ans.) 4921 (iii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
London Bye-Election, Resignation of h. m. for S. York (remarks) 6384 (iv).
McGillicuddy, Mr. D., Letter to Sir Wm. Mulock, Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 6602 (iv).
McKenzie, D. D., Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill, on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. Johnston) 8478 (v).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6797 (iv).
Melfort Mail Service, Charges *re* Delays (remarks) 9789 (v).
Mint, Royal Canadian, Estimated Cost, Capacity, &c. (Ans.) 2185, 2326 (ii).
Mutual Reserve Ins. Co., Payment of Claims, &c. (Ans.) 2333 (ii).
Nixon, Robt., on M. (Mr. Foster) to cancel Vote in Com. of Sup., 9329, 9769 (v).
Northwest Territories B. 160 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8765 (v).
N.W.T. Boundary Line Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5696 (iii).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, Termination of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9452 (v).
——— (remarks) 8182 (v).
Oats, Rolled, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 8984, 9763 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2718 (ii).
Ontario Fire Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. Boyce) in Com., 2772 (ii).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 4965 (iii), 5963 (iv).
Ottawa City Act (1899) Amt. (B. 180) 1°*, 7642 (iv) ; in Com., 8686 (v).
Ottawa Public Buildings, Rentals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6818 (iv).
Port Arthur Dredging, Time for Tenders (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6875 (iv).
Port Credit Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6871 (iv).
Prime Minister, Salary Increase : *See* 'First.'
P.E.I. and Mainland Winter Service, Claims for Damages (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6644 (iv).
——— Obligations of Dom. Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2664 (ii).
Privy Councillors Annuity : *See* 'Cabinet Minister.'
'Protestant Govt.', Formation of, &c., ref. to in Speech on Autonomy Bill, 3006 (ii).
'Protestant Schools,' Ref. to in Autonomy Bill, 3484 (ii).
Provident Savings Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 5974 (iv).
Provincial Govt. in N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Accounts, Meetings, &c. (remarks) 7100 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Quebec Citadel Walls, Repairs to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6726 (iv).
Richibucto Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 6730 (iv).
Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 103 (Mr. Tobin) in Com., 3669 (ii).
Rolled Oats, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8984, 9763 (v).
Royal Trust Co., Ref. to in Com., on Bill 99, 3651 (ii).
St. John, Halifax and W. Indies Mail Subsidy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7181 (iv).
Saskatchewan, Prov. of, B. 70, in Com. on Res., 8700 (iv).
Senate and House of Commons Indemnity B. 202 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9730 (v).
Senate and House of Commons, Conferences *re* Amts. to Bills (M.) 9280 (v).
Setters' Effects, Duty *re* in Com. on Ways and Means, 8997 (v).
South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9348, 9587 (v).
Sovereign Fire Insurance Co. of Canada B. 26 (Mr. E. F. Clarke) in Com., 1756 (i).
Spirits in Bond (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8681 (v).
Supply Bill (No. 206) M. for Com., 9798 ; 1° m., 2° m., and in Com., 9801 (v).
SUPPLY :
Charges of Management (contingencies) 8691 (v) ; (Receiver General's Office) 6249 (iv), 9052 (v).
Civil Govt., Auditor General (salaries) 6721 (iv); Finance Dept. (salaries) 9060 (v); Finance (private secretary) 6268 (iv); Gov. Gen.'s Office (clerical assistance) 6248 (iv), 9053 (v); Interior (mines branch) 6265; Miscellaneous (charwomen) 6268; Public Works (salaries) 6724 (iv), 9071 (v); Sec. of State (Civil Service examiners) 6249; (salaries) 6248 (iv), 9071; Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 9034 (v).
Govt. of N.W.T. (general vote) 9622 (v).
Inspection of Staples (contingencies) 6901 (iv).
Justice, Administration of (miscellaneous) 6721 (iv).
Legislation—Franchise Act (voters' lists) 6722, 6897 ; (H. of Commons) 6298 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and G.B.) 9622 ; (Canada and Mexico) 9622, 9680 ; (Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie) 9616; (Port Essington, B.C., &c.) 9616; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 9617 (v); (St. John, Halifax, &c.) 6901; (St. John and W. Indies) 7177 (iv), 8691 (v).
Miscellaneous (Academy of Arts) 7238 (iv); (Bank of Commerce, compensation, Yukon) 9615 (v); ('Canada Gazette') 6723; (Can. Mining Institute grant) 7247 (iv); (canals celebration, Sault Ste. Marie) 9621; (Champlain's monument) 9340 (v); (Dom. and Provincial accounts) 7241; (legal expenses *re* Martineau case) 6723; (legal services *re* Sunday Observance) 6722; (Pacific Cable grant) 7239 (iv); (Printing Bureau machinery) 9614 (v);

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Miscellaneous—*Con.*

(printing, &c.) 6723, 6901 (iv); (Public Accounts evidence) 9616 (v); (relief of distressed Canadians) 7247; (tariff commission) 9614 (v).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breaking steamers) 9620 (v).

Penitentiaries (Archibald, W. T., Parole Officer) 6722 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (improvements) 6735 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (engineers, firemen, &c.) 6823; (fuel) 6822; (furniture) 6817; (rents) 6818 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings, N.B. (Richibucto) 6730, 6813 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Lloydminster immigrant shed) 6734 (i).

Public Works—Buildings — Ont. (London drill hall, electric wiring) 6732 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (elevator, salaries) 6816; (grounds) 6817; (heating, &c.) 6816; (lighting) 6816; (Major's Hill Park) 6817; (repairs, &c.) 6815; (Rideau Hall) 6823; (telephones) 6814; (treasury vaults) 6825 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle repairs) 6734 (iv).

Public Works—Dredging—Dom. (repairs to vessels) 6890; Mar. Provs. (new plant) 6891; P.E.I. (new dredge) 6891 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Fort Lawrence) 6838 (iv); (Frude's Point) 9583 (v); (general vote) 7238 (iv); (Glace Bay) 9577 (v); (L'Ardoise breakwater) 6838 (iv); (Marble Mountain) 9580; (Petite Rivière) 9581; (Phinney's Cove) 9559 (v); (Port Hawkesbury wharf) 6837 (iv); (Porter's Lake) 9584 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Barry's wharf) 6873; (Blind river dredging) 6870; (Collingwood harbour dredging) 6879; (Grand River dredging) 6873; (Haileybury wharf) 6887; (Honora wharf) 6887; (Little Current channel) 6886; (Otonabee river) 6887; (Owen Sound Harbour) 6886; (Point Edward dredging) 6869; (Whitby harbour dredging) 6880 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Chateauguay dredging) 6847; (Doucet's Landing) 6849; (Little Rapids dam) 6839; (Maskinonge river) 6842; (Montmorency wharf) 6852; (Pierreville wharf) 6868; (Que., harbour improvements) 6724; (St. Alphonse de Bagotville wharf) 6868; (St. Maurice river dredging) 6851; (Sorel ice piers) 6841; (Yamaska Lock) 6868 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing 7616; (Deep Waterways Commission) 6894; (engineers, &c.) 6895 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Ottawa (bridges) 6889 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraphs — Mar. Provs. (Bay St. Lawrence) 7606; N.W.T. (Qu'Appelle and Edmonton) 6894; Quebec. (J. C. Taché, special) 6897; Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 6896 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (general vote) 7475 (iv); (rolling stock) 9514 (v); P.E.I. (working expenses) 6901 (iv).

Senate (contingencies) 6621 (iv).

Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 9037 (iv); (iron and steel bounties) 7216 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Transportation Commission (expenses) 8692 (v).

Unprovided Items (general) 6902 (iv)

Weights and Measures (inspection of staples) 9616, 9681 (v).

Yukon Ter. Govt. (additional allowance to Maj. Wood) 9250 (v).

Supreme Court, N.S., Vacancy, Appnmt. *re* (remarks)) 5210 (iii).

Thessalon Postmaster, Mr. J. B. Dobey, Irregularities, &c., on M. for Sup., 6220 (iv).

Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3651 (ii), 4681 (iii).

Toronto Harbour, Straightening River Don (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6889 (iv).

Toronto Post Office, Erection of, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6833 (iv).

Transportation Commission, Information *re* (remarks) 9680 (v).

Voters' Lists *re* Edmonton Election, Preparation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).

Ways and Means, The Budget (financial statement) 8888 (v).

——— Resolutions (m.) 8914 (v.)

——— (M.) for Com., 9798, in Com., 9801 (v).

Western Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4691 (iii).

White Lead, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8983, 9761 (v).

Wines, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8983, 9762, (v).

Wire Fencing: *See* 'N.W.T.,' &c.

Yarmouth, N.S., Investigation *re* (remarks) 9691 (v).

Finlay, Mr. J., *East Peterborough.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7895 (iv).

Campaign Literature, franked by Ministers of Crown (remarks) 1817 (i).

Collingwood Dock, Conroy Bros. Cheque (remarks) 6583 (iv).

Officials dismissed by Mr. Whitney (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iv).

Postmasters acting as Ret. Officers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6245 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.—Post Office (contingencies) 6245 (iv).

Finlayson, Mr. D., *Richmond, N.S.*

Autonomy B. 69, Attack on 'Orangeism' (remarks) in Com., 5879 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Bourgeois inlet) 9581; (Pierreville pier) 9581 (v).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney (Minister of Agriculture), *Brome.*

Agriculture, Dept. Rep. (presented) 321 (i).

Agricultural Meetings in Eastern Townships, Purposes, &c. (Ans.) 268 (i).

Agricultural Statistics, Expenditure *re* (remarks 990 (i).

Anglo-American Tel. Co., Subsidy Increases (Ans.) 108 (i).

Animals slaughtered under Diseases Act, Compensation (remarks) on conc., 6912 (iv).

Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (prop. res.) in Com., 676, in Com. on Res., 736 (i), 2413 (ii); 1° m., 2441; in Com., 2841, 2844 (ii).

Archives, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 6826 (iv).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4481 (iii); in Com., sec. 2 (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8563 (v); (readjustment of representation) in Com., 5755 (iii). *See* 'Manitoba'.

Binder Twine Sale : *See* 'Cordage.'

Butter and Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Grievance, &c. (Ans.) 8886 (v).

Butter shipped in Cold Storage *re* Atlantic Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 882 (i).

Canadian Cattle, British Embargo (remarks) 455 (i).

——— on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Com., 9022 (v).

Census and Statistics (B. 5) M. for Com. on Res., 820; in Com. on Res., 990; 1°*, 52; 2° m. and in Com., 625; M. for Com., 1013; in Com., 1069, 1467 (i).

Census and Statistics Act (N.W.T.) Amt. (B. 163) 1° m., 6105 (iv); 2° m. and in Com., 8774 (v).

Census Enumerators, Appnmt. of (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 1073 (i).

Census and Statistics, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) *re* Resolution, 631 (i).

Census, Total Expenditure for 1901, Dismissal of Staff, &c. (Ans.) 588 (i).

Census (1901) Vol. 2 (presented) 50 (i).

Child Immigration, Mrs Close's Scheme, on M. for Sup., 2126 (ii).

Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, Thermograph Records, &c. (Ans.) 2775 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8201 (v).

Cold Storage *re* Steamship Service, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 868 (i).

——— Stmnts. of Mr. E. D. Smith (remarks) 874 (i).

Copyright Photographs, Legislation *re* Amendments (Ans.) 1849 (i).

Cordage at Kingston Penitentiary, Sale of 58 Tons, &c. (Ans.) 6827 (iv).

Dairy Products, Classification for Export, &c. (Ans.) 7810 (iv).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*

Facer Steel Car Co.'s Patent Relief B. 27 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 1339 (i).

Franking Privilege, Extension of Time after Prorogation (remarks) 9395.

Freight Rates on Cattle : *See* 'Holstein.'

Freight Rates : *See* 'Ry. Rates.'

Fruit Growers Ass'on., P.E.I., Govt. Intention (Ans.) 381 (i).

Fruit Inspectors, Number, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 588 (i).

Fruit Marks Act (staple commodities) Amt. B. 155) in Com., 5979 (iv).

Fruit Marks Act, Convictions *re* (Ans.) 3010 (ii).

Gillis, N. J., Emplymt. at St. Louis Exhibition, &c. (Ans.) 3361 (ii).

Glanders, &c., Expenditure *re* by O. C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6700 (iv).

——— Spread of among Horses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6690 (iv).

Grain Inspection Act Amt. (B. 174) 1°*, 7420 (iv); in Com., 9395 (v).

Hog Plague in Essex and Kent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6712 (iv). *See* 'Veterinary.'

Holstein Breeders, Complaint *re* Freight on Rys. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6680 (iv).

Immigration of Skilled Labour, Toronto Labour Council, on M. (Mr. Foster) 7507 (iv).

Inverness, N.S., Postmaster, Personal Duties, &c. (Ans.) 8885 (v).

Japan Exhibition, Trade Increase *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6273 (iv).

——— (statement) 7908 (iv).

Lake Ramsay and New Ross Post Office Mail Service (Ans.) 9696 (v).

Lefebvre, A. P., Postmaster at Markstay, Investigation *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 7096 (iv).

Lesser Slave Lake, Mail Service, &c. (Ans.) 7019 (iv).

Liege Exhibition, Expenditure *re*: in Com. of Sup., 1831 (i).

Live Stock Record Associations incorp. (B. 148) 1° m., 5076; in Com., 5922; 3° m., 5927 (iii).

Live Stock Records of Can., Nationalization, &c. (Ans.) 1849 (i), 2185 (ii).

Lump-jaw in Cattle, Prevention of (remarks) on Conc., 6917 (iv).

Maladie du Coit among Horses, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6702 (iv).

Mange among Horses, Stamping out (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6719 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 3973 (ii).

Maps, Sale by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1476 (i).

Mineral Specimens *re* Exhibition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6269 (iv).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*

Montreal Dom. Exhibition, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9608 (v).

Niagara Fruit Growers' Association, Cor., &c., on Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 9395 (v).

N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Erection of Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5701 (iii).

Northwest Territories, Cost of Surveys, Number of Miles, &c., on M. (Mr. W. J. Roche) for Ret., 1396 (i).

Patent Acts Relief, Amts. *re* (remarks) 6559 (iv).

'Patent Record,' Supply to Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1828 (i).

Post Office Clerks, Examination for Statutory Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9059 (v).

Post Office Regulations *re* Distribution of Packages (remarks) 6961 (iv).

Provl. Govt. in N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'

Quarantine Officers, Examination of Ships, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2304 (ii).

Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5023 (iii).

See 'Holstein,' &c.

Seeds, Sale and Inspection (B. 7) prop. Res., 52; in Com., 54; 1°*, 66; 2° m., and in Com., 322, 1155, 1161, 1788; 3° m., 1868; on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1872; on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 1884 (i); on Sen. Amts., 7583 (iv).

Small-pox Epidemic, N.W. Ter., Prevention, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1842 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 1830; (aid to societies) 1829; (archives) 1823 (i), 6679; on conc., 6918, (iv); (Can. exhibits, Imperial Institute) 1836 (i); (creameries) 6938, 7014 (iv); (criminal statistics) 1473 (i); (dairying) 6932 (iv); (Dom. exhibition, B.C.) 9608 (v); (exhibitions) 1831 (i), 6269 (iv); (experimental farms) 6165 (iv), 9608 (v); (experimental farms, bulletins, &c.) 6926 (iv); (fumigating stations) 1831 (i); (live stock records) 6680 (iv); ('Patent Record') 1472 (i); (quinquennial Census, N.W.T.) 9608 (v); (statistics) 1828; (Year-book) 1474 (i).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (archivist) 9053; (contingencies) 9058; (patent branch) 9057 (v); (salaries) 91 (i), 9056; (private secretary) 9054; Post Office (salaries) 9058 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 868 (i).

Miscellaneous (International Congress, reception at Quebec) 9622 (v); (tuberculosis grant) 7248 (iv).

Post Office (mail service) 9610; (postal maps, engraving) 9060 (v).

Quarantine (cattle) 2309 (ii), 6690; on conc., 6912 (iv); (Grosse Isle steamer) 1838 (i); (organized districts, salaries) 2302 (ii); (Public Works Health Act) 1845; (Public health, organized districts) 1842; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 1845; (William's Head) 1841; (Winnipeg hospitals) 1846 (i).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*

Thermograph Records, Ret. laid on Table, 7016 (iv).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1374 (i).

Veterinary Inspectors *re* Hog Plague, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1934 (i).

See 'Hog,' &c.

Veterinary Surgeons in Man., Number (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6704 (iv).

Wire Fencing: *See* 'N.W.T.'

Year-book Statistics, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 997 (i).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles (Minister of Justice).

Quebec County.

Admiralty Court Registrars, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 126 (i).

Alien Labour Act, Appeal *re* Judge Anglin's Decision (Ans.) 8147 (v).

See 'Naturalization.'

Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 738 (i).

Autonomy (Alberta) Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5458; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5317; in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5601; (arbitration *re* assets) 5946 (iii); (B. N. A. Acts) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8527; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) dual language, 8583, 8631 (v); (B.N.A. Act, 1867 to 1886) 5672; (B.N.A. Act) 5719 (iii).

——— (C.P.R. lands) 6060 (iv).

——— (Crown Lands) Amt., 8171, 8256-7 (v).

——— (date of Act) 8634 (v).

——— (distribution of seats) 7739 (iv); 8090 (v).

——— (election of members) 5766, 5809 (iii).

——— (executive council) 5781 (iii).

——— (H. of C. representation) Amt. in Com., 5685, 5750 (iii).

——— (Hudson Bay Co. rights) 5947 (iii), 6049 (iv), 8168, 8170 (v).

——— (joint stock companies) in Com. (amt.) 6083 (iv).

——— (lands vested in Crown) 5918, 5946, 5986 (iii).

——— (laws, courts, &c.) 5783 (iii), 6101 (iv); (amt.) 5812, 5927 (iii), 8240, 8244 (v).

——— (Lt. Gov.'s powers) 5781 (iii).

——— (readjustment of representation) in Com. (amt.) 5753 (ii).

——— (school clause) in Com. (remarks) 5817 (iii).

——— (school clause) Explanation *re* Amendments (read) in Com., 5983 (iv).

——— (school clause amt.) 7121 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8394, 8414; on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8504; on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8292 (v).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Chas.—*Con.*
Autonomy (Alberta) Bill 69 (seat of government) 5781 (ii), 8249 (v).
——— (Senate representation) 5674 (iii).
——— (subsidy to provs.) in Com., 6087 (iv).
Autonomy B. 69, in Com., on Schedules (Athabaska) 8163 ; (Edmonton city) 8160 ; (Glechen) 8166 ; (High River) 8155 ; (Lacombe) 8156 ; (Leduc) 8157 ; (Macleod) 8151 ; (Peace River) 8163 ; (Pincher Creek) 8153 ; (Ponoka) 8156 ; (Red Deer) 8155 ; (St. Albert) 8163 ; (Saskatchewan) 8161 ; (Stony Plains) 8157 ; (Strathcona) 8157 ; (Sturgeon) 8162 ; (Wetaskiwin) 8157 (v).
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to sec. 16, schools, 8805 ; on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) schools, 8837 (v).
Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) in Com., sec. 19 (annual subsidy) Amt. 8760 ; (Crown lands) 8760 (v).
——— (distribution of seats) 8704 (v).
——— (law courts, &c.) Amt., 8758 (v).
——— (representation, H. of C.) Amt., 8703 (v).
——— (schools) Amt., 8759 (v).
——— (Senate representation) Amt. in Com., 8703 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Scott) to M. for 3°, 8877 (v).
Autonomy B. 69, Attack on 'Orangeism' (remarks) in Com., 5878 (iii).
——— Delay in Printing (remarks) 1671 (i).
——— Explanation *re* School Clauses (remarks) 5674 (iii).
——— Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2568 (ii).
——— Pets. circulated by Jacques Cartier Club to 'Catholic Quebec,' 2570 (ii).
——— Printing and Distribution (remarks) 1755 (i).
——— School Clause, Amts. Explanation, &c. (remarks) 5818 (iii).
——— Schools Clause 16 (statement) *re* Drafting, 4828.
——— Statement *re* School Attendance (remarks) 8095 (v).
See 'Mackenzie District B. 157,' 'Manitoba,' 'N.W.T., B. 156.'
Ballot Box Frauds in Dom. Elections, on M. (Mr. Porter) to Com. of Sup, 9214 (v).
Binder Twine Industry at Kingston Penitentiary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 482 (i).
Bissonette vs. Crown, Illegal Stamping of Letters in Montreal P.O. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 198 (i).
Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Denial *re* Telegrams, 546 (i).
B.C. Judgeship, Appnmt. of W. W. B. McInnes (Ans.) 382 (i).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Chas.—*Con.*
B.C. Legislation, Disallowance of (Ans.) 189 (i).
Cabinet, ex-Ministers, Annuity B. 203 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res. (Amt.) 9738 (v).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4240 (iii).
See 'G.T.R.', 'I.C.R.', &c.
Canada Evidence Act (B. withdrawn) 9075 (v).
Canadians' Mining Rights in S. Africa (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9532 (v).
C.P.R. Tax Exemption, Interpretation, &c. (Ans.) 730 (i).
Castonguay, Dismissal by Govt. (Ans.) 5689 (iii).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1099 (i).
Companies Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 8528 (v).
Controverted Election (Dom.) Act Amt. (B. 159) 1° m., 6103 (iv).
Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4262 (iii).
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. (B. 196) 1°, m., 9075; in Com., 9411; 3° m., 9524 (v).
Davie, Geo. T., Wrecking Plant *re* Ship Channel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2479 (ii).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) on Sen. Amts., 7625 (iv).
Dom. Police Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 54 (i).
Edmonton Election, Printed Lists of Voters, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5862 (iii).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) on M. for 1°, 987 ; in Com., 1401 (i), 2106, 3208 (ii).
Express Cos.: *See* 'Ry. B. 4.'
Extradition Cases before Commissioner at Montreal, &c. (Ans.) 3937 (ii).
Franchise Act (1898) Amt. (B. 52) 1° m., 818 (i); 2° m., and in Com., 2112 (ii), 9198 (v).
Gaynor-Greene Extradition Case, Charges against Mr. Lafontaine (Ans.) 3938 (ii).
Govt. Contracts Work (B. 51) 1° m., 818; 2° m., and in Com., 1672 (i).
G. T. Ry. Arbitration (B. 199) 1° m., 9279; in Com., 9529 (v).
See 'I.C.R.', &c.
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4208 (iii).
——— Statement *re* C.A.R. Amalgamation, &c., 4222 (iii).
G. T. Ry., Appeal to Judicial Committee, &c. (Ans.) 9081 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7621, 7626, 7677 (iv).
Great Northern Ry. of Canada B. 71 (Mr. J. T. Schell) in Com., 4259 (iii).
Half-Breed Scrip Investigation, Progress *re* (remarks) 9725 (v).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Chas.—*Con.*

Hamelin and Gosselin, Imprisonment, &c. (Ans.) 1849 (i).

Highway Crossings : *See* 'Ry. B. 2.'

Inspector of Insurance and Director General of Public Health (B. 200) 1° m., 2° m., and in Com., 9688 (v).

I.C.R. and C.A.Ry. Act (running rights) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 4195 (iii); in Com., 6143, 7584 (iv):

I.C.R. and G.T.R. Arbitration, Information *re* (remarks) 68, 165 (i).

Judges of Provincial Courts Act (salaries) Amt. (B. 204) M. for Com. on Res., 9702; in Com on Res., 9740 ; 1°*, 9760; in Com., 9702; (amt.) 9798 (v).

Judicial Vacancies, Length of, &c. (remarks) 7424 (iv).

——— Promotions and Appointments (statement read) 8002 (v).

Justice, (Penitentiaries) Rep. (presented) 271 (i).

Keewatin District (B. 158) 1° m., 6103 (iv).

Kentville Rifle Range, Purchase of Site, Statement (read) 9706 (v).

——— Investigation, Rep. of Evidence (remarks) 8698 (v).

——— (remarks) 7584 (iv).

Killam, Judge : *See* 'Ry. Commn. B. 36 '.

Kingston Penitentiary Supplies, Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 477 (i).

Land Titles Act (1894) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 9083 (v).

Lewis, Edward Norman, Relief (B. 142) 1°*, 4550; 2° m., (amt.) 5136 (iii).

Mackenzie District (B. 157) 1° m., 6103 (iv).

——— (M.) to withdraw, 8176 (v).

Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation (denial) *re* Drafting, &c., 4013 (ii).

——— on M. to adjn., 4044 (ii).

Martineau Defalcations and Evidence *re* Bank Suit (remarks) 112 (i).

Montreal Sheds, Harbour Commissioners, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 761 (i).

Naturalization and Aliens Act Amt. (B. 184) in Com., 8685, 8689 (v).

Newspaper Reports *re* Interviewing Prisoners (remarks) 3251 (ii).

Nixon, Robert, Investigation *re* (remarks) 9788 (v).

Northwest Irrigation Act Amt. B. 161 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°*, 6104 (iv).

Northwest Territories (B. 160) 1° m., 6104 (iv); 2° m., 8763; in Com., 8765 (v); 3° m., 9408 (v).

N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5694 (iii).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Chas.—*Con.*

Northwest Territories Representation Act Amt. (B. 156) 1° m., 6046 (iv) ; in Com., 8769; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Agents, 8771 (v).

Northwest Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) on Sen. Amts., 7683 (iv).

Opposition Leader, Indemnity : *See* 'Senate and House of Commons,'

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 2547, 3181, 3187 (ii).

Owen, Thomas David Patent Relief B. 177 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8652 (v).

Parole System for Convicts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 467 (i).

Pilotage Act (Quebec) Amt. B. 171 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 7443 (iv).

Plains of Abraham, Purchase by Govt., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).

Political Crisis in Quebec, &c. (remarks) 754 (i).

Protection to Women and Children, Amt. to Criminal Code *re* Wife Beaters (Ans.) 592 (i).

Provl. Govt. in N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'

Public Works Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. Hyman) on M. for 1°, 819 (i).

Quebec Political Crisis (remarks) 823 (i).

Ry. Act (1903) Amt. B. 36 : *See* 'Railway Commissioners.'

Railways and Canals Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1674 (i).

Ry. Act (express companies) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for Adjnmt., 3246 (ii).

Ry. Act, 1903 (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 309; (M.) to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c., 312 ; agreed to (Y. 85 ; N. 45) 314 ; on Com., 1780 (i), 3223 (ii).

Railway Act (1903) Amt. (B.) wthdrn., 6103 (iv).

Railway Commissioners (chairman) Appnmt. (B. 36) Res. prop., 319; M. for Com. on Res., 493 ; in Com. on Res., 563 ; 1° m., 582 ; 2° m., 745 ; in Com., 1596, 1599 ; 3° m., 1802 (i).

——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1627 (i).

Ry. Debts Bill : *See* 'Exchequer.'

Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at Elections, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7337 (iv).

Roads and Road Allowances, Alberta and Saskatchewan B. 195 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 9528 (v).

St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Wrecking Plants, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2477 (ii).

Saskatchewan, Prov. of : *See* 'Autonomy B. 70.'

Seamen's Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 2120 (ii), 7436 (iv).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Chas.—*Con.*

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 369, 1790 (i).

Senate and House of Commons Indemnity (B. 202) M. for Com. on Res., 9701 ; in Com. on Res., 9726, 9733 ; in Com., 9791 (v).

South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9341 (v).

Statutes, Revision of (remarks) 745 (i).

Sunday Observance, Govt. Legislation *re* (Ans.) 8656 (v).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 87 ; Justice (salaries) 72 ; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 103 (i).

Dominion Police (salaries) 138 (i).

Immigration (medical inspection) 9238 (v).

Justice, Administration of (B. C. Judges) 9683 (v) ; (Exchequer Court, salaries) 125; Man., &c. (Judges' travelling allowances) 123 ; N.W.T. (court room, Prince Albert) 124 (i) ; (N. W. Judges) 9683 (v) ; (maintenance of prisoners) 122 ; (miscellaneous) 102 ; (stenographers, Sup. Court) 125 (i).

Justice—N.S. (Judges' salaries) 124 (i).

Justice—Supreme Court (salaries) 125 (i) ; (Three Rivers Judges) 9682 (v).

Justice—Yukon (court fees) 137 ; (Judges' travelling allowances) 126 ; (law books, &c.) 136 ; (maintenance of prisoners) 135 ; (witnesses, &c., fees) 135 (i).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 937 ; (Quebec and Natashquan) 967 ; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 949 ; (wrecking plant) 958 (i).

Miscellaneous (consolidation of statutes) 7244 (iv), 8672; (Dominion and Provincial legislation) 9685 (v); (litigation matters) 7247 (iv); (Sabbath Day legislation) 9684; (W. A. Duncan's account) 9864 (v).

Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 480 ; (Edmonton Jail) 481 (i), 9684 (v) ; Penitentiaries (general) 465 ; (contracts *re* supplies) 479 ; (Kingston) 477 ; (parole system) 465 ; (Prince Albert Jail) 481; (Regina Jail) 481; (St. Vincent de Paul) 480 ; (Stoney Mountain, Man.) 481 (i) ; (Stoney Mountain school) 9684 (v).

Post Office (detective service) 209; Yukon (salaries) 214 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle) 1111; (Montreal Inland Rev.) 1125 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Château Richer) 7290; (Montmorency wharf) 7312 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Que. (Bryson) 7586 (iv).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act (salaries) Amt. (B. 205) M. for Com. on Res., 9705; in Com. on Res. and 1°* of B., 9760 (v).

Supreme Court, N.S., Vacancy, Appnmt. *re* (remarks) 5210 (iii).

Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 4684 (iii).

Trading Stamps, Legislation *re*, &c. (Ans.) 7020 (iv).

See 'Criminal Code.'

Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 719, 1774 (i).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Chas.—*Con.*

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8637 (v).

Wire Fencing : *See* 'N.W.T.,' 'Boundary.'

Wrecking Plant 'Lord Strathcona' in Com. of Sup., 958 (i).

See 'St. Lawrence.'

Yukon Elections, Delay in opening Ballot Boxes (remarks) 988 (i).

Yukon Judges, Salaries and Allowances (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).

Yukon Member-elect, Delay in Gazetting (remarks) 453 (i).

Forget, Mr. R., *Charlevoix.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5206 (iii).

Salmon, Capt., Resignation, &c., on M. (Mr. Ames) for Cor., 397 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E., *North Toronto.*

Address, on The, 21 (i).

Admiralty Court Registrars, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 126 (i).

Adulteration of Food, Prosecutions under Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1699, 1712 (i).

Agents, I.C.R., Policy *re* Dwelling Houses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).

'Agnes G. Donohue,' Schr., Seizure of (remarks) 1508 (i).

Alberta Province : *See* 'Autonomy.'

Allan Strs., List of Sailings, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 885 (i).

Animals slaughtered under Contagious Act, Compensation *re* (remarks) on conc., 6911 (iv).

Anthracite Coal Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 136 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 5976 (iv).

Archives Building, Ottawa, in Com. of Sup., 603 (i).

Armouries, Construction of, Generally; in Com. of Sup., 1649 (i).

——— Govt. Policy *re* Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1547 (i).

Ashcroft and Cariboo Mail Service. Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3670 (ii).

Ashcroft Water and Light Co., Conditions of Lease *re* Land (Ques.) 2491 (ii).

Audit Act, Progress *re* (Ques.) 2190 (ii).

Auditor General and Audit Act (notice of motion) 9541 (v).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 9631 (v).

Auditor General's Rep., Inquiry for, 51, 97 (i).

Autonomy, Provincial, for N. W. Ters. B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5487 (iii); on M. for 1°, 1435 (i); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3363 (ii).

——— in Com. (B.N.A. Act) 5732 (iii).

——— (compensation *re* lands) in Com., 5817 (iii).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Autonomy, Provincial, for N. W. Ters. B. 69
——— (distribution of seats) 7725 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8022; on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7817, 7823, 7923 (iv).
——— (lands vested in Crown) 6016 (iv).
——— (laws, courts, &c.) 5929, 5943 (iii).
——— (school clause amt.) 7122, 7137 (iv).
——— (subsidy to provs.) in Com., 6087, 6098 (iv).
Autonomy Bill, Amendments *re* (remarks) 2840 (ii).
——— Approval by Cabinet, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2270 (ii).
——— Changes *re*, &c. (remarks) 2046 (ii)
——— Delay in Printing (remarks) 1671 (i).
——— Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2557 (ii).
——— Information asked for in Rets., Inquiry for, 3091 (ii).
——— Pets. circulated in Quebec, on Ques. of Order, 2570 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order, *re* Mis-statement of Speech by Mr. Belcourt, 3517-20 (ii).
——— on Resignation of Hon. C. Sifton (remarks) 1864 (i).
——— Schedules *re* Saskatchewan (remarks) 5476 (iii).
——— School Clause, Explanation *re* Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5818 (iii).
——— Second Reading *re* (remarks) 2022 (ii).
——— (remarks) 262 (i).
See 'Manitoba.'
Badgley Island Timber Cutting, License granted (Ques.) 452 (i).
Binder Twine Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7221 (iv).
——— Industry, Kingston Penitentiary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 482 (i).
Blair, Mr., Resignation from Ry. Commission (remarks) on M. for Com. on B. 6, 524 (i).
——— Re-Hearing of N. W. Cases, &c. (remarks) 56 (i).
——— Inquiry for Tel., 697 (i).
Breakwaters, Wharfs, &c., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9553 (v).
Budget, on The, Reply to Financial Statement, 8915 (v).
——— Inquiry *re*, 2006, 2441, 2762 (ii), 7100 (iv).
Burford Armoury Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1649 (i).
Business of the House, Notices of Motions, &c. (remarks) 9523 (v).
See 'Govt. Legislation,' 'Morning,' &c.
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers, on Orders of the Day, 3566 (ii).
——— Interior Dept., Information *re* (remarks) 3450 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
'Canada'-'Cape Breton,' Collision, Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2631 (ii).
Canada and Mexico SS. Communication (remarks) 66 (i).
Canadian Cattle, British Embargo (remarks) 456 (i).
Canal Inspectors, Qualifications, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1509 (i).
Carpets purchased by Govt., Value, &c. (remarks) 8266 (v).
Catholic Mutual Benefit Association of Canada, B. 93 (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com., 2769 (ii).
Cement, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9765 (v).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 625 (i).
Centre Toronto Electoral District, Vacancy (notification) 2777 (ii).
Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 49 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 2765 (ii).
Charges by P.M.G. *re* Resignation in 1896 (remarks) 841 (i).
Citizens' Bank of Canada B. 133 (Mr. Barr) in Com., 5973 (iv).
Cold Storage : *See* 'Statements.'
Collingwood Govt. Dock, Conroy Bros. Cheque (remarks) 6579 (iv).
Commercial Agencies in G.B., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7208 (iv).
Committees, Sel. Standing, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add Names, 110 (1).
Criminal Code (appeals) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) on M. for 3° (M.) to ref. back to Com. *re* Amt., 9699 (v).
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9425 (v).
Customs Collections on Sunday (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 413 (i).
Customs Officers' Uniforms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 413 (i).
Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 190 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9761 (v).
Dismissals from Public Offices (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 140 (i).
Dominion Annuity Co.'s incorp. B. 82 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 2767 (ii); on M. for 3°, 2768 (ii).
Dom. Lands, Officials' Salaries, on Statement (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 9289 (v).
——— Open to Applicants, Ref. to by Prime Min. (remarks) 1935 (i).
——— Sale, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 2006 (ii).
Doukhobors Homestead Entries *re* Village Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iv).
Dredge used in Govt. Works, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 795 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Drummond County Ry., Expenditure on Capital Account, &c., (M. for ret.*) 2334 (ii).
—— (remarks) 1940 (i).
Easter, Adjournment (remarks) 4458 (iii).
Estimates, Delay in bringing down and effcient criticism (amt.) to Sup., 9085 (v).
—— (remarks) 9051 (v).
Estimates, of the Interior, Obstruction, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9276 (v).
Exports and Imports Returns, Issue of Monthly Rep. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7214 (iv).
Facer Steel Co.'s Patent Relief B. 27 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 1339 (i).
Fisheries Industry, Commission *re* Investigation, Recommendation, &c., on M. (Mr. Ganong) 6312, 6337 (iv).
Fredericton Post Office, Equipment, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 172 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys.: *See* 'Holstein.'
Gamebridge, Masonry Inspector, Dismissal, Imperfect Ret. (remarks) 5600 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Papers, 8004 (v).
See 'Ritchie.'
Gillies Brothers, Limited, B. 95 (Mr. A. A. Wright) in Com., 2764 (ii).
Glanders among Horses, Expenditure *re* by O. C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6700 (iv).
Gold Medal Furniture Co's Patent Relief B. 102 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3399 (ii).
Govt. Legislation, Inquiry for, on M. to take in Wednesdays, 820 (i).
Govt. Railways, Rails taken up and renewed, Tons, Disposition of, &c. (M. for ret.) 2066 (ii).
Govt. Steamers, Coal Supply (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2614 (ii).
—— Purchase of Supplies, in Com. of Sup., 2617 (ii).
G.T. Ry. Arbitration B. 199 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 1°, 9280 (v).
See 'I.C.R.'
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4205, 4214 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7678 (iv)
G. T. P. Ry. Commission, Appnmts. of Staff, Number, Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 916 (i).
—— (Ques.) 688 (i).
—— Estimates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2182 (ii).
—— Interim Rep. (remarks) 6310 (iv).
—— Surveys, Information *re*, Mr. Hay's Address, &c. (remarks) 2007 (ii).
—— Surveys, Quebec and Moncton Route, Information *re* (remarks) 228 (i).
—— Surveys, Rep. in Ry. Dept. &c. (remarks) 2018 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
G.T.P. Ry., Terminals, Plans deposited with Govt. on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 2823, 2829 (ii).
—— Winnipeg Terminals, Contracts, &c. (remarks) 9541 (v).
—— Winnipeg Terminals, Cor. *re* (remarks) 6311 (iv).
Half-Breed Scrip, Issue to U.S. Citizens (remarks) 6311 (iv).
Half-Breed Scrip to non-residents (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6489, 6560 (iv).
Half-Breed Scrip, Charges *re*, &c., on M. for Sup., Cor. &c. (read) 7647 (iv).
—— Charges *re* Mr. Chaffee's Claim (personal explanation) 7916 (iv).
—— Mr. Chaffey's Letter (read) 8183 (v).
—— Investigation, Appnmt. of Counsel (remarks) 8528, 8697 (v).
—— Instructions to Judge Myers, *re* Investigation, Inquiry for, 7723 (iv), 8179 (v).
—— O. C. *re* Judge Myers (remarks) 8003 (iv).
—— Patents issued, &c. (remarks) 8003 (v).
—— Inquiry for papers, 7099, 7422 (iv).
—— Patents *re* (remarks) 6907 (iv).
—— Issue of Patent, Inquiry for (remarks) 7020 (iv).
—— Investigation, Progress *re* (remarks) 9725 (v).
—— Complete Ret. (remarks) 9179 (v).
—— Further Papers, Inquiry for, 9029 (v).
—— Information *re* (remarks) 8777 (v).
See 'Nixon.'
Halifax and Esquimalt Defences, Cor. O.Cs., &c., with Dom. Govt. (M. for copies*) 2334 (ii).
Halifax Equipment, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6511 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers in Mar. Provs., Criticism *re* Votes for, 9101 (v).
Harbours and Rivers—N.S., Charges against Govt. Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9553 (v).
Hay transported over I.C.R., Cor. between Govt. &c. (M. for copies) 164, 280 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 919 (i), 2005, 2595, 3450 (ii).
Hillsborough Bridge, Murray Harbour Branch Ry., in Com., of Sup., 2147 (ii).
See 'Murray'.
Holstein Breeders, Complaint *re* Freight Rates on Rys. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6680 (iv).
Homestead inspectors and Govt. Officials, acting as Political Organizers, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 9255 (v).
Homestead Inspectors, Policy *re* Politicians (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6407 (iv).
See 'Nixon,' 'Leach.'
House of Commons, Furniture, Purchase of, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6614 (iv).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
House of Commons, Official Duties of Staff, Statement *re* (remarks) 9077 (v).
——— Purchases, Audit of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6617 (iv).
See 'Library,' 'Ventilation.'
Icebreaker 'Montcalm', Accident to, &c. (remarks) 4752 (iii).
Immigration in B.C., Authority for Inspection, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9332 (v).
Immigration of Skilled Labour, Statement from Toronto Labour Council, on M. for Sup., 7504 (iv).
——— Notice of Motion, 7424 (iv).
See 'North Atlantic.'
Imperial Guarantee and Accident Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2771 (ii).
Imports and Exports, Total Amount for Home Consumption, 1904 (Ques.) 380 (i).
Indian Dept., Promotions *re* Senority of Service (remarks) in Conc., 6909 (iv).
——— on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6921 (iv).
I.C.R. and G.T.R. Arbitration, &c. (remarks) 68 (i).
——— Information *re* (remarks) 165 (i).
See 'G.T. Ry., B. 199.'
I.C.R., Chapman, F. B., Emplymnt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1342 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1954 (i).
——— Fuel Inspector, Duties, &c. (Ques.) 451 (i).
——— Hay : *See* 'Hay.'
——— Parlour Cars, &c., Net Profits (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2254 (ii).
——— Passes issued, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2258 (ii).
——— Private Cars, Number, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2258 (ii).
——— Railway Rates, Increases, &c. (remarks) on Explanation (Mr. Emmerson) 6118 (iv).
——— Receipts and Expenditures, Total Amount (Ques.) 688 (i).
——— Rolling Stock, Equipment, Additions from 1900 to 1904 (M. for ret.*) 736 (i).
——— Supplies, Purchase of Oil, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2246 (ii).
——— Traffic Arrangements with Foreign and Can. Rys., Amounts received (Ques.) 4703 (iii).
Interior, Minister of (remarks) 1152 (i)
Internal Economy Board, Rep. of Proceedings (remarks) 9077 (v).
International Bridge and Terminal Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 87 (Mr. Grant) on Sen. Amts., 9695 (v).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
International Postal Supply Co., Renting of Stamping Machines (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7219 (iv).
Japanese Trade with Canada, Discrimination *re* Canadian Goods (remarks) 6656 (iv).
——— on Statement (Mr. Fisher) 7908 (iv).
——— (remarks) 7816 (iv).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9743 (v).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6662 (iv).
——— (remarks) 9709, 9711 (v).
Killam, Hon. Mr. Justice, Appnmt. as Chairman of Ry. Commissioners Board (remarks) on B. 36, 524 (i).
'Kingsford' Dredge, Cost of Operation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 801 (i).
Leach, R. E. A., Dom. Lands Agents (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9251 (v).
Letter Carriers, Sick Leave, Payment, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 176 (i).
Library Accommodation, Extension of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).
London Militiamen at London Election (remarks) 7358 (iv).
Losses sustained for Damaged Goods, *re* 'Minto' Str. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2623 (ii).
McAlpine, Mr. E. H., Expenditure *re* Litigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1522 (i).
McMichael, Mr., Customs Inspector, Duties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 406 (i).
Mail Bags, Locks, Repairs, &c., Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 205 (i).
Mails carried free by Rys. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 185 (i).
Mail Carriers, System of Payments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions, Information *re* System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 923 (i).
Mail Subsidies *re* Newfoundland Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).
Man. Boundaries, M'gr Sbarretti's Explanation on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn., 3951 (ii).
——— Letter to Cardinal Rampolla (read) 3956 (ii).
——— Letter of Mr. Russell to Cardinal Rampolla (read) 3957 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 'naming Member,' 3859 (ii).
See 'Autonomy.'
Manitoba Elections, Duties of Ret. Officers (remarks) 1633 (i).
Manitoba Election Returns (remarks) 1672 (i).
Martineau, Defalcations, Evidence *re* Bank Suit (remarks) 112 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Meeting after Six o'clock Recess (remarks) 450 (i).
Melfort Mail Service, Charges *re* Delays (remarks) 9790 (v).
Messengers, House of Commons, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 243 (i).
Meteorological Building, Toronto, Erection of (Ques.) 1149 (i).
Meteorological Observatory, Removal to Ottawa (remarks) *re* Cor. with Mr. E. F. Clarke, 9772 (v).
Metric System, *re* Weights and Measures (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1695 (i).
Military Council, Constitution, Duties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 419 (i).
Military Equipment for Defences, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 446 (i).
Military Heads, Appnmt. to Militia Council (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 432 (i).
Militia Act (permanent force) Amt. B. 170, on prop. Res. (Sir Frederick Borden) 6905 ; on M. for 2°, 7263 (iv), 9179 (v).
Militia Armouries, &c., Supervision of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 423 (i).
Militia Canadian Garrisons, Mr. Broderick's Proposition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9109 (v).
Militia Force, Reduction of, on Explanation (Sir Frederick Borden) to M. for Sup., 6999 (iv).
Ministers of Finance and Interior, Absence, &c. (remarks) 321 (i).
Mint, Royal Canadian, Estimated Cost, Capacity, &c. (Ques.) 2185, 2326 (ii).
'Montcalm,' Accident to, &c. (remarks) 4752 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, B. 192 (Mr. Préfontaine) on M. for 1°, 9029 (v).
Moosejaw and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 20 (Mr. Scott) in Com., 2762 (ii).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9082 (v).
See 'Business.'
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2134 (ii).
Murray Harbour Branch Ry., Construction, Tenders, Plans, Specifications, &c. (M. for copies *) 2334 (ii).
Nicolas, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) on conc., 9685 (v).
Nixon, Mr., Appnmt. as Dom. Lands Agent, Macleod, N.W.T. (remarks) 5718, 6111 (iv), 9076 (v).
——— Charges *re* (M.) to adjn., 8098 (v).
——— Investigation *re* (remarks) 8697 (v).
——— 2nd Investigation *re* Charges, Letter from Mr. Beere (read) 9787 (v).
Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Nixon, Mr. (M.) to cancel Vote for Salary, in Com. of Sup., 9316, 9329 (v).
——— Reduction of Salary (Amt.) on conc., 9769, Neg. (Y. 30; N. 66) 9770 (v).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 6048 (iv).
See 'Half-breed.'
North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses *re* Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9321 (v).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9442 (v).
N.W. Cases, Re-hearing before Ry. Commission (remarks) 56 (i).
Northwest Irrigation Act Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 6104 (iv).
N.W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 8 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 460 (i).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 1891 (i), 2051 (ii).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5587 (iii).
——— on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5704 (iii).
N.W.T. Govt. Lands, Sale of in 1903-4, Rates, &c. (M. for O.C.*) 164 (i).
N.W.T. Govt. Officials, Interference in Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9718 (v).
N.W. Ters. Land Sales, Inquiry for Ret., 1154 (i).
Oats, Rolled, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9763 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2763 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 9819 (v).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5965 (iv).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) on M. for 1°, 317; on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1889 (i); in Com., 3186 (ii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7280 (iv).
Parliament Buildings, Addition to H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5801 (iii).
Parole System for Convicts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 465 (i).
Personal Explanation : *See* 'Resignation.'
Pets. *re* Autonomy Bills, Ques. of Order, 2320 (ii).
Petroleum Bounties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).
Pilotage Act (Quebec) Amt. B. 171 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 7440 (iv).
Plains of Abraham, Purchase by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
Pneumatic Tube System, Cost, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 217 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Conmee & Bowman's Tender, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4469 (iii).
——— Circular Letter of Acting Minister of Public Works (remarks) *re* Cor., 4667 (iii).
Postage on Newspapers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 179 (i).
Postage Stamps and Bank Notes, Contracts *re*, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 204 (i).
Postal Rates Increases, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 221 (i).
Post Office Clerks, Examination for Statutory Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9058 (v).
P.E.I. Communication with Mainland (remarks) 833 (i).
——— Investigation *re* Tunnelling, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 2811 (ii).
Prohibitionist Principles, on Charges by P.M.G. (explanation) 842 (i).
Provident Savings Association B. 134 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 5974 (iv).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Accounts Rep., Inquiry for, 97 (i).
Public Buildings, Comparison with U.S. System of Rentals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1024 (i).
Public Buildings in Towns, &c., Amounts first voted, population, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1398 (i).
Public Building Sites, &c., Non-partisan Selections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 429 (i).
Public Works Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. Hyman) on M. for 1°, 819 (i).
Public Works Portfolio (remarks) 6047 (iv).
Public Works, Rep. of Minister, Delay, &c. (remarks) 601 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Tronsfer to Marine Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 772 (i).
Quebec Political Crisis (remarks) 823, 826 (i).
Railways and Canals Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1675 (i).
Railway Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com. on Res., 494, 524; in Com. on Res., 572; in Com., 1616., (i).
Railway Commission, Board of Maintenance, 1534 (i).
——— Number and Names of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 684 (i).
——— Staff Salaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1539 (i).
——— Rep. of Mr. Blair, Inquiry for, 1539 (i).
Resignation in 1896, Charges of P.M.G. (personal explanation) 841 (i).
Returns, Inquiry for, Delay, &c. (remarks) 4751 (iii).
——— Inquiry for, *re* Public Works, 9688 (v).
——— Inquiry for, 1594 (i), 2262 (ii), 5600 (iii).
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* form of

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Oath at Elections, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7337 (iv).
Richelieu Bridge at Sorel, O.C. and Rep. &c., Inquiry for, 8098 (v).
Ritchie, James, Inspector of Masons *re* Trent Valley Canal, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 2777 (ii).
See 'Gamebridge.'
Riviere Ouelle Spur Line (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1981 (i).
Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 169 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6969; in Com., 7262 (iv).
Royal Trust Co., Ref. to in Com. on B. 99, 3651 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery, Cost of Establishment. &c., on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Ret., 2079, 2092 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery System, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 220 (i).
St. John, Halifax and W. Indies Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7187 (iv).
St. John Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 776 (i).
St. John Quarantine Station, Acetylene Gas Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1052 (i).
Saskatchewan, Creation of Province : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Issue of Patents, &c., (Ques.) 8267, 8655 (v).
Schukin, Ivan, Cancellation of Homestead Entry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iv).
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 2115 (ii).
Seamen's Act Amt. (shipping masters) Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 7428 (iv), 9030 (v).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 52; in Com., 355, 1203 (i).
Separate School Pamphlet, Official Distribution, Preparation, &c. (Ques.) 2328 (ii).
——— (remarks) 2006 (ii).
Sifton, Hon. C., Resignation (remarks) 1853 (i).
Smart, Jas. A., Emplymnt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iv).
——— Resignation, &c. (remarks) 115 (i).
S. Africa and Canada SS. Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co., on Sen. Amts., 9815 (v).
Speaker, Election of (remarks) 3 (i).
Statements of Mr. E. D. Smith *re* Cold Storage (remarks) 875 (i).
SUPPLY :
Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1699, 1712 (i).
Agriculture, &c. (creameries) 6938 (iv) ; (criminal statistics) 1473; (i) ; (dairying) 6936; (live stock records) 6680 (iv); (Patent Record) 1472 (i).
Canals—Cornwall (repairs at locks) 1494 ; Grenville (guide piers) 1500 ; Miscellaneous (inspections, &c.) 1509; (staff and

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Canals—*Con.*
repairs) 1546; Murray (repairs) 1495; Trent (improvements) 1499; (surveys) 1489; Welland (stone protection) 1496 (i).
Charges of Management, 69 (i); (Receiver General's Office) 9053 (v).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture Dept. (archivist) 9053; (private secretary) 9054 (v); (salaries) 92; Auditor Gen.'s Office (salaries) 77, 90; Customs (contingencies) 258, 405; (inspectors salaries) 405 (i); (salaries) 78 (i), 9069 (v); Finance (salaries) 78, 118 (i), 9061 (v); Geological Survey (salaries) 122 (i), 9249; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (clerical assistance) 9053 (v); (salaries) 70 (i); High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 120; Indian Affairs (contingencies) 116; Interior (salaries) 114 (i); Conc. (salaries) 6909 (iv); (salary increases) 9070 (v); Inland Revenue (salaries) 89 (i), 9069 (v); Justice (salaries) 72; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 2443 (ii), 9051; Militia (contingencies) 9068 (v); (salaries) 112 (i), 9067 (v); Post Office Dept. (salaries) 95 (i), 9058 (v); Privy Council (salaries) 71 (i); Public Works (salaries) 95 (i); Railways and Canals (law clerk) 9066; (private sec.) 9063 (v); (salaries) 93; Sec. of State (salaries) 74; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 96 (i).
Dom. Lands (Banff, pamphlets *re*) 6424; (contingencies) 6406 (iv), 9289 (v); (homestead inspectors) 6407 (iv); (land agents) 9251; (maps, printing, &c.) 6424 (iv); (outside salaries) 9251, 9289 (v); (roads and bridges) 6423; (surveys, &c.) 6406 (iv).
Dominion Police (salaries) 138 (i).
Excise (additional remuneration) 1688; (allowance to customs collectors) 1689 (inspections, &c.) 1693; (inspectors' salaries) 1679; (L. A. Frechette, translation) 1690; (methylated spirits) 1691; (preventive service) 1688; (travelling expenses) 1689 (i).
Geological Survey (surveys, &c.) conc., 9685 (v).
House of Commons (additional messenger) 6613; (committee expenses) 6594; (leather trunks) 6606; (library books) 6945 (iv); (messengers) 243 (i); (pages) 6613 (iv); (salaries) 238 (i); (sergeant-at-arms, salaries) 6611; (sessional clerks) 6595; (sessional messengers) 6612; (stationery) 6594 (iv).
Immigration (agents in Can. and G. B.) 9226, 9308; Amt. on conc., 9769; (detention hospital, B.C.) 9227; (medical inspection, B.C.) 9331; (salaries) 9313 (v).
Indians—B.C. (industrial schools) 9339; (Pemberton Band) 9340 (v).
Indians—Generally (land management fund) 237; (legal expenses) 237 (i).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (implements) 9336 (v).
Indians—Mar. Provs. (schools) 225 (i).
Indians—Ont. and Que. (legal expenses) 9336 (v); (medical attendance) 223; (surveys) 236 (i); (Treaty No. 9) 9336 (v).
Inspection of Staples (grain inspection) 7227 (iv).
Justice—Man., &c. (Judges' salaries) 123; N.W.T. (maintenance of prisoners) 122; Supreme Court (salaries) 125; (Three Rivers Judgeship) 9683 (v); Yukon (living allowances) 130; (maintenance of prisoners) 135 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7535 (iv).
Legislation — Debates (expenditure) 6592 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Annapolis and G.B.) 967; (Can. and Mexico) 895 (i), 9680 (v); (Canada and Mexico), on conc., 6909 (iv); Canada and S. Africa) 973; (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 934; (Grand Manan and Mainland) 922; (Halifax and Canso) 937; (Halifax and Nfld.) 906; (Halifax, Nfld. and Liverpool) 902; (Magdalen Islands) 906; (Manchester Line) 923; (Murray Bay and River Ouelle) 938; (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 945; (Petit de Grat) 966; (Pictou and Cheticamp) 935; (Pictou and Montague Bridge) 926; (Port Mulgrave and Canso) 936; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 927; (P.E.I. and Mainland) 919; (P.E.I. and Nfld.) 940; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 937; (Quebec and Gaspé) 927; (Quebec and Natashquan) 967; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 948; (St. John and Halifax) 923; (St. John and Minas Basin) 971; (St. John and W. Indies) 7177 (iv); (St. John and Westport) 966; (Victoria and San Francisco) 906; (Victoria and Vancouver) 939; (wrecking plant) 957 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 441 (i), 6512 (iv); (arsenals) 446 (i); (depots) 9113 (v); (Dom. arsenal) 6513 (iv); (Militia Council) 9109; (ordnance) conc., 9686 (v); (pay and allowance) 413 (i), 6511; (Royal Military college) 7003 (iv); (surveys) 440 (i); (transports, &c.) 6513 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Academy of Arts) 6959 (iv); (Champlain's monument) 9340; (Dom. and Provincial legislation) 9684 (v); (Naturalization Act) 6957 (iv.); (noon gun, &c.) 121 (i); (Pacific cable grant) 7277: (Paris agency) 6958; (secret service) 6958 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 2614; (schools of navigation) 2639 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 481; (Edmonton Jail) 481; (general) 465; (parole system) 465 (i).
Pensions (Fenian raid) conc., 6961; (militiamen, 1885) 6957 (iv).
Post Office (detective service) 209; (inspectors' salaries) 144; (letter carriers) 174; (mail service) 177; (mail service) Amt. *re* Thessalon Postmaster on conc., 9772; (postal maps, engraving) 9060 (v); (provisional allowances) 166; (ry. mail clerks) 139; (salaries) 166; Yukon (mail service) 203; (salaries) 214 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—General (armouries) 1649; (clerk of works) 1642 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 1633 (i); (Winnipeg immigration building) 9550 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Campbellton) 1048 (i); (generally) 7284 (iv); (St. John detention building) 1050; (St. John quarantine) 1052; (Woodstock armoury) 1057 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Edmonton) 9550 (v); (Moosejaw) 1638; (Prince Albert) 1638; (Red Deer court house) 1639; (Regina P.O.) 1639 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 846, 1020; (Canso) 1023; (Glace Bay) 1034: (Halifax Dom. building) 1036; (Halifax

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY —*Con.*
Public Works—*Con.*
Immigration building) 1036 ; (Inverness) 1041 ; (Shelburne) 1043 ; (Sydney Mines) 1045 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Belleville armoury) 1547 ; (Bowmanville) 1549 ; (Brantford drill hall) 1550 ; (Bridgeburg) 1550 ; (Cobourg armoury) 1555 ; (Guelph armoury) 1555 ; (Hawkesbury) 1560 ; (London military stores) 1562 ; (Military College) 1561 ; (North Bay) 1564 ; (Oshawa) 1564 ; (St. Mary's) 1579 ; (Sandwich) 1579; (Simcoe) 1581 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additions, &c.) 9542 (v); (archives) 603; (coal sheds) 1565; (elevator attendants) 1667; (lighting) 1667; (museum) 755, 765; (Post Office reconstruction) 1574; (Royal Mint) 608-620 ; (telephones) 1669 ; (Wellington St. paving) 1572; (western block, addition) 766 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Souris) 1047 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (maintenance) 1666 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Annapolis) 9576 ; (Baddeck wharf) 9585 ; (Battery Point) 9552; (Boisdale wharf) 9585; (Bourgeois inlet) 9581; (Devil's Island) 9551; (Economy wharf) 9579; (Glace Bay) 9577; (Half Island cove) 9584; (Irish cove) 9578; (Kelly's cove) 9582; (Parker's cove) 9552; (Parrsboro harbour) 9579 ; (Petite Riviere) 9580; (Phinney's Cove) 9552; (Pierreville pier) 9581; (Porter's Lake) 9583; (Pugwash wharf) 9578; (Ray's Creek) 9576 ; (River Hebert) 9578; (Round Hill wharf) 9552; (Sydney quarantine station) 9578; (Tatamagouche wharf) 9579 ; (Toney river) 9581 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur) 785 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Louise embankment) 772 (1).
Quarantine (cattle) 6700; on conc., 6911 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, construction, &c.) 2278 (ii), 6427; (surveys) on conc., 6910 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (additional sidings) 6432 (iv); (Amherst accommodation) 1983; Drummondville improvements) 1960 (i); (locomotive machinery) 6428 (iv); (Mitchell diversion) 1940; (Moncton accommodation) 1946; (Newcastle improvements) 1967; (St. Fabien subway) 1981 (i); (station accommodation) 6429 (iv); (steel rails, &c.) 1989; (Sydney Mines extension) 1987 (i); (ties, &c.) 6429 (iv); (water service) 2170 (ii) ; (working expenses) 6908 (iv).
Railways and Canals—Miscellaneous (litigation) 1522 ; (engineers, &c) 1521 (i).
Railways—P.E.I. (air brakes) 2178 (ii); (Bloomfield agent's house) 6432 (iv); (Cardigan branch) 2172 (ii) ; (Charlottetown track extension) 6433 (iv); (Freetown station house) 2180; (Georgetown station) 2179; (M.C.B. couplers) 2178; (Morrell bridge swing span) 2177; (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2134 (ii); (working expenses) 6908 (iv).
Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance) 1534 (i).
Scientific Institutions (astronomical observatory) 9248 (v).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Senate (contingencies) 6943 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Immigration Act) 7204 (iv); (salaries) 981 (i); (commercial agencies) 7208; (iron and steel bounties) 7216 (iv).
Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 1698 (i); (inspection of staples) 9681 (v); (metric system) 1699; (standards) 1695 ; (travelling expenses) 1695 (i).
Yukon Ter. Govt. (additional allowance to Maj. Wood) 9250; (local council grant) 9250 (v).
Telegraph Lines in Canada and Americanization (remarks) 7646 (iv).
Thessalon Postmaster, Mr. J. B. Dobey, Irregularities, &c., on M. tor Sup., 6203, 6212 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Boyce) tor Cor., 3202 (ii).
——— Amt. to Reduce Vote, on conc., 9772 (v).
Timber Lands, sold or leased by Interior Dept., Descriptions, &c. (M. for ret.*) 9698 (v).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3651 (ii), 4680 (iii).
Tobacco Industry, Inspection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1681 (i).
Toronto, Centre, Vacancy, Issue of Writ (remarks) 3251 (ii).
Toronto Observatory, Govt. Policy *re* Removal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9248 (v).
Toronto Pneumatic Postal Service, Contract *re* Trench (remarks) 5807, 5922 (iii).
Transportation Commission, Appnmt. of Chairman (remarks) 404 (i).
——— Complete Membership and Reps. *re* (remarks) 321 (i).
Trent Valley Canal, Inspector Ritchie's Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 2777 (ii).
——— Incomplete Return (remarks) 4750 (iii).
Turriff, J. G., Employment by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 8266 (v).
Uniforms for Letter Carriers, Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 206 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) on M. for 3°, 8818 (v).
Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 8695 (v).
Walton, Mr. R. M., Arrest by U.S. Authorities in the South (remarks) 4199 (iii).
Wharfs, Piers, Docks, Constructed by Govt. since 1896 (M. for ret.) 2777 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 8178 (v).
White Lead, Tariff *re*, in Com. on B. 190, 9761 (v).
White, Mr. Odbur, Dismissal from I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2211 (ii).
Wines, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9762 (v).
Wire Fencing : *See* 'N.W.T.,' &c.

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Wrecking Plant 'Lord Strathcona,' in Com. of Sup., 957 (i).
Yarmouth Bank of N.S., Investigation *re* (remarks) 9690 (v).
Yukon, Member-elect, Delay in Gazetting (remarks) 454 (i).
——— Reforms, &c., on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 7035 (iv).
——— Salaries and Living Allowances (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 214 (iv).

Fowler, Mr. G. W., *King's and Albert, N.B.*
Acetylene Gas Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1052-3 (i).
Allan Fast SS. Service, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 894 (i).
Autonomy B. 69, in Com. (Crown Lands) 8260; (seat of Govt.) 8244 (v).
Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Conspiracy, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. on B. 36, 535 (i).
Dismissals from Public Offices, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 140 (i).
I.C.R. Employees, Messrs. Weldon, McDougall, &c., Political Partisans (Ques.) 1146 (i).
Killam, Judge, Appnmt as Chairman of Ry. Commisson (remarks) on M. for Com. on B. 36, 535 (i).
Kingston, N.B., and Jubilee Station Mail Service, Tenders *re*, &c. (Ques.) 5133 (iii).
Maccan Mail Contract, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 188 (i).
Martineau Defalcations, Collection of Guarantee (remarks) 113 (i).
Military Medical Officers, Appnmts., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 417 (i).
Militia Act (permanent force) Amt. B. 170 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6985 (iv).
Militia Buildings, Architects, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).
Pneumatic P.O. System, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. *See* 'Autonomy.'
Ry. Act, 1903 (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 297 (i).
Ry. Commissioners (chairman) Appnmt. of, B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com. on Res., 535 (i).
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at Elections, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7363 (iv).
St. John Quarantine Station, Acetylene Gas Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1053 (i).
St. John River, N.B., Govt. Policy *re* Wharfs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).
Sackville Ry. Station, Tenders *re* Erection, &c. (Ques.) 5133 (iii).
Sherbrooke Drill Shed, Site, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 428 (i).

Fowler, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*
Silver Coins, Worn, &c., Redemption of (Ques.) 688 (i).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture (creameries) 7016 (iv).
Canals—Grenville (guide piers) 1500 ; (Williamsburg (steam hoist) 1495 (i).
Chinese Immigration (salaries) 981 (i).
Civil Govt.—High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 120 (i).
Justice—Man., &c. (Judges' travelling allowances) 122 ; N.S. (Dodd, Judge, salary) 124; Yukon (law books) 136 ; (living allowances) 127 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 978 ; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 948, 951 (i) ; (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 945 (i).
Militia (Dom. arsenal) 445 (i) ; (Dom. arsenal) 7012 (iv) ; (medical officers) 417 ; (rifle, &c., grants) 444 (i) ; (Royal Military college) 7002 (iv).
Post Office (inspectors' salaries) 144 ; (provisional allowances) 170 ; (Ry. mail clerks) 139 (i).
Public Works—N.B. (Campbellton) 1048 ; (St. John quarantine) 1052 ; (Woodstock armoury) 1057 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 1021 ; (Inverness) 1042 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough armoury) 1578 ; (Sandwich) 1580 ; (Stratford armoury) 1581 ; (Toronto warehouse) 1586 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Post Office reconstruction) 1574 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Miscou harbour) 7498; (Mud Cove) 7500; (Quaco harbour) 7501 ; (St. John harbour) 7503 ; (St. John tributaries) 7502 ; (Salmon River) 7499 ; (tidal waters) 7503 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Bay St. Lawrence) 7397 ; (Beckerton) 7397 ; (Breton Cove) 7397 ; (Clark's harbour) 7398 ; (Country harbour) 7399 ; (Culloden) 7401 ; (Digby Pier) 7402 ; (Inverness Mines) 7405 ; (Mahone bay) 7408 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Yamaska River) 7394 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (general vote) 7455 (iv).
Sussex Rifle Range, Inspector (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7011 (iv).
Woodstock Armoury, N.B., Clerk of Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1058 (i).

Gallery, Mr. D., *Montreal, St. Anne.*
Montreal Inland Revenue Building, Addition and Site, *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1121 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal Inland Revenue) 1121 ; (Montreal P. O. improvements) 1129 ; (Montreal P. O., pneumatic system) 1135 (i).

Galliher, Mr. W. A., *Kootenay.*
Anthracite Coal Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 136) (M.) to present Pet., 4550 ; Pet. (presented) 4644 ; 1°*, 4807 (iii) ; in Com., 5976 (iv).

Galliher, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8034 ; on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Scott) C. P. R. lands, 8795 (v).
——— (C.P.R. lands) in Com., 6066 (iv).
——— (Senate representation) 5682 (iii).
Autonomy B. 69 'Yellow Dog,' Ref to in Newspapers (remarks) in Com., 5896 (iii).
Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) on Amt. (Mr. Scott) to M. for 3°, 8873 (v).
Budget, on The, 8971 (v).
Canada Life Assurance Co., Ref. to in Com. on B. 108, 4694 (iii).
Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 11) 1°*, 317 (i).
Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 190 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9763 (v).
G.T.P. Ry. Plans *re* Terminals, Deposited with Govt., on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 2827 (ii).
Imperial Guarantee and Accident Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2771 (ii).
Inland Revenue (guarantee bonds) B. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8680 (v).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9740, 9796 (v).
Kaslo and Lardeau-Duncan Ry. Co.s (B. 141) Pet. (presented) 3744 (ii); 1°*, 4550 (iii).
Killam, Judge, Appnmt. as Chairman of Ry. Commission, on M. for Com. on Ry. B. No. 36, 506 (i).
Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 137) 1°*, 4550 (ii).
Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 24) 1°*, 493 (i).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 493; in Com., 1706 (i).
Northwest Coal and Coke Ry. Co.'s (B. 140) 1°*, 4550 (iii).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2054 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s (B. 12) 1° m. 316 ; in Com., 1283, 1888 (i), 2532, 2714, 2951, 2958. 3177; 3° m., 3393 (ii).
Pacific Bank of Canada (B. 175) 1° m., 7420; 2° m., 7625 (iv).
Private Bills Petitions (M.) to extend time, 4375 (iii).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Railway Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com., 506 (i).
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at Elections, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7346 (iv).
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Prefontaine) in Com., 7438 (iv).
Spirits imported in Bond (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8680 (v).

Galliher, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*
SUPPLY :
Justice—Yukon (law books) 137 (i).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 4683 (iii).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. D. Ross) 2° m., 4700 (iii); in Com., 8316, 8641 ; on M. for 3°, 8828, 9045 (v).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 135) 1°*, 4550 (iii).
Western Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4689 (iii).
White Lead, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9763 (v).
Yukon, Reform *re*, Condition of Country (remarks) on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 7069 (iv).

Ganong, Mr. G. W., *Charlotte, N.B.*
Atlantic Fisheries Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 270 (i).
——— Inquiry for, 1242 (i).
Carbide Manufacture, Willson Patent, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1055 (i).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr Fisher) in Com. on Res., 1002 (i).
Cold Storage Plants for Bait, &c. (Ques.) 1505 (i).
Fisheries Industry, Commission of Investigation, Recommendation, &c. (M.) to adjn., 6312 (iv).
Fishing Bounties Fraud *re* Payment, Rep. of Mr. Matheson (M. for copy*) 1770 (i).
Grand Manan, N.B., Payments to Life-saving Crew (Ques.) 4921 (iii).
House of Commons, Rooms for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 251 (i).
James Bay Lobsters, Investigation by Govt. (Ques.) 6475 (iv).
Labour Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) in Com. on Res., 274 (i).
Lepreaux Point Light, &c., Caretaker, Investigation *re* Dismisals, &c. (Ques.) 6475 (iv.)
Life-saving Crew, Grand Manan, N.B., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 4921 (iii).
Lobster Canneries, Licenses, Applications, &c., N.B., District No. 1 (Ques.) 584, 910 (i).
Lobster Fishing, Open Season in 1903-4-5 (Ques.) 1504 (i).
Lobsters, Legal Length in Bay of Fundy, Changes made, &c. (Ques.) 583 (i).
New Brunswick Southern Ry., Negotiations *re* Purchase, &c (Ques.) 584 (i).
Ryan, Heber W., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4458 (iii).
Submarine Signal Apparatus (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 892 (i).
SUPPLY :
House of Commons (rooms) 251 (i).

Ganong, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY —*Con.*
Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Can. and Mexico) 896; (Magdalen Islands) 907 (i).
Public Works—Buildings, N.B. (Campbellton) 1048; N.S. (Antigonish) 855, 1015; (Inverness) 1040; (Shelburne) 1044 (i).

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 13) 1° m., 317 (i).
Money transmitted by Mail, Par. in 'Le Soleil' &c. *re* Legislation (Ques.) 4807 (iii).
Riviere du Loup Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7323 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Fraserville harbour) 7323 (iv).

Geoffrion, Mr. V., *Chambly and Verchères.*
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. (B. 59) 1° m., 986 ; in Com., 1399 (i), 2106, 3205 (ii).
Fessenden Wireless Tel. Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 144) in Com., 6380, 6607 (iv).
Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s (B. 96) 1°*, 2005 (ii).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s (B. 47) 1°*, 728 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 149) M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 9072 ; in Com., 9340, 9586 ; on Sen. Amts., 9815 (v).

German, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4944 (iii).
Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s (B. 31) 1°*, 493 (i).
Canada Southern Bridge Co.'s (B. 29) 1°*, 493; in Com., 1286 (i).
Canada Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 30) 1°*, 493 (i).
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1291 (i).
Ry. Act, 1903 (highway crossing) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 302 (i).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Grenville (guide pieds) 1501 ; (Port Colborne elevator) 1269, 1291; (summit level) 1263; (stone protection) 1497 (i).
Transportation Problem *re* Waterways (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1269 (i).
Welland Canal Water Power Leases, Names, Quantity, &c. (M. for ret.) 2097 (ii).
Western Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4696 (iii).

Gervais, Mr. H., *Montreal, St. James.*
Canada Temperance Act Amt. (B. 128) 1° m., 3359 (ii).
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9412 ; Res. of Boards of Trade and Cor., &c. (read) 9413 (v).

Gervais, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Crown Casualty Co. (B. 125) Pet. presented, 2322 ; 1° m., 2593 (ii).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. (presented) 493 (i).
——— (M.) to conc. 683 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. (presented) 4457 (iii).
——— (M.) to conc., 4550 (iii).
——— 3rd Rep. of Com. (presented) 4549 (iii).
——— (M.) to conc. 4551 (iii).
——— 4th Rep. (presented) 4983 (iii).
——— (M.) to conc., 5034 (iii).
——— 5th Rep. (presented) 7096 (iv).
——— 6th Rep. (presented) 9392 (v).
——— 7th Rep. (presented) 9773 (v).
——— on M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com., 9804 (v).
Fish Transportation from Boston to Montreal, via G.T.R., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1930 (i).
G.T.P. Ry. Commission, Surveys, &c., Number of Employees (M. for ret.*) 1770 (i).
——— (Ques.) 686 (i).
I.C.R. Passes for Quebec Councillors (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1922, 1925 (i).
Montreal P. O., Pneumatic System Installation, in Com. of Sup., 1131 (i).
Montreal, Quebec and Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 73) 1°*, 1592 (i).
Postal Facilities, Montreal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1131 (i).
Private Bills, Extension of Time for Pets. (M.) 2203 (ii).
Provident Savings Association incorp. (B. 134) 1°*, 4370 (iii).
St. Lawrence Ship Canal and Lake Champlain Co.'s (B. 43) 1°*, 625 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (pneumatic tube system, Montreal) 1131 (i).
Worthington, Col. and Independence of Parlt. Act, *re* Cor. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9164 (v).

Girard, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*
SUPPLY :
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 949 (i).

Gladu, Mr. J. E. O., *Yamaska.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) in Com., sec. 2 (B. N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) dual language, 8621 (v).

Gordon, Mr. D. A., *East Kent.*
Monarch Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 164) 1°, 6232 (iv).
Railway Commision Rep., Non-production of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6238 (iv).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Com., 4987 (iii).

Grant, Mr. G. D., *North Ontario.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4703 (iii).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 179 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 8654 (v).

Georgian Bay and Seaboard Ry. Co.'s (B. 35) 1°*, 493 (i).

Georgian Bay Islands, Sale, &c., Ques. of Privilege, 6736 (iv).

International Bridge and Terminal Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 87) on Sen. Amts., 9695 (v).

James Bay Ry., Deviation of Line, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 9697 (v).

——— Maps *re* Location, &c. (Ques.) 2190 (ii).

Murphy, Edward Albert, Relief (B. 126) 1°*, 3091 (ii).

Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3135 (ii).

Private Bills Pets. Extension of Time (M.) *re* Report, 318, 448 (i), 2491 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Rama wharf) 9602 (v).

Underwood Typewriter Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 145) 1°*, 4644 (iii).

——— (B. 146) 1°*, 4644 (iii).

Greenway, Mr. T., *Lisgar.*

Agriculture and Colonization Com., 4th Rep. (M.) to conc., 6310 (iv).

——— 2nd Rep. (M.) to conc., 4081 (iii).

Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 9396 (v).

Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6738 (iv).

Gunn, Mr. B. B., *South Huron.*

Adulteration of Food, Prosecutions under Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1726 (i).

Autonomy B. 69, Attack *re* 'Orangeism' (remarks) in Com., 5910 (iii).

Fruit Marks Act, Convictions *re* (Ques.) 3010 (ii).

Goderich Mail Contract, Tender *re* (Ques.) 2493 (ii).

Seaforth Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 858 (i).

Tobacco Industry, Inspection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1687 (i).

Guthrie, Mr. H., *South Wellington.*

Autonomy and Provincial Rights, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjn., 1752 (i).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5153 (iii).

Autonomy Bill, on Resignation of Hon. C. Sifton (remarks) 1863 (i).

Criminal Code (1902) Amt. (B. 67) 1°*, 1421 (i).

Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9436 (v).

Dominion Elections Act (1900) Amt. (B. 9) 1° m., 263 (i).

Guthrie, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Guelph and Georgian Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 100) 1°*, 2108 (ii).

Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Ry. Co.'s (B. 112) 1°*, 2184 (ii).

Niagara-Welland Power Co.'s (B. 40) 1°*, 625 (i).

Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) in Com., 1770 (i).

Haggart, Hon. J. G., *South Lanark.*

Alien Labour Law, Amts. *re* (remarks) 6232 (iv).

Animals slaughtered under Diseases Act (remarks) on conc., 6912 (iv).

Anthracite Coal and Ry. Co.'s Pet., on M. (Mr. Galliher) to present, 4550 (iii).

Auditor General and Audit Act, on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 9657 (v).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5481 (iii).

——— in Com. (B.N.A. Act) 5728 (iii).

——— (C.P.R. lands) in Com., 6055 (iv).

——— (distribution of seats) 7735 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8019; on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7852 (iv).

——— (Hudson Bay Co. rights) 5947 (iii).

——— (joint stock companies) 6084 (iv).

——— (lands vested in Crown) 5946 (iii).

——— (law, courts, &c.) 5814, 5935 (iii).

——— (school clause amt.) 7125 (iv).

——— Official Report of Division (remarks) 5432 (iii).

——— Printing and Distribution (remarks) 1754 (i).

Bank Notes, Circulation and Printing *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6251 (iv).

Bisonnette vs. Crown, Illegal Stamping of Letters in Montreal P.O. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 196 (i).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 179 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 8654 (v).

Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4236 (iii).

Canada Atlantic Ry. Purchase, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 2685 (ii).

——— Purchase by G.T.R. (remarks) 69 (i).

See 'I.C.R.' &c., 'Transportation.'

Canada Eastern Ry. Co., Purchase, &c., on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Ret., 734 (i).

——— Litigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1523 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 58 (Mr. Lamont) on Senate Amts., 9078 (v).

Canada Southern Bridge Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. German) in Com., 1287 (i).

Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 627, 659 (i).

Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4269 (iii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
Culbute Canal, Litigation *re* Flooding (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1522 (i).
Drummond Co. Ry., Expenditure *re* (remarks) 1942 (i).
Elevator at Port Colborne, in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1291 (i).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3205 (ii).
Freight Rates : *See* 'Ry. Rates.'
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale to Mr. F. W. Grant (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6488 (iv).
Gillies Brothers, Limited, B. 95 (Mr. A. A. Wright) in Com., 2765 (ii).
Government Contracts B. 51 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1672 (i).
Govt. Legislation (remarks) on M. to take in Wednesdays, &c., 821 (i).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3649 (ii), 4203 ; on M. for 3°, 4233 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7677; on M. for 3°, 7861 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry., Plans deposited with Dept. of Rys., on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 917 (i).
G.T.P. Surveys, Quebec and Moncton Route, Reps. *re* (remarks) 228 (i).
——— Surveys, Reps. in Ry. Dept., &c. (remarks) 2009 (ii).
Great Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 71 (Mr. J. T. Schell) in Com., 4258 (iii).
Half-Breed Scrip to Non-residents, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 6565 (iv).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6501 (iv).
——— Charges, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) 7672 (iv).
Highway Crossings : *See* 'Ry. B. 2.'
House of Commons P.O., Delay in Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 200 (i).
Immigration in B.C., Medical Inspection (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9334 (v).
I.C.R. and C.A. Ry. Act (running rights) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 4190 (iii); in Com., 6140 (iv).
I.C.R. and G.T.R. Arbitration, &c. (remarks) 68 (i).
——— on Annual Statement (Mr. Emmerson) 1906 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1950 (i).
——— Rates, Increases *re*, on Explanation Min. of Rys., 6120 (iv).
——— Reply to Annual Statement (Mr. Emmerson) 7447, 7457 (iv).
Judges taken from Bench for Appointments (remarks) 517 (i).
Killam, Judge, Appnmt. as Chairman of Ry. Commission (remarks) in Com. on B. 36, 517 (i).
Labour Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com. on Res., 274 (i).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
Lévis, Purchase of Land for I.C.R. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6670 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. W. J. Roche) for Copies, 1768 (i).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2140 (ii).
Nixon, Robt., on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to cancel Vote, in Com., of Sup., 9330 (v).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9469 (v).
N.W. Mounted Police B. 8 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 99 (i).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2056 (ii).
N.W.T. Boundary Fence, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5693 (iii).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5970 (iv).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 2542 (ii).
Poonamalie Dam, Pet. *re* Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9379 (v).
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1291 (i).
Postmasters acting as Partisan Officials (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6245 (iv).
Private Bills Pets., Extension of Time for Receiving (remarks) 318 (i).
Provl. Govt. N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Works Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. Hyman) on M. for 1°, 819 (i).
Quebec Bridge *re* G.T.P. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2295 (ii).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. B. 77 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 1243 (i).
Ry. Act (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 283; in Com., 1787 (i).
Railways and Canals Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1674 (i).
Railway Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1602 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1622 (i).
Railway Commission, Board of, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1533 (i).
——— Appnmt. of Chairman, on M. for Com. on Res. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 517 (i).
Ry. Debts. : *See* 'Exchequer.'
Railway Rates, Discriminating *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5016 (iii).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 76 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2325 (ii).
Resignations in 1896, Charges of P.M.G. (personal explanation) 839 (i).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

Rural Mail Delivery, Cost of Establishing &c. on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Ret., 2080 (ii).

Salmon, Capt., Resignation, &c., on M. (Mr. Ames) for Cor., 389 (i).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 351, 1798 (i).

Sifton, Hon. C., Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill (remarks) 1866 (i).

South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9340 ; on M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 9072 (v).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Carillon and Grenville (guide piers) 6305 (iv).

Canals—Chambly (culvert, St. Thérèse Island) 6302 (iv) ; (macadamizing roads) 9378 (v).

Canals—Cornwall (concreting apparatus) 6298 (iv).

Canals—Farran's Point (gas plant) 6308 (iv).

Canals—Lachine (electrical installation) 9354 ; (enlargement) 6294 ; (lock gates suspension) 6301; (Mill St. paving) 6301; (power house flumes) 6300 ; (repairs) 6307; (wall underpinning) 6299 (iv).

Canals—Miscellaneous (remuneration to lockmasters) 9384 (v).

Canals—Rapide Plat (enlargement, Upper entrance) 6289 (iv).

Canals—Rideau (extension) 1333 (i).

Canals—St. Lawrence (shoals) 6289 (iv).

Canals—St. Ours (landing wharf) 6302 (iv).

Canals—St. Peters (dredging) 6304 ; (repairs) 6308 (iv).

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 1335 (i).

Canals—Soulanges (construction) 6290 (iv).

Canals—Trent (Geo. Matthews Co. damages) 6303 (iv); (Holland River) 9359 (v); lowering floor of lock 6303 (iv); (McLaren's creek bridge) 9379 (v) ; (Peterborough dam) 6303 (iv); (staff on dams) 9383 (v); (surveys) 6291 (iv) ; (surveys of dams) 9377 (v).

Canals—Welland (elevator at Port Colborne) 1266, 1291 (i); (long level deepening) 6290; (lowering head of lock No. 1) 6309 (iv); (Port Colborne level) 1263 (i).

Charges of Management (Receiver General's Office) 6249 (iv).

Civil Government—Customs (salaries) 80 (i); Geological Survey (contingencies) 6248; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (clerical assistance) 6248 (iv); (salaries) 70 (i); Interior (mines branch) 6264 (iv); Labour Department (salaries, &c.) 100; Marine and Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 102 (i), 6266 (iv); Post Office (contingencies) 6240, 6245 (iv); Railways and Canals (private sec.) 9062 (v).

House of Commons (sessional messengers) 249 (i).

Immigration (medical inspection) 9239 (v).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (Treaty No. 9) 9336 (v).

Justice, Administration—N.W.T. (miscellaneous) 101 (i).

Legislation (House of Commons) 6268 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 884 (i).

Miscellaneous (Pacific cable grant) 7277 (iv).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works Buildings, Ottawa (museum) 757; (Royal Mint) 623 (i).

Quarantine—General (cattle) on conc., 6912 (iv).

Railways and Canals—Generally (litigation) 1522 (i).

Railways—G.T.P. (salaries, &c.) 2295; (surveys, construction, &c.) 2282 (ii); (surveys) 7496 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 9384, 9388 (v) ; (general vote) 7447, 7457 (iv); (Mitchell bridge) 7942 (i); (working expenses) 9384 (v).

Railways—P.E.I. (Hillsborough bridge) 2040 (ii); (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2140 (ii).

Railways—Ry. Commission, Board of (maintenance) 1533 (i).

Tay Canal, Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 1307 (i).

Thessalon Postmaster, Mr. J. B. Dobey, Irregularities, &c., on M. for Sup., 6210 (iv).

Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3668 (ii).

Tobacco Industry, Inspection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1687 (i).

Transportation Commission, Rep. *re* C.A.Ry. (remarks) in Com. on B. 45, 4225 (iii).

Transportation Problem *re* Waterways (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1267, 1291 (i).

Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 701, 1776 (i); on M. for 3°, 1779 (i).

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8639 (v).

White, Mr. Odbur, Dismissal, &c., on M. for Cor., 193 (i).

Wire Fencing Contract : *See* ' N.W.T.'

Wright Electoral District, Issue of Warrant, &c. (remarks) 98 (i).

Hall, Mr. R. R., *West Peterborough.*

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4409 4415 (iii).

Vibert, Philip Relief B. 172, 2° m., 7261 (iv).

Harty, Mr. Wm., *Kingston.*

Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.'s (B. 85) 1°*, 1788 (i).

Montreal, Ottawa, Kingston and Georgian Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 97) 1°*, 2005 (ii).

Henderson, Mr. D., *Halton.*

Agriculture Committee, 2nd Rep. on M. (Mr. Greenway) to conc., 4081 (iii).

Alexandra Bridge, Ottawa, Lighting, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7586 (iv).

Allans, SS. Owners, Contract *re* Cold Storage (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 865 (i).

Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 679, 742 (i), 2419; in Com., 2841 (ii).

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5440; (subsidy) 5572 (iii).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Autonomy B. 69, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4811 (iii).
——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5642 (iii).
——— (lands vested in Crown) 6041 (iv).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8511 (v).
——— (subsidy to provs.) 6088; letter from Hon. G. W. Ross to Min. of Fin. (read) 6092 (iv).
Autonomy Bill, Official Report of Division (remarks) 5433 (iii).
Autonomy B. (Saskatchewan) B. 70, in Com., sec. 12 (distribution of seats) 8750 (v); on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Scott) 8873 (v).
See 'Lt. Govs.,' 'N.W.T. B. 160.'
Bank Note Circulation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6251 (iv).
Bank Notes lost in Circulation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6261 (iv).
Battleford and Lake Lenore Ry. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Parmelee) on M. for 1°, 1671 (i).
Beaujeu Bank Pier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Binder Twine Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7222 (iv).
Binder Twine Industry at Kingston Penitentiary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 488 (i).
Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 179 (Mr. Turriff) on M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 8653 (v).
Bronte Lighthouse, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2868 (ii); 9176 (v).
Buffalo Specimen *re* Exhibition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6272 (iv).
Campaign Literature and Franking Privilege (remarks) 1814 (i).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 3°, 4412 (iii).
Canada Life Assurance Co., ref. to in Com. on B. 108, 4684 (iii).
Canadian Agency B. 77 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for Com., 9049 (v).
Canadian Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Com., 9004 (v).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1074 (i).
Census Enumerators, Appnmt. of (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 1074 (i).
Clinton P. O., in Com. of Sup., 852 (i).
Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8236 (v).
Colson, F., Emplymt. in Sec. of State's Office (Ques.) 8146 (v).
Cullers, Abolition of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7579 (iv).
Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 190 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. 9761 (v).
Desks in Chamber, Inconvenience of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1569 (i).
Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) in Com., 4971 (iii).
Farmers' Bank of Canada B. 124 (Mr. T. Martin) in Com., 4700 (iii).
Fertilizers, Inspection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1726 (i).
Fruit Marks Act (staple commodities) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5979 (iv).
Government Contract B. 51 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. 1673 (i).
Govt. Steamers, Purchase of Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2621 (ii).
Grain carried to Halifax via I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1919 (i).
Grain Inspectors, and Recommendation from Boards of Trade (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7234 (iv).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4216 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7621 (iv).
Hamilton and Kilbride Mail Contract, Cost of (Ques.) 9080 (v).
Hersey, A. H., Relief B. 167 (Mr. T. G. Johnston) in Com., 7624 (iv); 7682 (iv).
Highway Crossings: *See* 'Ry. B. 2.'
House of Commons Furniture, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).
——— Locked Drawers for Private Papers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).
Imperial Guarantee and Accident Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2771 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act (guarantee bonds) Amt. B. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8677 (v).
I.C.R., Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1959 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).
'Lady Laurier,' Number of Crew at Halifax (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2616 (ii).
Lead Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7223 (iv).
Lt. Governors of Alberta and Saskatchewan B. 193 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9033 (v).
Lowville to Milton Mail Service, Cost of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 9080 (v).
Metric System, Adoption of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1694 (i).
Mineral Specimens *re* Exhibitions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6272 (iv).
Murray Harbour Ry. and Hillsborough Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2169 (ii).
Northwest Territories B. 160 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8768 (v).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5698 (iii).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*
N.W.T., Boundary Line, Wire Fence Contract, on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5585 (iii).
Oats, Rolled, Tariff changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9764 (v).
Ontario Fire Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. Boyce) in Com., 2772 (ii).
Ottawa Buildings, Cost of Maintenance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1572 (i).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 4966 (iii).
Pacific Bank of Canada B. 175 (Mr. Galliber) on M. for 1°, 7420; on M. for 2°, 7625 (iv).
Patent Act Reliefs, (remarks) *re* Amts., 6559 (iv).
Penny Banks Charters, Stmnt. *re* Business (Ques.) 687 (i).
Petroleum Crude, Bounties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1295 (i).
Post Office Regulations *re* Distribution of Packages (remarks) 6962 (iv).
Printing Bureau, Outside Printing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6951 (iv).
Provident Savings Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 5975 (iv).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Buildings, Govt. Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 852 (i).
Ry. Act, 1903 (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 308 (i).
Railways and Canals Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1676 (i).
Ry. Commission B. 36 (chairman) on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1630 (i).
——— Ques. of Order, *re* Relevancy of Debate, 558 (i).
'Reptile Press', &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1576 (i).
Rolled Oats : *See* 'Oats.'
Sarnia Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 862 (i).
Saskatchewan, Prov. of. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Sec. of State's Dept., Number of Employees (Ques.) 8147 (v).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 339, 375, 1188; on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) to M. for 3°, 1880 (i).
Sorel Workshop, Purchase of Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2488 (ii).
Spirits in Bond (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8681 (v).
SUPPLY :
Adulteration of Food (violations of Act) 1701 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (bulletins) 6928 ; (exhibitions) 6272 ; (experimental farms) 6165 (iv).
Canals—Grenville (guide piers) 1501; Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1295; (stone protection) 1496; (surveys) 1235 (i).
Charges of Management (bank notes) 6251 (iv).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*
SUPPLY —*Con.*
Culling Timber (salaries) 7236 (iv).
Dom. Lands (surveys, maps, &c.) 6406 (iv).
Excise (inspectors' salaries) 1682 (i).
House of Commons (sessional clerks) 6603 (iv).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6392 ; (agents, G. B. &c.) 7700; (printing contingencies) 7712 (iv).
Indians—B.C. (industrial schools) 6556; (travelling expenses) 6557 (iv).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (live stock) 6544 ; (provisions, &c.) 6550 (iv).
Indians—Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6518 (iv).
Indians—P.E.I. (medical attendance) 6538 (iv).
Inspection of Staples (grain inspectors) 7226 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7523 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 2868 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subvention (Can. and Mexico) 898; (Can. and S. Africa) 974; (G.B. and Can.) 865; St. John and W. Indies) 7199 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Acadamy of Arts) 7238 (iv). Bank of Commerce, Yukon, compensation) 9615 (v); (consolidation of statutes) 7244; (Dom. and Provincial accounts) 6959, 7242; (Pacific Cable grants) 7240; (Paris agency) 6958 (iv); (Printing Bureau machinery) 9615; (tariff commission) 9614 (v); (tuberculosis grant) 7248 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Arctic expedition) 6468 (iv) ; (govt. service) 2616 (ii).
Penitentiaries (parole system) 469 (i).
Post Office (mail service) 9609 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 852 ; Ont. (Toronto P. O. pneumatic system) 1591; Ottawa (archives) 605 ; (H. of C. improvements) 1565 (i) ; (new deptl. buildings, site, &c.) 9606 (v) ; (Printing Bureau) 1576 (i).
Public Works—Dredging—Man. (snag boat) 7577 ; Ont. and Que. (new plant) 7577 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Salmon river) 7575 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (general) 7237 ; (Margaree) 7412 ; (Scott's bay) 7416 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bronte) 7548 ; (Owen Sound) 7562 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Chateau Richer) 7292 ; (Lake St. Peter piers) 6454 ; (St. Anicet and Ste. Barbe waterways) 7384 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (architects, &c.) 7618; (cement testing) 7614 (iv); (temporary clerks) 9605 (v).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges—N.W.T. (colonization roads) 7595 ; Que. (Bryson) 7586 (iv).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 7579 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Ont. (Pelee Islands) 7609 (iv) ; Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 9605 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (general vote) 7452 (iv) ; (traffic arrangements) 1919 (i).
Trade and Commerce (iron and steel bounties) 7216 (iv).
Weights and Measures (metric system) 1694 (i).
Thermograph Records *re* Atlantic Steamers (M. for copies) 1767 (i).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Tobacco Industry, Inspection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1682 (i).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) in Com., 704 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. D. Ross) on M. for 2°, 4702 (iii); in Com., 8316, 8637; on M. for 3°, 9040 (v).
Ventilation in H. of Commons (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).
Walsh, Major John, Superannuation and Appmnt. of Mr. Binks (Ques.) 8146 (v).
Western Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4684 (iii).
White Lead, Tariff *re*, in Com. on B. 190, 9761 (v).
Yukon Ter. Reforms, &c., on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 7025 (iv).

Herron, Mr. J., *Alberta.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5522 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4878 (iii).
——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5619 (iii).
——— (Crown Lands) 8265 (v).
——— (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8088 (v); on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7828, 7886, 7947, 7984 (iv).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8518 (v).
——— (seat of govt.) 8248 (v).
——— (subsidy to provs.) 6088 (iv).
——— on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7772 (iv).
Autonomy B. 69, in Com. on Schedules (Macleod) 8151; (Pincher Creek) 8153 (v).
Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Scott) 8869 (v).
Autonomy Bill, Mr. Haultain, Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2557 (ii).
Belly River Bridge Work (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7592 (iv).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Co., Passenger Rates, Ref. to Ry. Commission (remarks) 6836 (iv).
Experimental Farms, Establishment of in Alberta (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6171 (iv).
Fishing Rights in N. Western Lakes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2900 (ii).
Frank, Town of, Grant to Settlers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9603 (v).
Freight Rates on Cattle: *See* 'Holstein.'
Glanders among Horses, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6702 (iv).
Half-Breed Claims, Unsettled, Complaints *re* (remarks) 9813 (v).
Half-Breed Scrip to Non-Residents (remarks) on M. for Sup. 6504 (iv).

Herron, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Holstein Breeders Association, Office of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6686 (iv).
Immigration, Govt. Policy *re* Placing of Settlers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9329 (v).
Live Stock Record Associations incorp. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5925 (iii).
Macleod Land Office, Reopening of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9272 (v).
Macleod, Mounted Rifles, Trouble *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9169 (v).
Macleod, Mr. Nixon, acting as political Organizer during elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9267 (v).
Maladie du Coit, Disease among Horses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6702 (iv).
Man. and N.W.T. Govt. Officials, Resignation, &c., 1904 (Ques.) 1344 (i).
Middle Fork Falls, Location of, Conditions of Sale, &c. (Ques.) 9079 (v).
Militia Act (permanent force) Amt. B. 170 Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6987 (iv).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5583 (iii).
Provl. Govt. N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1188 (i).
Small-pox Epidemic, N.W. Ter. Prevention of, &c. remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1841 (i).
Stoney Indians, Depleting Game, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6548 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1705 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 6171 (iv); (experimental farms) 9608 (v); (live stock records) 3686 (iv).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6403 (iv); (agents, &c.) 9329 (v); (interpreters) 7702 (iv).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (live stock) 6541 (iv).
Militia (permanent force) 9169 (v).
Miscellaneous (Alaska surveys) 7720 (iv).
N.W.M. Police (Yukon) 8669 (v).
Post Office (mail service) 9612 (v).
Public Works—General (clerk of works) 1644 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.W.T. (Saskatchewan survey) 9603 (v).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges—N.W.T. (Belly River) 7592; (colonization roads) 7594 (iv).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (Gatineau River) 7631 (iv).
Quarantine—Public Health (organized districts) 1841 (i).
Yukon Govt. (additional allowance to Maj. Wood) 9251 (v).
Wire Fencing: *See* 'N.W.T.'

Hughes, Mr. J. J., *King's, P.E.I.*
Catholic Mutual Benefit Association (B. 93) 1°*, 2005; in Com., 2769 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. J. J.—*Con.*
Murray Harbour Branch, P.E.I. Ry., Cost of Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9486 (v).
North Lake P.O., Removal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9612 (v).
P.E.I. and Mainland Steam Communication, &c. (remarks) 1754 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Investigation *re* Soundings, &c., on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 2795 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Indemnity B. 201 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9791 (v).
Storm Signals in Lighthouses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9176 (v).
SUPPLY :
Lighthouse and Coast Service (storm signals) 9176 (v).
Militia (permanent force) 9163 (v).
Ocean and River Service (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 2655 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg postal station) 9549 (v).
Railways—P.E.I. (Cardigan branch) 2174 (ii); (Cardigan branch) 9484; (Georgetown accommodation) 9486 (v).
Winter Mail Service, P.E.I., Famine *re* Cattle Feed, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2655 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. S., *Victoria & Haliburton, O.*
Autonomy (Alberta) B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5511 (iii).
——— Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3766 (ii).
——— on M. for 3°, Amt. (schools) 8833, Neg. Y. 37 ; N. 106) 8834 (v).
——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5615 (iii).
——— (B.N.A. Act) 5732 (iii).
——— (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7817, 7953, 7971 (iv).
——— (election of members) 5769, 5810 (iii).
——— (H. of C. representation) 5752 (ii).
——— (Lt. Gov.'s powers) 5781 (iii).
——— (readjustment of representation) 5757 (iii).
——— (Senate representation) 5674 (iii).
——— in Com., on Schedules (Edmonton city) 8161; (Saskatchewan) 8161; (Stony Plain) 8157; (Sturgeon) 8162 ; (Vermilion) 8155 (v).
Autonomy B. 69, School Clause Amts. (M.) that Com. rise, 5833 (iii).
See 'Manitoba.'
Autonomy Bill, Preparation of Maps *re* Schedules (remarks) 5477 (iii).
Balsam Lake Waterways, Agreement *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1524 (i).
Bowman and Commee, Contract *re* Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 797 (i).
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers (remarks) on Orders of the Day, 3569 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*
Campaign Literature and Franking Privilege, &c. (remarks) 1811 (i).
C.A. Ry. and I.C.R. : *See* 'Ry. B. 132.'
Canada Eastern Ry. Purchase, &c., on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Ret., 735 (i).
Canadian Cattle, Embargo in G.B., on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Com., 9018 (v).
Canadian Fast Mail Service, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to adjn., 9781 (v).
Castonguay, Dismissal and Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 5688 (iii).
——— (remarks) 6653 (iv).
Cattle Embargo, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 902 (i).
See 'Can. Cattle.'
Director of Operations, *re* Militia Council (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 418 (i).
Dobey, Mr. : *See* 'Thessalon.'
Dredges employed at Port Arthur (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 790 (i).
Dredges, Working Expenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 803 (i).
Dress Regulations for Militia (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
Elevator at Port Colborne, in Com. of Sup., 1266 (i).
Franking Privilege, Use of Stamps, &c. (remarks) 5134 (iii).
Freight Rates, Statement *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 890 (i).
See 'Ry. Rates.'
Glanders among Horses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6694 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry. Terminals, Plans deposited with Govt. on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 2835 (ii)
——— Surveys, Rep. in Ry. Dept, &c. (remarks) 2017 (ii).
G.B. and Her Colonies, Inter-Imperial Parlt. (prop. res.) 2334, 2395 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Ingram) 2402 (ii).
Gregory, Col., Retirement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 418 (i).
Halifax and Esquimalt Military Defences. Govt. Control, &c., Par. in 'Journal' (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1402 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, N.S., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9572 (v).
Hay Lake Channel, Lowering of Water (remarks) 701 (i).
Highland Cadet Corps, Montreal, Efficiency, &c. (remarks) 7815 (iv).
Huron County Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 859 (i).
Immigrants : *See* 'North Atlantic.'
Indian Reserves, abandoned by Indians, Sales, (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6563 (iv).
Inter-Imperial Parlt., between G.B. and Her Colonies (prop. res.) 2334, 2395 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*
Japan, Trade Relations with Dom., on Stmt. (Mr. Fisher) 7910 (iv).
Judge Advocate General, Appnmt. of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6656 (iv).
——— Purchase of Site, on Statement (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 9708 (v).
——— Rep. *re* Evidence (remarks) 8698 (v).
Labour Union Labels : *See* 'Union.'
Letter Carriers, Brantford, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 217 (i).
Lindsay Drill Hall, Erection of (Ques.) 271 (i).
London, Bye-Election, Resignation of H. M. for S. York (remarks) 6384 (iv).
London Militiamen at Niagara (remarks) *re* London Election, 7249 (iv).
McGillicuddy, Mr. D., Letter to Sir William Mulock, Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 6601 (iv).
Man. Boundaries Extension, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) *re* 'Political Debts,' 3858 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) naming Member, 3858 (ii).
——— Mr. Speaker's Ruling (personal explanation, 3879 (ii).
Medical Officers and Independence of Parlt. Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 418 (i).
Medical Officers *re* Militia, Pay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 417 (i).
Military Camp at S. Simcoe, Establishment of (remarks) 9713 (v).
Militia Act (permanent force) Amt B. 170 (Sir Frederick Borden) on M. for 2°, 7267 (iv), 9189 (v).
Militia Camp : *See* 'Kentville.'
Militia Council, Appnmt. of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 416 (i).
——— Regulations, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 416 (i).
Militia Orders *re* Civil Servants (remarks) 1261 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9453 (v).
N.W.T. Grazing Leases, &c. (remarks) *re* Question, 5478 (iii).
Order in the House (remarks) 323 (i).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5744 (iii), 5966 (iv).
Ottawa Buildings leased by Govt., Payment of Taxes, &c. (Ques.) 379 (i).
Ottawa Drill Hall, Increased Accommodation, &c. (Ques.) 271 (i).
Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, &c. (M.) to adjn., 5785 (iii).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*
Port Arthur, Fort William and Kaministiquia Harbours, Amount of Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1398 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 2263 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 1065 (i).
——— Dredging Contract, Conmee & Bowman's Tender, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4655 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Rep., 4644, 4921 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4462 (iii).
Post Office, H. of C., Locked Boxes, &c. (remarks 8387 (v).
Post Office in N.W.T., Establishment of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 223 (i).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Questions answered by Ministers (remarks) 1067 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Com., 5006 (iii).
See 'Freight.'
Railways (Govt.) Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6155 (iv).
Red Deer, Battleford, Calgary Ry. Co.'s B. 19 (Mr. Logan) on M. for 1°, 318 (i).
Returning Officers, Instructions, &c., Ques. of Order, 7361 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for (remarks) 5209 (iii).
Riviere Ouelle Spur Line (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1982 (i).
Rooms for Members, Rearrangement, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 250 (i).
Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 169 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 7262 (iv).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 323; Leter from Mr. Hogg (read) 1793 (i).
Sessional Clerks, Employed to get Data for Speeches (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6601 (iv).
Sifton, Hon. C., Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill (remarks) 1861 (i).
Statements of Mr. E. D. Smith *re* Cold Storage (remarks) 874 (i).

SUPPLY :
Canals—Soulanges (gasoline boat) 1421 ; Trent (construction) 1420; (surveys) 1480; Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1266 (i).
Geological Survey (surveys, &c.) 8669 (v).
House of Commons (messengers) 248 (i) ; (sessional clerks) 6597, 6601 (iv).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6388 (iv).
Labour Dept.—(Labour Gazette) 7512 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Mexico) 900; (St. John, N.B., and Belfast) 902 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 441; (pay and allowance) 416 ; (surveys) 439 ; (target ranges) 445 (i).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
N.W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 8660; (Yukon force) 8662 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg military) 1636 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Woodstock armoury) 1050 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Lloydminster immigrant shed) 6734 (iv); (Prince Albert 1639; (Saskatoon) 1641 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 850; (Inverness) 1042; (Shelburne) 1044; (Sydney Mines) 1045 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (London drill hall) 6733 (iv); (Owen Sound) 9548 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (addition to H. of C.) 9543 (v); (archives) 606; (Royal Mint) 608 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Phinney's Cove) 9560 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Beaverton) 7546; (Blanche river) 7547; (Bracebridge) 7548 (iv); (Port Arthur) 785; (Port Colborne) 815 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Souris) 1047 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (harbour improvements) 782 (i); (Richelieu dredging) 7377 (iv); St. Mary's Current) 814 (i).
Quarantine (cattle) 6694 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (general vote) 7447 (iv); (Halifax terminals) 2035 (ii).
Thessalon Postmaster, Mr. J. B. Dobey, Irregularities, &c., on M. for Sup., 6221 (iv).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3656 (ii).
Transportation Problem *re* Waterways, in Com. of Sup., 1275 (i).
Trent Canal Surveys, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1471 (i).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 712 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) on M. for 3°, 8825 (v).
Ventilation, H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9546 (v).
White, Mr. Odbur, Dismissal from I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2210, 2235 (ii).
Wire Fencing, N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re*, Omission from 'Hansard,' of Question (remarks) 5582 (iii).

Hyman, Hon. C. S. (Minister of Public Works), *London.*
Acetylene Gas Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1052-3 (i).
Alexandria P.O., Contract *re*, &c., (Ans.) 1760 (i).
Amherst Pier, N.S., Contract *re* Construction (Ans.) 4371 (iv).
Armouries, Construction of Generally, in Com. of Sup., 1649 (i).
——— Erection of, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1547 (i).

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*
Bic Wharf, Land purchased from P. Ross (Ans.) 1850 (i).
Brantford Parade Ground (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1554 (i).
Brantford Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 861 (i).
Breakwaters, Wharfs, &c., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9553 (v).
Canada Southern Bridge Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. German) in Com., 1287 (i).
Carpets, Purchase by Govt. for Parliament Buildings, Value, &c. (Ans.) 8266 (v).
Cascumpec Sandhills Channel, P.E.I., Amount expended (Ans.) 2773 (ii).
Catholic Mutual Benefit Association B. 93 (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com., 2770 (ii).
Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 49 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 2767 (ii).
Chatham Armoury, Contract, Price, &c., *re* Erection (Ans.) 587 (i).
Civil Servants Guarantees, &c., *re* P.O. Dept. (Ans.) 1758 (i).
Clinton P.O. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 854 (i).
Cornwall Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1552 (i).
Dipper Harbour Breakwater, Construction *re* (Ans.) 912 (i).
Dominion Annuity Co.'s incorp. B. 82 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 2768 (ii).
Dredges employed at Port Arthur, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 790 (i).
Drill Hall, Fredericton, Contract *re* (Ans.) 729 (i).
Frank, Grant to Settlers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9603 (v).
Fredericton Military Buildings, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 728 (i).
Geological Survey Museum, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 759 (i).
Glace Bay, N.S., Purchase of Site for Building (Ans.) 9697 (v).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 3°, 4229 (iii).
Greece's Point Wharf, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2063 (ii).
Howard's Cove, P.E.I., Survey *re* Wharf (Ans.) 4703 (iii).
Hull Wharf, Total Cost (Ans.) 2064 (ii).
Huot, Mr. J., Payments to *re* L'Ange Gardien Beach (Ans.) 1343 (i).
Ice Jams on Thames River (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1014 (i).
Immigration Property, Leased by Govt. (Ans.) 914 (i).
I.C.R. Traffic Arrangements with Foreign and Can. Rys., Amounts received (Ans.) 4703 (iii).
Jacques Cartier Surveys, Costs, Reports, &c. (Ans.) 593 (i).

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*
'Kingsford,' Dredge, Cost of Operation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 801 (i).
Labour Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 712, 1778 (i).
Lambert's Pier, P.E.I., Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 4373 (iii).
Lennoxville Post Office, Construction (Ans.) 4373 (iii).
Library Accommodation in Archives Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 004 (i).
Magog Post Office, Erection of (Ans.) 5785 (iii).
Mail Distributing Stations, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ans.) 915 (i).
Mexico Steamers, Subsidies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1560 (i).
Miminegash River Dredging, Commencement of Work (Ans.) 3834 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 779 (i).
Montreal Inland Revenue Building Addition, Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1119 (i).
Moosejaw and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 20 (Mr. Scott) in Com., 2762 (ii).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1707 (i).
North Thompson River Improvements, B.C., Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 5784 (iii).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2052, 2325 (ii).
Ontario Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. Boyce) in Com., 2772 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2763 (ii).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5964 (iv).
Ottawa Buildings and Civic Taxation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1663 (i).
——— List of Buildings rented (read) 1664 (i).
——— Taxes paid, &c. (Ans.) 380 (i).
Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Surveys, on Inquiry for Copy of Instructions, 822 (i).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3180 (ii).
Parliament Buildings, Additions to H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5790 (iii).
Penetanguishene Dredging, Name of Owner of Boat (Ans.) 2063 (ii).
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Advertisement *re* Tender of Conmee and Bowman, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4458, 4651 (iii).
——— Tenders *re* (remarks) 5963 (iv).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 2263 (ii).
Port Arthur, Fort William and Kaministiquia Harbours, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1065 (i).
Port Burwell Work, Contractor, &c., Prices paid, &c. (Ans.) 589 (i).
Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*
Port Hood, N.S., Breakwater, Estimated Cost, Approval, &c. (Ans.) 5132 (iii).
Port Perry Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2190 (ii).
Port Stanley Harbour, Tender *re* (Ans.) 1760 (i).
P.E.I. Dredging, Number and Names of Harbours, &c. (Ans.) 1148 (i).
——— Mount Stewart Wharf Accommodation (Ans.) 1763 (i).
——— Winter Communication, Tunnel, &c., on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 2813 (ii).
Provident Savings Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 5974.
Public Buildings, U.S. System of Renting, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1025 (i).
Public Works Act Amt. (B. 54) 1° m. 819 (i).
Public Works, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 731 (i).
——— Delay in bringing down (remarks) 602 (i).
Quebec Drill Hall, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1145 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Transfer to Marine Dept., in Com. of Sup., 771 (i).
Questions answered by Ministers (remarks) 1068 (i).
Railway Commission, Rental of Rooms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1542 (i).
Returns *re* Public Works, on Inquiry for, 9688 (v).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 4751 (iii).
Rondeau Harbour Works, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1761 (i).
Royal Mint, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 606 (i).
Rustico Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1594 (i).
St. Angel Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1759 (i).
Ste. Famille Wharfage, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1150 (i).
St. Ignace Channel Dam, Plan, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 592 (i).
St. John Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 776 (i).
St. John Quarantine Station, Acetylene Gas Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1052 (i).
St. Joseph Pier, Lake Huron, Delay in Completion (Ans.) 2774 (ii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Rep. *re* Investigation into defective Boilers in Dredges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2472 (ii).
St. Paul Land and Hydraulic Co.'s Lease, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 2777 (ii).
Seaforth P. O. Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 859 (i).
Sherbrooke Drill Shed, Immediate Erection of (Ans.) 5784 (iii).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1139 (i).

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*

Summerside Drill Shed (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1563 (i).

Summerside Harbour Breakwater, in Com. of Sup., 1739 (i).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries) 94 (i).
Public Works — Buildings, B.C. (Fernie) 1641; (Vancouver) 1642; (New Westminster, Indian Branch) 1641 (i); Dom. (heating) 1670; (rentals) 1663 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—General (armouries) 1649; (clerk of works) 1642 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 1633; (Dom. renewals) 1634 (i); (St. Boniface) 9549 (v) ; (Selkirk) 1634 ; (Virden drill hall) 1634 (i); (Winnipeg customs) 9549 (v); (Winnipeg immigration) 1635 (i), 9550 (v) ; (Winnipeg militia stores) 1635 (i); (Winnipeg postal station 9549 (v); (Winnipeg P.O.) 1636 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Campbellton) 1048; (St. John drill hall) 1049; (St. John immigration shed) 1050; (St. John quarantine) 1052 ; (Woodstock armoury) 1057.
Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Calgary P.O.) 1638; (court house) 1638; (Edmonton jail) 1638; (Edmonton) 9550 (v); (Medicine Hat) 1638; (Moosejaw) 1638; (Prince Albert) 1638; (Red Deer court house) 1639; (Regina P. O.) 1639; (Saskatoon) 1640; (Strathcona Horse barracks) 1637 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 846, 1018; (Canso) 1023; (Glace Bay) 1034; (Halifax, Dom. buildings) 1036; (Halifax, immigrant building) 1037; (Inverness) 1041; (Shelburne) 1043; (Sydney Mines) 1045; (Sydney P.O.) 1044 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Belleville armoury) 1547; (Bowmanville) 1549 ; (Brantford drill hall) 1550; (Bridgeburg) 1550; (Chatham armoury) 1551; (Cobourg armoury) 1554; (Guelph armoury) 1555; (Hamilton drill hall) 1559; (Hawkesbury) 1560; (Kingston barracks) 1560; (Kingston stables) 1561; (London barracks) 1562; (London military stores) 1562; (London P.O.) 1563; (military college) 1561; (military college drill hall) 1561 (i) ; (Neepawa) 9549 (v) ; (North Bay) 1563 (i) ; (Orillia) 9549 (v) ; (Oshawa) 1564 (i); (Owen Sound) 9547 (v); (Peterborough armoury) 1578; (St. Catharines drill hall) 1578; (St. Mary's public building) 1578; (Sandwich) 1579; (Simcoe) 1581; (Stratford armoury) 1581; (Toronto barracks) 1589; (Toronto customs) 1581; (Toronto drill hall) 1582; (Toronto postal station) 1591; (Toronto P.O.) 1590; (Toronto warehouse) 1583 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (addition and alteration) 9542 (v) ; (archives) 603 (i) ; (astronomical observatory) 9542 (v) ; (coal sheds) 1565 (i); (eastern block) 9547; (elevators) 9551 (v); (elevator attendants) 1667; (heating, &c.) 1667; (H. of C. improvements) 1565 (i); (improvements) 9549 (v); (lighting) 1667; (museum) 754 (i); (new deptl. buildings, site, &c.) 9605 ; (rentals, &c. statement (read) 9605; (post office fittings) 9551 (v); (reconstruction) 1573; (Printing Bureau) 1575 ; (repairs, &c.) 1663 (i) ; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 9550 (v) ;

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY —*Con.*

Public Works—*Con.*
Royal Mint) 606 ; (steel shelving) 1564 (telephone) 1669; (Wellington St. paving) 1571; (western block, addition) 765 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Souris) 1047 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Actonvale) 1101; (Chicoutimi) 1106; (Dom., renewals) 1108 ; (Grosse Isle) 1108 ; (Lachute) 1111 ; (Levis) 1112; (Longueuil) 1113; (Magog) 1114; (Montmagny) 1117; (Montreal barracks) 1118; (Montreal Inland Rev.) 1119; (Montreal military buildings) 1125; (Montreal P.O. improvements) 1127; (Montreal warehouse) 1119 (i) ; (Quebec hospital) 9547 (v) ; (Quebec Immigration pier) 1138; (St. John's) 1143; (Sherbrooke drill hall) 1139; (Valleyfield) 1144 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (maintenance, &c.) 1666 (i).
Public Works—Dredging (new plant) 9604 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Campbellton wharf) 1744 (i); (Dipper harbour) 9588 (v); (St. John harbour) 9588; (tidal water wharfs) 9590 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.W.T. (Saskatchewan surveys) 9603 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 9576 (v); (Apple River wharf) 1728 (i); (Baddeck wharf) 9585; (Barrington wharf) 9581; (Battery Point) 9552; (Bourgeois inlet) 9581; (Devil's Island) 9551; (Economy wharf) 9579; (Frude's Point) 9581; (Glace Bay) 9577; (Half Island Cove) 9584; (Irish Cove) 9578; (Kelly's Cove) 9582 ; (Marble Mountain) 9580 ; (Parker's Cove) 9552; (Parrsboro harbour) 9579; (Parrsboro pier) 9578 ; (Petite Rivière) 9580; (Phinney's Cove) 9553; (Pierreville pier) 9581; (Porter's Lake) 9583; (Pugwash wharf) 9578; (Ray's Creek) 9576; (River Hebert) 9578; (Round Hill wharf) 9552; (Sydney Quarantine station) 9578 ; (Tatamagouche) 9579; (Toney river) 9581 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Barrie pier) 9595; (Crowe's landing) 9600; (Echo Bay) 9598; (Honora wharf) 9597; (Manitoulin wharf) 9597; (Meaford harbour) 9599; (Midland harbour) 9601; (Owen Sound) 9600 (v); (Port Arthur) 784; (Port Colborne 815 (i) ; (Rama wharf) 9602 ; (Rosseau wharf) 9600; (Saugeen) 9602; (Severn River) 9602; (Stokes Bay) 9598; (Trenton dredging) 9600 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (creosoted timber) 1737; (Higgin's pier) 1734 ; (McPherson's Cove) 1735; (Miminegash breakwater) 1735(i); (Mount Stewart) 9585 (v); (New London) 1735; (Point Prim Island) 1736; (repairs) 1737; (Richmond Bay) 1738; (Rustico) 1738; (St. Peter's Bay) 1739; (Summerside breakwater) 1739; (Wood Island) 1743 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse I'Ilot) 9591; (Beauce wharf) 9591; (Disraeli wharf) 9593; (Douglastown) 9592; (English river) 9591; (Grande Riviere de Beaupré) 9592; (Grondine wharf) 9592 (v); (harbour improvements, Que.) 770 (i) ; (Hospital wharf, Grosse Isle) 9608; (Lake Megantic) 9591; (Laprairie ice piers) 9590; (Lotbiniere wharf) 9592 (v); (Louise embankment) 7700; (Newport breakwater)

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works.—*Con.*
9592; (Oshawa harbour) 9660; (Percé wharf) 9592; (Petite Riviere) 9591; (Riviere aux Renards) 9592; (St. Alphonse wharf) 9591; (St. Genevieve piers) 9592; (St. Jean des Chaillons) 9592 (v); (St. Lawrence channel) 2472 (ii); (St. Mary's current) 814 (i); (Sorel deep water wharf) 9593 (v).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (temporary clerks) 9605 (v); (C.P.R. account) 9604; N.W.T. (QuAppelle-Edmonton) 9604; (Descente des Femmes) 9604; (Grosse Isle system) 9604; Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 9605 (v).
Public Works — Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay survey) 9547 (v).
Thames River Survey, Lake St. Clair Region, Completion and Cost (Ans.) 591 (i).
Toronto Drill Hall, in Com. of Sup., 1582 (i).
Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Zimmerman) in Com. (amt.) 4259 (iii).
Toronto Harbour Works, Tenders *re* Breakwater at Eastern Gap (Ans.) 1761 (i).
Toronto Pneumatic Postal Service, Contract *re* (remarks) 5921 (iii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).
Transportation Commission, Reps. *re* (remarks) 9687 (v).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. D. Ross) on M. for 2°, 4701 (iii).
Ventilation in H. of Commons, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).
——— Mr. Manny's Offer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9544 (v).
Wharfs, Construction, on Inquiry for Ret., 8181 (v).
——— Govt. Policy *re* Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1728 (i).
Wharfs, Piers, Docks, &c., Constructed by Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2777 (ii).
Whitby Wharf Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2190 (ii).
Wire Fencing Contract, on Inquiry for Copy (remarks) 5962 (iii).

Ingram, Mr. A. B., *East Elgin.*
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 677, 742 (i).
Assiniboia and Moose Mountain Indian Agency, Rep. of Inspector (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9337 (v).
Auditor General's Resignation and Amts. to Audit Act, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6523 (iv).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5461 (iii).
——— in Com. (Alberta Boundaries) 5650 (iii).
——— (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8061 (v); on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7781, 7820, 7939, 7982 (iv).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (election of members) 5779 (iii).
——— (lands vested in Crown) 5996 (iv).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8494 (v).
——— (Senate representation) 5682 (iii).
——— in Com., on Schedules (Athabaska) 8163; (Edmonton city) 8160; (Lethbridge) 8150; (Macleod) 8152; (Ponoka) 8156; (Sturgeon) 8162 (v).
Autonomy Bill, Census *re* Rural and Town Populations (remarks) 8094 (v).
——— Edmonton Election Contest (remarks) in Com., 5888 (iii).
——— date of election (remarks) in Com., 5890 (iii).
——— Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2587 (ii).
——— Official Report of Division (remarks) 5429 (iii).
——— School Clause Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5852 (iii).
——— School Clauses, Explanation *re* Amts. (remarks) 5819 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) *re* Mr. Belcourt's Charges, 3521 (ii).
See 'Edmonton,' 'Man.'
Bills from the Senate, on M. (Mr. A. Johnston) to place on Order Paper, 8096 (v).
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers, on Orders of the Day (remarks) 3583 (ii).
Cadet Corps, Ammunition supplied, &c (remarks) 7815 (iv).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4236 (iii).
See 'I.C.R.'
'Canada'-'Cape Breton,' Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2638 (ii).
Canada Eastern Ry., Total Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1922 (i).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 668; in Com. on Res., 1008; in Com., 1070 (i).
Census Enumerators, Appnmt. of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1076 (i).
Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 874 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com.of Sup., 8204 (v).
Commercial Agencies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7211 (iv).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 4551 (iii).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) in Com., 4976 (iii).
'Druid,' Expenditure *re* Maintenance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2703 (ii).
Drummond County Ry., Expenditure *re* (remarks) 1941 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Edmonton Election, Voters Lists, Refusal to Conservatives (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5852 (iii).
——— List of Voters, Names (read) 5855 (iii).
Exports and Imports, Monthly Rep. (remarks) in Com. of Cup., 7215 (iv).
Fishing Rights in N. Western Lakes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2900 (ii).
Gas and Electric Light Inspection, Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1692 (i).
Government Contracts B. 51 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1673 (i).
Govt. Steamers, Coal Supply (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2608 (ii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3885 (ii), 4130, 4202 (iii).
——— on M. for 3°, 4228 (iii).
——— Summary Statements of C. A. Ry., 4231 (iii).
——— Statement *re* Mileage, 4223 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7622 (iv).
G. B. and Her Colonies, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes), Ques. of Order, 2402 (ii).
Immigrant SS. Contracts: *See* 'North Atlantic.'
Index to Hansard (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1570 (i).
I.C.R. and C. A. Ry. Act (running rights) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 4196 (iii); in Com., 6141 (iv).
I.C.R., on Annual Statement (Mr. Emmerson) 1903 (i).
——— Dining Cars, Losses *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2255 (ii).
——— Private Cars, Number, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2259 (ii).
——— Sidings and Spur Lines, in Com. of Sup., 1974 (i).
——— Supplies, Purchase of Oil (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2248 (ii).
——— Traffic Arrangements and Freight Diversions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2219 (ii).
——— Traffic Arrangements and Freight Rates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2234 (ii).
Jamieson, Dr., Payment to *re* Berens Agency (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6552 (iv).
Labour Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com. on Res., 279; in Com., 710 (i).
Lead Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7222 (iv).
Live Stock Record Associations incorp. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 5083 (iii).
London Malitiamen and London Election (remarks) 7253 (iv).
Mail Bags, Locks, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 209 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*con.*
Manitoba Boundaries, 'Race and Religious Cry', Ref. to by Mr. Paterson (remarks) 4028 (ii).
——— M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 4073 (ii).
Metric System, Adoption *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1694 (i).
Mexico Steamers, Subsidies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1560 (i).
Midland Range Lights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2738 (ii).
Military Equipment for Defences, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 447 (i).
Montreal Bridge and Terminal Co.'s B. 138 (Mr. Piché) on M. for 2°, 4703 (iii).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2133 (ii).
Nixon, Mr., Dom. Lands Agents, Charges Against, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8109 (v).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, Termination of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9441 (v).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Erection of Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5714 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5589 (iii).
Oils, Inspection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7618 (iv).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 4969 (iii).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7281 (iv).
Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5792 (iii).
'Patent Record', Supply to Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1827 (i).
Père Marquette Ry. Co., Emplymt. of Aliens, Rep. *re* (remarks) 6232 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 7916 (iv).
Petroleum, Bounties *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7221 (iv).
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contracts, Tender of Conmee & Bowman, &c., on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4467 (iii).
P.E.I. Winter Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2678 (ii).
Public Works Rep., Date of Issue (remarks) 755 (i).
Ry. Act (crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 3244 (ii).
Railway Commission B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Ques. of Order, 1623 (i).
Railway Commissioners' Board, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1528 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Car (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1538 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Railway Commission Rep., Non-Production of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6235 (iv).
'Reptile Press,' &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1577 (i).
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at Election, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7339 (iv).
Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 103 (Mr. Tobin) on M. for 2°, 2297 (ii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Wrecking Plant, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2476 (ii).
Saskatchewan, Prov. of: *See* 'Autonomy.'
'Scout,' Str., Claims *re* Injuries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6463 (iv).
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 7425 (iv).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) to M. for 3°, 1880 (i).
Separate Schools, Issue of Circulars, &c. (remarks) 2410 (ii).
Statements of Mr. E. D. Smith *re* Cold Storage (remarks) 874 (i).
SUPPLY:
Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1703, 1723 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (aids to societies) 1829; (archives) 1826; (Can. exhibit, Imperial Institute) 1836 (i); (experimental farms) 6172 (iv); (statistics) 1827 (i).
Canals—Miscellaneous (surveys) 1521 (i); Trent (Holland River) 9360 (v).
Chinese Immigration (salaries) 983 (i).
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 6267 (iv).
Excise (inspectors' salaries) 1687; (methylated spirits) 1692 (i).
Fisheries (protection service) 2909 (ii).
House of Commons (sessional clerks) 6601 (iv).
Immigration (medical inspection, B.C.) 9230 (v).
Indians—B.C. (industrial schools) 6557 (iv).
Indians—General (Dr. Bryce, salary) 6558; (printing) 6558 (iv).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (implements) 9337 (v); (provisions, &c.) 6550; (seed grain) 6539 (iv).
Indians—Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6534 (iv).
Indians—N.W.T. (inspectors) 6548 (iv).
Indians—P.E.I. (medical attendance) 6537 (iv).
Inspection of Staples (grain inspectors) 7226 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7511 (iv).
Legislation (House of Commons) 6269 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoys) 2704; (salaries) 2703 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Mexico) 900 (i), 9622 (v); (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 935; (Halifax and Newfoundland) 906; (Manchester Line) 933; (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 945; (Port Mulgrave and Canso) 935; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 929; (P.E.I. and Newfoundland) 943; (Quebec and Gaspé) 926 (i); (St. John and W. Indies) 7200 (iv); (wrecking plant) 959 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Miscellaneous (consolidation of statutes) 7246; (Dom. and Provincial accounts) 7241; (Mining Institute grant) 7248; (Pacific cable grant) 7240 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Aberdeen boilers) 6465; (Arctic expedition) 6471 (iv); (govt. steamers) 2608; (life saving awards) 2624; (life saving stations) 2635 (ii); (Mr. Low's honorarium) 6743 (iv); (schools of navigation) 2642 (ii); (steamers, maintenance) 6464 (iv); (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 2662 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (heating) 1670; (repairs, &c.) 1665 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—General (clerk of works) 1642 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dom. renewals) 1634; (Virden drill hall) 1634; (Winnipeg, immigration) 1635; (Winnipeg, military stores) 1635; (Winnipeg P.O.) 1637 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Woodstock armoury) 1061 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Saskatoon) 1641 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 851, 860; (Sydney Mines) 1045 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Bridgeburg) 1550; (Guelph armoury) 1555; (Hamilton drill hall) 1559; (London military stores) 1562; (St. Mary's) 1578 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (coal sheds) 1565; (heating, &c.) 1667; (improvements) 1569; (lighting) 1668; (Museum) 756 (i); (new deptl. buildings, site, &c.) 9607 (v); (post office reconstruction) 1574; (repairs, &c.) 1663; (telephones) 1669; (Wellington St., paving) 1571 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Magog) 1116 (i).
Public Works—Dredging—Man. (snag boat) 7577 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (repairs, &c.) 7575 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Dauphin) 7571; (Lake St. Francis) 7572; (Selkirk) 7573.
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Campbellton wharf) 1744 (i); (Miscou harbour) 7499 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.W.T. (repairs, &c.) 7573 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Apple River wharf) 1730 (i); (Cow Bay, Port Morien) 7399; (Culloden) 7401; (Cunningham Point) 7402; (Devil's Island) 7402; (Digby pier) 7402; (Janvrin's Island) 7406; (L'Ardoise) 7407; (Lunenburg) 7408; (Main-à-Dieu) 7409; (Margaree) 7409; (Port Hood) 7414; (Scott's bay) 7415 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Amherstburg) 7546; (Bayfield pier) 7546; (Belle River) 7546; (Cobourg) 7549; (Collingwood) 7549; (Depot Harbour) 7552; (Goderich) 7553; (Grand Bend) 7554; (Lake Temiscaming) 7559; (Little Current) 7560; (Matchedash bay) 7560; (Oliphant harbour) 7561; (Owen Sound) 7562; (Point Edward) 7562; (Port Burwell) 7563; (Sarnia) 7564 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (creosoted timber) 1737; (Point Prim Island) 1737; (Rustico) 1738; (St. Peter's Bay) 1739 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Canton Fabre) 7289; (Chateau Richer)

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works.—*Con.*
7294; (Lake St. Peter piers) 6461 (iv); (St. Lawrence channel) 2476 (ii); (St. Simeon) 7393 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (architects) 7618, 7620; (cement testing) 7613; (clerical assistance) 7620 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges—N.W.T. (colonization roads) 7594, 7598 (iv).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (Gatineau River) 7631; (St. Maurice) 7582; (Upper Ottawa Co.) 7629 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Dom. generally) 7636 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—N.W.T. (Qu'Appelle and Edmonton) 7633 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 7636 (iv).
Post Office (mail bags, &c.) 209 (i).
Quarantine, &c. (public health, organized districts) 1845 (i).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, construction, &c.) 2289 (ii); (surveys, plans, &c.) 9495; (terminals, &c.) 9499 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (additional sidings and spurs) 1974; (bridge strengthening) 1921 (i); (Cape Road crossing) 6432; (general vote) 7455 (iv); (gratuities) 2183 (ii); (locomotive machinery) 6428 (iv); (Mitchell bridge) 1940 (i); (revenue collections) 2219 (ii); (rolling stock) 1987 (i), 9519 (v); (St. Moise station) 1976; (steel rails, &c.) 1990; (Sydney Mines extension) 1988 (i); ties, &c.) 6430 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (Cardigan branch) 2175; (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2133 (ii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance) 1528 (i).
Steamboat Inspection (salaries) 2696 (ii).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Immigration Act) 7208; (commercial agencies) 7211; (iron and steel bounties) 7216 (iv).
Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 1697; (inspectors, &c.) 1692; (electric light inspection) 1696; (metric system) 1698 (i).
Thompson, Capt. Thos., Preventive Officer at Port Bruce, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1763 (i).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 710 (i).
See 'Labour.'
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. D. Ross) on M. for 2°, 4701 (iii).
Water Meters Inspection B. 188 (Mr. Broder) in Com., 9410 (v).
White, Mr. O., Dismissal from I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2211 (ii).
Wire Fencing: *See* 'N.W.T.'
Wrecking Plant, 'Lord Strathcona' in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
Wrecking Plants, Bonus to Capt. Leslie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2476 (ii).

Jackson, Mr. S. J., *Selkirk.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) in Com., sec. 16 (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8398 (v).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 9400 (v).

Jackson, Mr. S. J.—*Con.*
Grasshopper Scourge, Man., Relief to Farmers (Ques.) 909 (i).
Manitoba Voters Lists, Control of by Dominion Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6783 (iv).
Ninety-Fifth Battalion, Reduction, &c. (Ques.) 909 (i).

Jackson, Mr. Wm., *West Elgin.*
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 2439 (ii).
Poultry Experiments on Farms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6184 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 6171 (iv).
Senate (contingencies) 6621 (iv).

Johnston, Mr. A., *South Cape Breton.*
Autonomy B. 69, Attack on 'Orangeism' (remarks) *re* in Com., 5877 (iii).
——— (election of members) in Com., 5776 (iii).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8461 (v).
——— (remarks) in Com., 5825 (iii).
Bills from the Senate (M). to place on Order Paper, 8096 (v).
Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Conspiracy, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. on Res., 553 (i).
Estimates, Obstruction of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9273 (v).
Facer Steel Car Co.'s B. 27 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 1285 (i).
G. B. and Her Colonies, Inter-Imperial Parlt., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2398 (ii).
Hersey Relief B. 167 (Mr. T. G. Johnston) in Com., 7682 (iv).
I.C.R., Transportation Facilities *re* Fish Trade (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1931 (i).
McKenzie, Mr. D. D., Resignation, &c., Ques. of Order, 8475 (v).
Marine Officers at Halifax, Complaints *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2755 (ii).
Nixon, Mr., Dom. Lands Agent, Charges against, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8139 (v).
'Orangemen,' Attack *re* Quotations from Quebec Papers *re* (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 8350 (v).
Printing Bureau, Outside Printing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iv).
Ry. Commissioners, (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com. on Res., 553 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Com., 4999 (iii).
Rifle Range in Cape Breton (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9169 (v).

Johnston, Mr. A.—*Con.*

S. Africa and Canada SS. Service, Dates of Sailing, Values, &c., of Exports carried, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1397 (i).

SUPPLY :

Fisheries (dog-fish experiments) 9174 (v).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7520 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (keepers' salaries) 2698; (lightships) 2753 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Halifax and Canso) 938; (Manchester Line) 933; (P.E.I. and Nfld.) 940; (P.E.I. and Newfoundland) 7093; (St. John and W. Indies) 7197 (iv).
Militia (association rifle grants) 9169 (v).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 2598 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Cow Bay, Port Morien) 7399 (iv).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 7581 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 9512 (v); (steel rails) 2001 (i).

Telephone Grievances, on M. (Mr. Maclean), Discussion out of Order, 9535 (v).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s (B. 79) 1°*, 1671 (i).

Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) in Com., 1773 (i).

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) on M. for 3°, 8828; Ques. of Order, 8829 (v).

Wrecking Plants in St. Lawrence Channel (remarks) *re* Discussion, 2480 (ii).

Johnston, Mr. T. G., *West Lambton.*

Harper, Geo. Dance, Relief (B. 154) 1°*, 5919 (iii); in Com., and 3°, 6377 (iv).

Hersey, Arthur Howe, Relief (B. 167) 1°*, 6232; in Com., 7624, 7682 (iv).

International Terminal and Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 87) 1°*, 1933 (i); in Com., 3135 (ii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1357 (i).

Kemp, Mr. A. E., *East Toronto.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4922 (iii).

C.A.R. and I.C.R. : *See* 'Ry. B. 132.'

Canada Life Assurance Co., Ref. to in Com. on B. 108, 4692 (iii).

Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 640 (i).

Criminal Code (trading stams) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9425 (v).

Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 190 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9764 (v).

Dumping Clauses, Amts. to (remarks) in Com. on B. 190, 9767 (v).

——— Customs Instructions *re*, &c. (M. for copies) 695 (i).

Fog Horns : *See* 'Toronto Island'.

Hay, Free Transportation over I.C.R., &c. (Ques.) 59 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1929 (i).

Kemp, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Advertising Car, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2257 (ii).

——— Coal, Free Transportation, Quantity in 1902-1903, &c. (Ques.) 2065 (ii).

——— Coal carried to Ottawa free in 1902-1903 (Ques.) 2192 (ii).

——— Freight Rates, Increases, &c., on Explanation of Min. of Rys., 6124 (iv).

——— on Annual Statement (Mr. Emmerson) 1897 (i).

——— Passes Issued, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2257 (ii).

——— Purchases by Tender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2181 (ii).

——— Supplies, Purchase of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2251 (ii).

——— Traffic Arrangements with other Rys. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1915 (i).

Japan Trade Relations with Can., on Stmnt. (Mr. Fisher) 7911 (iv).

Loans by Govt., Temporary or Permanent, Total Amount, Rate of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 4921 (iii).

Oats, Rolled, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9764 (v).

Passenger and Freight Rates, Advancement of, Information *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1542 (i).

Pneumatic System in Toronto P.O., in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).

P.E.I. and I.C.R., Claims for Damages, Amounts paid (Ques..) 383 (i).

Printing Bureau, Printing of Reps., &c., in Com. of Sup., 1575 (i).

Railway Commission, Freight and Passenger Rates, Advancement *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1542 (i).

Railway Act (running rights) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6141, 6150 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Can. exhibits, Imperial Institute) 1836 (i).
Canals—Miscellaneous (repairs, &c.) 1547 (i); Trent (Holland River) 9360; (Surveys) 9354 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (London, barracks) 1562; (London, military stores) 1562; (Toronto, barracks) 1590; (Toronto, customs) 1581 ; (Toronto, drill hall) 1582; (Toronto, postal station) 1592 (i); (Toronto, P.O.) 1590; (Toronto, warehouse) 1587 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (H. of C. improvements) 1565; (paving Wellington street) 1571; (post office reconstruction) 1573; (Printing Bureau) 1575; (steel shelvin) 1564 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Lachute) 1112; (Sherbrooke drill hall) 1141 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 1913 (i), 9386 (v); (double track) 1933 (i), 9390 (v); (revenue collections) 2204 (ii).
Railways—Miscellaneous (school of transportation) 9382 (v).

Kemp, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY —*Con.*
Railways—P.E.I. (air brakes) 2178; (Cardigan branch) 2171; (Summerside improvements) 2177 (ii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance) 1524, 1542 (i).
Toronto Drill Hall, in Com. of Sup., 1582 (i).
Toronto Island Fog Horn, Testing, &c., Complaints *re*, Cor., &c. (read) 9281 (v).
Trading Stamps : *See* 'Criminal.'
Water Meters Inspection B. 188 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 9410 (v).
Western Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4692 (iii).
Yonge Street Bridge, Toronto, Order *re* Construction, Tel. *re*, &c. (Ques.) 586 (i).

Kennedy, Mr. J. B., *New Westminster.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5256 (iii).
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers (remarks) on Orders of the Day, 3583 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3200 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 7581 (iv).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8643 (v).

Lake, Mr. R. S., *Qu'Appelle.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3532 (ii); in Com. on Res., 5483 (iii).
——— (Alberta boundaries) in Com., 5661 (iii).
——— (C.P.R. lands) in Com., 6072 (iv).
——— (Crown Lands) 6036 (iv). 8257 (amt.) 8259 (v).
——— (date of Act) 8634 (v).
——— (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8026; on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7772, 7825, 7848, 7888, 7940 (iv).
——— (election of members) in Com., 5772 (iii).
——— (readjustment of representation) 5755 (iii).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8494 (v).
——— (seat of govt.) 8256 (v).
——— (Senate representation) 5676 (iii).
——— (subsidy to provs.) 6089 (iv).
——— on M. for 3°, Amt. (distribution of seats) 8862 (v).
Autonomy (Saskatchewan) B. 70, in Com., sec. 12 (distribution of seats) 8704 (v).
——— in Com., Schedules (Grenfell) 8757 (v).
——— (Crown lands) 8761 (v).
——— on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Scott) 8871 (v).

Lake, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*
Autonomy Bill, Census Statistics *re* Population (remarks) in Com. on B., 8093 (v).
——— Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2521 (ii).
——— (personal explanation) *re* Draft Bill, 1902, 4348 (iii).
——— School Clause Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5842 (iii).
See 'N.W.T., B. 156.' 'Priv., Ques. of.'
Bredt, P. M., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 189. 265 (i).
C.P.R. Tax Exemption, Interpretation *re* (Ques.) 730 (i).
Cement, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8995 (v).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 671 (i).
Dom. Lands, Open to Applicants, &c., Ref. to by Prime Minister (Ques.) 1935 (i).
Doukhobor Homestead Entries *re* Village Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
Electoral Lists for N.W.T., Names of Qualified Electors (Ques.) 7684 (iv).
Entennier, Mr. Henry, Entries for Homestead Lands, &c. (Ques.) 190 (i).
See 'Homestead.'
Fisher, Mr. P. G., Retirement, &c. (Ques.) 264 (i).
Fishing Rights in N. Western Lakes, Lease to F. H. Markey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2901 (ii).
Glanders arong Horses, Compensation *re* Slaughter (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6697 (iv).
Govt. Officials in N.W.T., acting as Political Partisans (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9267 (v).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 9494 (v).
Hamelin and Gosselin, Sentence and Imprisonment, &c. (Ques.) 1849 (i).
Homestead Entries, Bogus Entries by Land Companies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9270 (v).
——— Henry Entennier's Location (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9268 (v).
See 'Entennier.'
Homestead Inspectors, Policy *re* Politicians (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iv).
Homestead Inspectors acting as political organizers (remarks) in Com of Sup., 9261; Prime Minister's speech (quoted) 9263 (v).
Homesteads for Residents, N.W.T., Second Applications, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2067 (ii).
Indian Agents acting as Magistrates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6545 (iv).
Indian Reserves, Sale of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6552 (iv).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9740 (v).

Lake, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*
N.W.T. Govt. Officials, Interference in Election Campaigns (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9713 (v).
Northwest Territories Representation Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Agents, 8772 (v).
Pollock, Mr. J. R., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 190 (i).
Porter, S., Dom. Lands Agent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9252 (v).
——— Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 190 (i).
Privilege (Ques. of) *re* Separate Schools, Par. in 'Globe,' 3649 (ii).
School Lands, Sold by Auction, in N.W. Ters., Number of Acres (Ques) 730 (i).
Schukin, Ivan, Cor. *re* Homestead Patent concelled (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6408; Cor., &c. (read) 6410 (iv).
Shaw, Mr. J. B., Retirement, &c. (Ques.) 264 (i).
——— Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2334 (ii).
Smart, Mr. Jas., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6419 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Arts—Agriculture, &c. (quinquennial census, N.W.T.) 9609 (v).
Dom. Lands (homestead inspectors) 6408 (iv), 9261; (land agents) 9252; (land sales) 9267 (v).
Govt. of N.W.T. (general vote) 9622 (v).
Immigration (agents G.B., &c.) 7698 (iv).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (annuities) 6538; (live stock) 6545; (surveys) 6552 (iv).
Inspection of Staples (grain inspection) 6901 (iv).
Quarantine (cattle) 6697 (iv).
Weights and Measures (inspection of staples) 9616, 9682 (v).
Wire Fence, Contract *re* N.W.T. Boundary Line, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5697 (iii).

Lalor, Mr. F. R., *Haldimand.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5055 (iii); (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8022; on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7941 (iv); (election of members) in Com., 5772 (iii); (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8510; on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8322 (v); (Senate representation) in Com., 5682 (iii).
Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) on M. for 3°, 8866 (v).
Autonomy Bills, Attack on Orangeism (remarks) in Com., 5902 (iii); School Clause Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5866 (iii).
Bank Notes lost in Circulation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6261 (iv).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 642 (i).
Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8210 (v),

Lalor, Mr. F. R.—*Con.*
Dredging, System of Hiring Dredges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6843 (iv).
Dunnville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1656 (i).
Fishing Rights, Lease to F. H. Markey, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2899 (ii).
Grenville Canal, Lumber for Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1515 (i).
I.C.R. Freight Rates, Increases, &c. on Explanation of Min. of Rys. 6134 (iv).
Jams, &c., Prosecutions *re* Adulteration, &c. (remarks) in Com of Sup., 1721 (i).
Kingston Lighthouse Depot, Establishment of (Ques.) 915 (i).
Lighthouse Depot at Prescott, Tenders *re* Contract (Ques.) 1340 (i).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6792 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Order with or without Tender (M. for ret.*) 1397 (i).
Marine, Deptl. Supplies, Inquiry for Ret., 2594 (ii).
Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5790 (iii).
Patent Medicines, Inspection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1726 (i).
Public Works Labourers, Emplymt. by Govt. *re* Political Influence (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6859 (iv).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 335, 1799 (i).
Sorel Workshops, Purchase of Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2488 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1703, 1727; (jams, &c.) 1721 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Can. exhibits at Imperial Institute) 1837 (i).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (live stock) 6541 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 2607; (winter mail service. P.E.I.) 2678 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—General (armouries) 1656 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (St. Peter's Bay) 1739 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Lake St. Peter piers) 6432; (Maskinonge River dredging) 6843; (Montmorency wharf) 6855 (iv).
Thessalon Postmaster, Mr. J. B. Dobey, Irregularities, &c., on M. for Sup., 6205 (iv).
Welland Canal, Emplymt. of Labour, Political Influence (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6855 (iv).
Wire Fencing, Contract *re* N.W.T. Boundary Line, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5698 (iii).

Lamont, Mr. J. H., *Saskatchewan.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4329 ; in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5563 (iii).

Lamont, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
Autonomy B. 69, in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8068; on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7893 (iv).
——— (election of members) in Com., 5768 (iii).
——— (lands vested in Crown) in Com., 6021 (iv).
——— (schools) Amt. 8491 (v).
Autonomy (Saskatchewan) B. 70, in Com. (Distribution of seats) 8712, 8743 (v).
Autonomy B. 69, School Clauses Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5825 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 58) 1°*, 986 (i); on Sen. Amts., 9078 (v).
Edmonton, Yukon & Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 62) 1°*, 1241 (i).
G.T.P. Ry., Location of Line from Winnipeg (remarks) 9814 (v).
Hudson's Bay Servants, Claims *re* Estate of Lord Selkirk, Cor. with Rev. Mr. Taylor (M. for copies*) 9698 (v).
Saskatchewan, Prov., Permanent Capital (remarks) 1596 (i).

Lancaster, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln & Niagara.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3424 (ii).
——— in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7946 (iv).
——— (Hudson Bay Co. rights) 5948 (iii).
——— (Lt. Gov.'s powers) 5781 (iii).
——— (readjustment of representation) in Com., 5764 (iii).
——— School Clause Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5827 (iii).
Dom. Lands, B.C., Sale to Mr. T. W. Patterson, &c. (Ques.) 4371 (iii).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3208 (ii).
Farmington and Wilmot Mail Contractor, Name, Guarantee, &. (Ques.) 2330 (ii).
Franking Privilege, Abuse of, *re* Circulars of Dental Institute (remarks) 1807 (i).
G.T.P Ry. Terminals, Plans deposited with Govt., on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 2824 (ii).
Green, Samuel H., Postmaster at Kaslo, B.C., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2331 (ii).
Invérness Postmaster, Personal Duties, &c. (Ques.) 8885 (v).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9741 (v).
Kaslo Postmaster, S. H. Green, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2331 (ii).
Kent, Miss A., Dismissal as Postmistress at Kent, N.S. (Ques.) 2331 (ii).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6669 (iv).
Killarney and Little Current, Contractor *re* Mail Service (Ques.) 3669 (ii).

Lancaster, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*
Labour Union Labels : *See* 'Union.'
Lake Ramsay and New Ross Postoffice Mail Service (Ques.) 9696 (v).
McDermot, Clara Bidwell Relief B. 152 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 6275, 6347; on M. for 3°, 6376 (iv).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. (B. 3) 1°*, 9; B. (withdrawn) 733 (i).
——— (B. 44) 1° m., 684; 2° m., 918, 1399 (i).
——— on M. for Adjnmt., 3249 (ii).
Patterson, T. W., Sale of Dom. Lands to, in New Westminster, B.C. (Ques.) 4371 (iii).
Postmasters acting as Ret. Officers, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6244 (iv).
Railway Act (1903) Amt. (B. 2) 1°*, 9; 2° m., 281; in Com., 312, 1780 (i), 3223 (ii).
Railway Commission Rep., Non-production of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6236 (iv).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to M. for 3°, 1885 (i).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Welland (lowering head of lock No. 1) 6309; (Vanderburg, Stephen, claims *re* injuries) 6306 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Post Office (contingencies) 6244 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Chatham armoury) 1553; (Cobourg armoury) 1555; (Military College stables) 1562; St. Catharines drill hall) 1578; Ottawa Post Office reconstruction) 1573 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Apple River wharf) 1732; Ont. (Port Colborne) 815 (i).
Thessalon Postmaster, Dismissal *re* Irregularities (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6226 (iv).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) in Com., 1776 (i).
Welland Canal Employees during Oct., Nov. (Ques.) 453 (i).

Lapointe, Mr. E., *Kamouraska.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) in Com., sec. 2 (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8565, 8615 (v).

Laurence, Mr. F. A., *Colchester.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4745, 4753 (iii).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) in Com., 4972; on M. for 3° (amt.) 5113 (iii).
Fishery Overseers in Colchester Co., N.S., Number and Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 5978 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, construction, &c.) 2288 (ii).

Laurier. Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G. (Prime Minister), *East Quebec.*
Address, on The, 36 (i).
——— (M.) to present to His Ex., 50 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Address, The, Reply to from His Ex. (presented) 1340 (i).
'Agnes Donahoe,' Schr., Seizure by Uruguayan Govt. (remarks) 6108, 6137 (iv).
Agriculture Committee, Meetings, &c. (remarks) 404 (i).
Alberta Bill: *See* 'Autonomy.'
Alberta Steamer Service, Number of Navigable Miles, &c. (Ans.) 6904 (iv).
Alien Labour Law, Amts. *re* (remarks) 6232 (iv).
See 'Telegraph,' &c.
Animals slaughtered under Contagious Act, Compensation (remarks) on conc., 6914 (iv).
Anthracite Coal and Ry. Co.'s Pet., on M. (Mr. Galliher) to present, 4550 (iii).
Arctic Expedition, Capt. Peary's Voyage (remarks) 4753 (iii).
Ashcroft and Cariboo Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ans.) 3670 (ii).
Ashcroft Water and Light Co., Lease of Land, &c. (Ans.) 2492 (ii).
Ash-Wednesday, Adjournment (M.) 2112 (ii).
Associated British Canadian Society and Labour Dept., Complaints *re* Graeme Hunter (Ans.) 2189 (ii).
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co., Payments to (remarks) 7021 (iv).
Atlantic SS. Service, Shipping Space and American Shippers (remarks) 5428 (iii).
Auditor General and Audit Act, on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 9627 (v).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (presented) 271 (i).
——— Part I (presented) 109 (i).
——— on Inquiry for, 51, 97, 1151 (i).
Aud. General's Resignation, Legislation *re* Audit Act (Ans.) 590 (i).
Autonomy (Alberta) B. (No. 69) in Com. on Res., 5434, 5479 (iii); 1° m., 1421 (i); 2° m., 2915 (ii); (M.) for Com., 5423 (iii).
——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5601 (iii).
——— (B.N.A. Act, s. 2) 5719 (iii), 8526 (v).
——— (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8564, 8571 (v).
——— (C.P.R. lands) 6051 (iv).
——— (date of Act) 8634 (v).
——— (distribution of seats) 7724 (v); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8010; on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7817, 7821, 7922 (iv).
——— (Hudson Bay Co. rights) 5954 (iii).
——— (legislative assembly) 5815 (iii).
——— (schedules *re* constituencies) 5815 (iii).
——— (school clause amt.) 7145 (iv), Amt. (m.) 8269; on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8495 (v).
——— (Senate representation) 5674 (iii).
——— (Subsidy clause) in Com. on Res., 5489 (iii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Autonomy (B. 69) 3° m., 8777 (v); on Amt. (Mr. Scott) C.P.R. Land Taxes to M. for 3°, 8792 (v); on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8852 (v).
——— in Com. on Schedules (Gleichen) 8153; (Macleod) 8152; (Pincher Creek) 8153 (v).
Autonomy (Saskatchewan) B. (No. 70) 2° m., 5424 (iii) 8698; in Com., 8702 (v).
——— (distribution of seats) 8705 (v).
——— (Moosejaw) 8758 (v); 3° m., 8866; on Amt. (Mr. Scott) to M. for 3°, 8874 (v).
Autonomy Bills, Alberta, Province of, Financial Clauses (prop. res.) 2913 (ii).
——— Approval by Cabinet (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2268 (ii).
——— on Constitutionality of, &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2196 (ii)..
——— Debate *re*, on Personal Explanation (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2045.
——— Delay in Printing (remarks) 1671 (i).
——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 6836 (iv).
——— Franchise System (remarks) 5477 (iii).
——— Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2502 (ii).
——— Information asked for in Rets., on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 3091 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for Papers, &c. (remarks) 2595 (ii).
——— Lt. Gov. Salaries) (prop. res.) 8693 (v).
——— Meridian Divisional Line between Alberta and Saskatchewan, Letter (read) 8634 (v).
——— Notice of Amendment, &c. (remarks) 2761 (ii).
——— Notice of Procedure (remarks) 3169 (ii).
——— Number of Votes polled, Census, &c., (List read) in Com. on Bill, 7733 (iv).
——— Official Report of Division (remarks) 5429 (iii).
——— Population *re* Saskatchewan Boundaries (remarks) 5920 (iii).
——— Printing, &c. (remarks) 1755, 1788 (i), 8762 (v).
——— Provincial Rights, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjn., 1751 (i).
——— Ry. Subsidies to Provs., &c. (remarks) 4202 (iii).
——— (remarks) 262 (i).
——— on Resignation of Hon. C. Sifton (remarks) 1866 (i).
——— Resolutions *re* (remarks) 1594 (i).
——— Saskatchewan, Province of, Financial Clauses (prop. res.) 2914 (ii).
——— Schedules *re* (remarks) 4375, 4750 (iii).
——— Schedules, Population and Votes cast (remarks) 5576 (iii).
——— Schedules *re* Saskatchewan (remarks) 5475 (iii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Autonomy (B. 69) Second Reading, &c. (remarks) 2022, 2112 (ii).
See 'Manitoba Boundaries.'
Badgley Island Timber Cutting, Licenses granted (Ans.) 452 (i).
Ballot Boxes, Payments to Mr. Cayouette (remarks) 989, 1337 (i).
Ballots, Blank, Method of Issuing, Complaints *re* S. Lanark and Ottawa (Ans.) 1342 (i).
——— Printing, &c., for Carleton, Glengarry, &c. (Ans.) 587 (i).
——— Procedure *re* Printing, &c. (Ans.) 911 (i).
Banking, Act Amt., Legislation (remarks) 2442 (ii).
Binder Twine Mounties paid, &c. Statement (read) in Com. of Sup., 7221 (iv).
Blair, Mr., Resignation, &c. and Re-hearing of N.W. Cases (remarks) 56 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ry. B. No .36, 511 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Tel., 697 (i).
Boissevain Postmaster, Mr. Alex. McKnight, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2328 (ii).
Borden, Mr. R. L., Congratulations to *re* Election (remarks) 624 (i).
Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Co.'s B. 179 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 8655 (v).
Bredt, Mr. Emplymt. by Govt., 190, 265 (i).
B.C. Immigration Legislation, Dissallowance of (Ans.) 6475 (iv).
Britton, Judge, Rep. *re* Investigation, on Inquiry for Ret., 1152 (i).
Brunet, Mr., G.T.P. Ry. Commissioner, Resignation of (remarks) 5036 (iii).
Business of the House, Ms. for Sup., &c. (remarks) 1241 (i)..
——— notices of motions (remarks) 9523 (v).
——— Cold Storage discussion (remarks) 8181 (v).
See 'Govt. Business.'
Cabinet Changes, Mr. Aylesworth's Position (remarks) 1336 (i).
Cabinet Vacancy (remarks) 4086 (iii).
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers (remarks) on Orders of the Day, 3562 (ii).
Cabinet Vacancy, Interior Dept., Information *re* (remarks) 3450 (ii).
——— Minister of Public Works, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjn. 5474 (iii).
——— Representation in N.W. Ters. (remarks) 3252 (ii).
See 'Autonomy,' 'Resignation,' 'Hudson,' 'Ministers,' 'Oliver,' 'Public Works.'
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4236 (iii).
Can. Atlantic Ry., Purchase of by G.T.R. (remarks) 69 (i).
See 'I.C.R.'

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
C.P.R. Land Taxation, Judgment of Sup. Court (remarks) 2023 (ii).
Canadian detained on U.S. Borders (remarks) 5921 (iii).
Canadian Shippers via Atlantic SS. Co.'s and Armour's Contracts (remarks) *re* B. 45, 4235 (iii).
Carbide purchased by Marine Dept., Quantity and Price (Ans.) 915 (i).
Castonguay, A. B., Cause and Report *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 6653 (iv).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 631 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) *re* Resolution, 631 (i).
Château Richer, Removal of Obstruction (remarks) 1154 (i).
Chesley Postmastership Vacancy, Appnmt., &c. (Ans.) 9081 (v).
Child Immigration to Can., Assistance by Govt. (Ans.) 1341 (i).
Child Immigration, Mrs. Close's Scheme (Ans.) 1936 (i).
Choquette, Judge, Date of Resignation and Appnmt. to Senate (Ans.) 1344 (i).
Civil Service Appnmts. since 1896 (Ans.) 585 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 5808 (iii), 6232 (iv).
Civil Service Examiners Rep. (presented) 5428 (iii).
Civil Service List (presented) 51 (i).
Clarke, Mr. E. F., Late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 2108 (ii).
Coal, Anthracite, Quantity used by Govt. (Ans.) 192 (i).
Colonial Conference and Tariff Discussions (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7099 (iv).
Colson, F., Appnmt. and Salary (Ans.) 8147 (v).
Commercial Agencies in G.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7208 (iv).
——— Letter *re* Mr. Jackson's Ability (read) in Com. of Sup., 7210 (iv).
Commercial Agents in Quebec, Collection of Taxes on (remarks) 9811 (v).
Committees, Sel. Standing (M.) 7 (i).
——— Lists (presented) 60 (i).
——— (conc.) 111 (i).
——— Addition of Names (M.) 110, 624 (i), 3090 (ii), 5210, 5576 (iii).
——— Changes of Names (M.) 227 (i).
Commodities, Packing and Sale (B. 152) 1°*, 5960 (iii).
Congdon, F. T., Appnmt. as Legal Adviser (Ans.) 7020 (iv).
Criminal Code (appeals) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) on M. for 3° (amt.) 9699 (v).
Consumption : *See* 'Tuberculosis.'

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9430; on M. for 3°, 9525 (v).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Passenger Rates, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6836 (iv).
Debates, Official, Sel. Com. (M.) 111 (i).
——— (M.) to add Name, 3090 (ii).
——— 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 5034 (iii).
——— on M. to conc. in 7th Rep., 9802 (v).
'De Lévis,' Str., Hydrographic Surveys, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 914 (i).
Demers, Mr. L. J., Decease of (remarks) 5139 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amts., Bills, Consideration during Recess (remarks) 9813 (v).
Dom. Lands, Open to Applicants, Ref. to in Speech (Ans.) 1935 (i).
——— Sale, &c., on Inquiry for Ret., 2006 (ii).
Dukus Indian Reserve, Sale of Timber, &c. (Ans.) 3202 (ii).
Easter Adjournment (M.) 4750 (iii).
——— (remarks) 4375, 4458 (iii).
Election, General, 10th Rep. (presented) 8001 (v).
Electoral Lists in N.W.T., Names of qualified Electors, &c. (Ans.) 7422, 7684 (iv).
'Emigration of State Children,' Cor. with Mr. C. Kinloch Cooke *re* (Ans.) 5478 (iii).
Entennier, Mr. Henry, Entries for Homestead Lands (Ans.) 190 (i).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Abandonment by Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 188 (i).
Estimates (1905-6)—(presented) 58 (i).
Estimates, Delay in bringing down and efficient Criticism, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) 9096 (v).
Exports and Imports, Returns, Issue of Monthly Rep. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7214 (iv).
Fencing Wire, Inspection by Govt. (Ans.) 585 (i).
See 'Wire.'
Fisheries Industry, Commission *re*, Recommendation, &c., on M. (Mr. Ganong) 6312, 6339 (iv).
Freight Rates : *See* 'Canadian Shippers.'
Georgian Bay Canal, Reps., &c. (Ans.) 192 (i).
Georgian Bay Islands, Jurisdiction Ontario and Dom. (remarks) 6487 (iv).
Georgian Bay, Lake Huron, &c., Fisheries, Requests *re* Investigation (Ans.) 5479 (iii).
Geographical Board of Canada, Rep. (presented) 625 (i).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays (M.) 3361 (ii).
——— Precedence on Wednesdays and Thursdays (M.) 820 (i).
See 'Business.'

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Graeme, Hunter, Complaints *re* Immigration Frauds (Ans.) 2189 (ii).
Grain Inspectors, List (read) in Com. of Sup., 7224 (iv).
Grain Survey Board, Pets. *re* Appnmts., on M. (Mr. Ames) for Cor. 1766 (i).
——— Recommendation of Montreal Board of Trade (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7232 (iv).
Grand Bend Pier, Delay in Building (Ans.) 1344 (i).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3649 (ii), 4205, 4226; on M. for 3° (remarks) 4228 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry., Plans deposited with Dept. of Rys, on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 918 (i).
——— Question answered by Govt. (remarks) 1596 (i).
——— Surveys, Information given out of Dept. of Rys., &c. (remarks) 2008 (ii).
——— Surveys, Reps. to Commission, &c. (remarks) 229 (i).
——— Survey of Route Moncton to Winnipeg Information *re* (remarks) 6135 (iv).
——— Terminals at Winnipeg, Cor., &c. (remarks) 9812 (v).
——— Terminus at Port Arthur, Ques. of Order, 6138 (iv).
Grass Seeds, Quantity exported (Ans.) 913 (i).
G. B. and Her Colonies, Inter-Imperial Parlt., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2392 (ii).
Half-Breed Claims unsettled, Complaints *re* (remarks) 9814 (v).
Half-Breed Scrip, Charges, *re* Mr. McDonald, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) 7675 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 7100 (iv).
——— Further Papers, on Inquiry for, 9029 (v).
——— Instructions to Judge Myers, *re* Charges (remarks) 8180 (v).
——— Instruction to Judge Myers, on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) 7723 (iv).
——— Investigation, Appmnt. of counsel (remarks) 8528, 8697 (v).
See 'Nixon.'
Half-Breed Scrip to Non-residents, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 6569 (iv).
——— Patents *re* (remarks) 6907, 7020 (iv).
——— Statements *re*, 8777 (v).
Halifax Fishery Awards, Payments to Provs., Ref. *re* (Ans.) 2065 (ii).
Hamilton and Kilbride Mail Contract, Cost of, &c. (Ans.) 9080 (v).
Herring Fishing Industry, Rep. of Commission, Printing, &c. (remarks) 4552 (iii).
High Court of Justice, Ont., Appnmt. *re* (remarks) 5209 (iii).
Highway Crossings : *See* 'Ry. B. 2.'

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Hudson's Bay, Sovereignty of Can. (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5609 (iii).
Immigrants deported, Nationalities, Number, &c. (Ans.) 1847 (i).
——— (remarks) *re* Question, 1592 (i).
Immigrants, Examination *re* Qualifications (Ans.) 2188 (ii).
——— False Representations to (remarks) *re* Bills, 8178 (v).
——— Number arriving in 1904 (Ans.) 1148 (i).
——— Office, G.B., Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 593 (i).
See 'North Atlantic.'
Indian Dept., Promotion of Mr. Bray (statement) 6920 (iv).
Indian Affairs, Report (presented) 111 (i).
I.C.R. and C.A. Ry. Act (running rights) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 4191 (iii).
I.C.R., Sydney Station, Collections for Freight, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Ret., 1768 (i).
Interior, Appnmt. of Minister (remarks) 4200 (iii).
——— Appnmt. of Dep. Minister (Ans.) 4371 (iii).
——— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 453 (i).
——— Minister of (remarks) 1152 (i).
——— Vacancy *re* Interior Dept. (remarks) 3362 (ii).
See 'Cabinet.'
Internal Economy Committee (M.) 8 (i).
——— Rep. *re* Proceedings (remarks) 9076 (v).
International Waterways Commission, Appnmt. of (remarks) 701 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7218 (iv).
James Bay Lobsters, Investigation by Govt. (Ans.) 6475 (iv).
'James W.,' Schooner, Rescue of Crew by SS. 'Durango' (remarks) 4199 (iii).
Johnson, T. G., Late, M.P., Decease of (remarks) 8694 (v).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9752 (v).
Killam, Judge, Appnmt. as Chairman of Ry. Commission, on M. for Com. on Ry. B. 36, 511 (i).
Killarney and Little Current Mail Service, Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 3670 (ii).
Kingston Lighthouse Depot, Establishment of (Ans.) 915 (i).
Labour, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 54 (i).
Labour Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com. on Res., 279; in Com., 703, 918; on M. for 3°, 1779 (i).
Leach, R. E. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1065, 1151 (i).
Lead Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7222 (iv).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Legal, M'gr., Quotation *re* Separate Schools, N.W.T. (Ans.) 6188 (iv).
Library and Printing Com. (M.) to add Name, 5686 (iii).
Life Boat Crews, N.S., Number, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 912 (i).
Lighthouse Depot at Kingston, Establishment of (Ans.) 914 (i).
Live Stock Record Association B. (remarks) 5808 (iii).
Live Stock Record Associations, Delay to Farmers (remarks) 5577 (iii).
Lloydmaster and Meridian Line between Provs. of Alberta and Saskatchewan (remarks) 8634 (v).
Lobster Canning Licenses in District No. 1, Govtl. Intention (Ans.) 910 (i).
Logberg Printing Co., Winnipeg, Payments to (Ans.) 4373, 4457 (iii).
London Militiamen and London Elections (remarks) 7256 (iv).
London and North Oxford Bye-Election, Issue of Writs (notification) 6311 (iv).
See 'Returning,' &c.
Lowville to Milton, Mail Service, Cost of Contract, &c. (Ans.) 9080 (v).
McCormack & Sharples, Messrs, Patent Relief, on M. (Mr. Calvert) to receive Pet. (objection) 6559 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries, Former Pets. *re* (remarks) 4084 (iii).
——— Mr. Jackson's Speech *re* Settlement (remarks) 4844 (iii).
——— O.C. of March 21st, 1905 (remarks) 3745 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. W. J. Roche) for Copies, 1768 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, M'gr. Sbarretti's Demands from Man. Govt. (stmnt.) 3834; Cor., &c. (read) 3841 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn., 3947 (ii).
Manitoba Election Returns (remarks) 1672 (i).
——— Duties of Returning Officers) 1507, 1633 (i), 4679 (iii).
Manitoba Farmers, Relief *re* Grasshopper Scourge (Ans.) 909 (i).
Man. and N.W.T. Govt. Officials, Resignations, &c., 1904 (Ans.) 1345 (i).
Manitoba School Fund, Amount paid, Amount claimed (Ans.) 379 (i).
Martin, Eli, Emplymt. in Customs Dept. (Ans.) 7097 (iv).
Militia, King's Regulations and Orders, Report (presented) 54 (i).
Mimimegash Breakwater, Contracts *re* Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 1350 (i).
Ministers of Finance and Interior, Absence, &c. (remarks) 323 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Montreal Harbour Sheds, Claims of P. Lyall & Sons (Ans:) 687 (i).
——— (remarks) *re* Ques., 697 (i).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness, Collections, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 403 (i).
Morning Sittings (M.) 9081 (v).
Nicolas, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) on conc., 9685 (v).
Nixon, Mr., Charges against, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8116 (v).
——— on Inquiry for Papers, 6048 (iv).
——— Investigation *re* (remarks) 8698, 9788 (v).
See 'Half-Breed.'
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, Protests *re* (remarks) 8887 (v).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9446 (v).
N.W. Mounted Police Pay (B. 8) prop. Res., 59; in Com. on Res., 98 (i); 1°*, 110; 2° m., and in Com., 459 (i).
N.W. Ters. B.: *See* 'Autonomy'.
N.W.T. Govt. Officials, Interference in Elections, Statement of Policy, on M. for Sup., 9721 (v).
N.W.T. Grazing Leases (remarks) *re* Question, 5478 (iii).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°*, pro forma, 5 (i).
Oliver, Hon. Frank, Appmnt. as Minister of Interior (notification) 4200 (iii).
Ontario Boundaries, Cor. with Dom. Govt., on Inquiry for (Mr. Barker) 3591 (ii).
——— Cor. with Ross Govt., on Inquiry for, 4078 (ii).
Ontario-Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2763 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com. (M.) to ref. to Special Com., 1888 (i); in Com., 3176 (ii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Number of Employees (Ans.) 382 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Expenditures *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7280 (iv).
Oxford, N., Issue of Writ, &c. (remarks) 6136 (iv).
——— Resignation of Mr. D. D. McKenzie (remarks) in Com. on Autonomy Bill, 8475 (v).
Pacific Cable Grants by Imp. Govt., Statement (read) in Com. of Sup., 7276 (iv).
Papal Ablegate: *See* 'Manitoba Boundaries'.
Parent, Hon. S. N., Appnmt. to Transcontinental Ry. Commission (remarks) 699 (i).
Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5799 (iii).
Patterson, T. W., Sale of Dom. Lands to in New Westminster, B.C. (Ans.) 4372 (iii).
Penny Banks, Charters, Stmnt. of Business, &c. (Ans.) 687 (i).
Petroleum Crude, Bounties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Pictou Cattle Disease, Investigation and Experiments *re* Cause (Ans.) 9079 (v).
Pollock, Mr. J. R., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 190 (i).
Port Arthur, &c., Dredging Contract, Ques. of Order *re* Irrelevancy of Debate, 4666, 4674 (iii).
Port Burwell Dredging Contract, Purchase of Dredge, &c. (Ans.) 8656 (v).
Porter, Mr. Sydney, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 190 (i).
Postmaster General's Dept. Rep. (presented) 54 (i).
Post Office Assessment System, Collections *re* (Ans.) 3671 (ii).
Post Office Regulations *re* Distribution of Packages, &c (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6635 (iv).
Preston, W. T. R., Immigration Agents, Salary, Reps., &c. (Ans.) 452 (i).
——— Visit to Canada (Ans.) 451 (i).
P.E.I. and G. B. Mail Subsidy, Statement (read) in Com. of Sup., 7088 (iv).
P.E.I. and Mainland, Mail Service, Delays, &c. (remarks) 280 (i).
P.E.I. and W. Indies SS. Subsidy, Amount paid, Representations *re* (Ans.) 591 (i).
Printing Bureau, Enlargement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6948 (iv).
Private Bills, Extension of Time, &c., on M. (Mr. Gervais) 2203 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Grant) 448 (i).
Prorogation, Probable Date (remarks) 9801 (v).
Provincial Autonomy: *See* 'Autonomy.'
Provincial Rights, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjn., 1749 (i).
Provincial Stock as Trust Investments in G.B., Cor., &c. (remarks) 9540. (v).
Provincial Subsidies, Readjustment of, on M. (Mr. Carvell) for Ret., 2103 (ii).
Public Works, Minister of, Rumour *re* Resignation (denial) 5035 (iii).
Public Works, Acting Min. of, Unconstitutionality of, &c. (remarks) 1938 (i).
Public Works, Delay in Rep. (remarks) 601 (i).
Public Works Portfolio (remarks) 6047 (iv).
Quebec Bridge *re* G.T.P. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2296 (ii).
Quebec Political Crisis (explanation) 825 (i).
——— Ques. of Order, 823 (i).
Ry. Act (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 282; in Com, 1787 (i).
Railway Commission, Appnmt. of Chairman, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) Ques. of Order, 320 (i).
Railway Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com., 511 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Railway Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 Ques. of Order, in Com., 1621 (i).
Ry. Commission, Appnmt. of Chairman (remarks) 54 (i).
——— Board of Maintenance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1534 (i).
——— Opinion of Min. of Jus. *re* (remarks) 6233 (iv).
——— on M. for Sup., 6233 (iv).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 2262 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 4751 (ii).
Royal Military Act Amt. B. 169 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6971 (iv).
Royal Mint, Ottawa; in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).
Ret. Officers, Deputy, Delay *re* Payments (remarks) 6560 (iv).
Returning Officers at Elections, Instructions *re* Form of Oath, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7333 (iv).
See 'London.'
St. Abdon Post Office, Establishment of, &c. (Ans.) 6653 (iv).
St. Francois Wharf, Expenditure *re* in Fall of 1904 (Ans.) 1344 (i).
Salvation Army and Immigration, Cor. *re* (Ans.) 7684. (iv).
Saskatchewan Boundaries, Addition to (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5622 (iii).
——— Conference *re* (remarks) 8268 (v).
Saskatchewan Prov., Permanent Capital (remarks) 1596 (i).
See 'Autonomy.'
Sbarretti, M'gr.: *See* 'Manitoba Boundaries.'
School Lands sold by Public Auction in N.W. Ters. (Ans.) 730 (i).
'Scout' Str., Explosion of Acetylene Gas, Investigation *re* (remarks) 4842 (iii).
Secretary of State, Deptl. Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 8147, 8656 (v).
——— Deptl. Report (presented) 5428 (iii).
Selkirk Ret. Officer, Occupation (Ans.) 1762 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Indemnity B. 202 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9729 (v).
Separate School Pamphlet, Preparation by Official Authority (Ans.) 2006, 2328 (ii).
Sessions, Earlier Meeting (remarks) in Discussion on Estimates, 9096 (v).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall, Purchase of Site, &c., (Ans.) 191 (i).
Sherbrooke Post Office, Improvements, &c. (Ans.) 192 (i).
Sifton, Hon. Clifford, Resignation (explanation) 1851 (i).
Silver Coins, Worn, &c., Redemption (Ans.) 688 (i).
Smart, Dep. Min. of Interior, Resignation (remarks) 115 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Smart, Resignation and Employment by Govt. (Ans.) 4371 (iii).
Speaker, Election (M.) 1 (i).
——— Dep. (M.) to appoint, 50 (i).
Speeches of Members, Delay in Printing Bureau (remarks) 7724 (iv).
Supply Bill 168, 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 6966 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c.—Experimental Farms (bulletins) 6931 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Finance (salaries) 118 (i); Geological Survey (contingencies) 6248 (iv); (salaries) 122; High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 120; Indian Affairs (salaries) 116; Interior (contingencies) 116; (salaries) 114; Militia (salaries) 112; Miscellaneous (noon gun, &c.) 121; N.W.M. Police (salaries) 78; Privy Council (salaries) 71 (i).
Culling Timber (salaries) 7236 (iv).
House of Commons—Library (salaries) 6944 (iv).
Indians Generally (agricultural grants) 237; (land management fund) 236; (legal expenses) 237; (St. Regis lockup) 237; Mar. Provs. (schools) 225; Ont. (blankets, clothing) 225; (medical attendance) 223; (surveys) 236; Que. (Oka band) 235; (schools) 225 (i).
Inspection of Staples (grain inspectors) 7224 (iv).
Legislation—General (printing, and binding, &c.) 6948; (laws, printing, &c.) 6948; (voters' lists) 6954; H. of Commons) 6269 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and New Zealand) 7094; (France and Can.) 7094; (Murray Bay and River Ouelle winter nav.) 7091; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 7088; (P.E.I. and Newfoundland) 7092; (St. John, Halifax and London) 7087; (St. John and W. Indies) 7087, 7176; (Victoria, Vancouver and Skagway) 7091; (wrecking plant) 7094 (iv).
Militia (permanent force) 9158 (v); (Royal Military college) 7004 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Academy of arts) 6959; (Can. Temperance Act) 6957; (Dom. and Provincial accounts) 6959; (N.W.M. Police) 6957 (v); (Naturalization Act) 6957; (Pacific cable grant) 7276; (Paris agency) 6958; (printing) 6957; (secret service) 6958 (iv).
N.W. Mounted Police (pay of force, &c.) 8657; (Yukon Force) 8662 (v).
Pensions (compensations) 6956; (Fenian Raid) 6956; conc., 6961; (militiamen 1885) 6957; (N.W.M. Police) 6957 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (generally) 7284 (iv); Ottawa (Royal Mint) 607, 612 (i).
Quarantine—General (cattle) on conc., 6914 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, construction, &c.) 2283 (ii); I.C.R. (working expenses) 6907 (iv); Ry. Commission, Board of (maintenance) 1534 (i); Transcontinental (surveys) on conc., 6910 (iv).
Senate (contingencies) 6943 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Immigration Act) 7204; (commercial agencies) 7208; (iron and steel bounties) 7216 (iv).
Supreme Court, N.S., Vacancy *re* (remarks) 5036 (iii), 6837 (iv).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Supreme Court Reports, Delay in Printing (Ans.) 1342 (i).
Sutherland, Hon. James, Decease of (remarks) 5316 (iii).
Telegraph Lines in Canada and Americans violating Alien Labour Act, on M. (Mr. Monk) to adjn., 7645 (iv).
Telephone Committee's Rep. (remarks) 9687 (v).
Telephone Grievances, and Tel. Com. Rep. (remarks) on M. (Mr. Maclean) 9535 (v).
Telephone Lines, Pet. *re* Municipal Control, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1248 (i).
Thermograph Records *re* Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Henderson) for Copies, 1767 (i).
Tignish Breakwater, Tenders *re*, &c. (Ans.) 7018 (iv).
Timber Sales in Man. and N.W.T., Advertisements *re* (Ans.) 7098 (iv).
Tison, B. Aimé, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6475 (iv).
Toronto, Centre, Vacancy, Issue of Writ (statement) 3362 (ii).
——— Registration, &c. (remarks) 3251 (ii).
Trading Stamps, Abolition of, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 5425 (iii), 7684 (iv).
——— (remarks) 5134 (iii).
——— Rels. from Boards of Trade *re* Legislation (Ans.) 6903 (iv).
See 'Criminal Code.'
Transcontinental Commission, Appnmt. of Chairman (remarks) 7916 (iv).
See 'G.T.P.'
Transportation Commission, Complete Membership, &c. (remarks) 321 (i).
——— Interim Rep., on Inquiry for (remarks) 731 (i), 2595 (iii).
——— Mr. Reford's Appnmt. (announcement) 492 (i).
——— Rep. *re*, (remarks) in Com. on B. 45, 4226 (iii).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on M. (Mr. Perley) for Special Com., 8636 (v).
——— on M. (Mr. Perley) to conc., 9522 (v).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8637; on M. for 3°, 8818 (v).
Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 8696 (v).
Veterans of 1886 and 1870, Grant of Lands (remarks) 6047 (iv).
Voters' Lists for Man., Printing, &c. (Ans.) 60 (i).
Voters' Lists, Preparation and Revision for Algomas, &c. (Ans.) 594 (i).
Walsh, Major John, Superannuation and Appnmt. of Mr. Binks (Ans.) 8146 (v).
Walton, Mr. R. M., Arrest by U.S. Authorities in the South (remarks) 4200 (iii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfred. G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Ways and Means (M.) for Com., 6966 (iv.)
Wharfs Construction, on Inquiry for Ret., 8179 (v).
Wire Fence along N.W.T. Boundary Line (Ans.) 5478 (iii).
——— Letter from Dep. Min. Cory (read) 5689 (iii).
——— Letter from Hon. Mr. R. F. Sutherland (read) 5691 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5580 (iii).
———on Inquiry for Ret., 5808 (iii).
Wire Fencing, Inspection of (Ans.) 686 (i).
Yonge Street Crossing Bridge, Construction, &c., Tel. *re* to Mayor (Ans.) 586 (i).
Yukon Commissionership, Vacancy *re* (remarks) 5036 (iii).
Yukon Elections, Delay in Ballot Box Opening (remarks) 988 (iii).
Yukon Ter., Ordinances Rep. (presented) 54 (i).
Yukon Elections Return of Member Elect, Telegrams (read) 1066 (i).
——— Returning Officer (remarks) 1152 (i).
——— Ret. Officer, &c., on Cor. with Govt. (remarks) 1259 (i).
Yukon Reforms *re* Condition of Govt (remarks) on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 7073 (iv).

Lavergne, Mr. A., *Montmagny.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3745; in Com. (school clause amt.) 7152 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 8348, 8373 (v); (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) dual language, 8556, 8612; on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) dual language, 8842; (personal explanation) *re* not voting, 8866 (v).
——— Orangemen, Attack on, Ques. of Order, 8365 (v).
Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 179) 1°*, 7642 (iv).
By-Elections, Resignations of Members, &c. (remarks) 7423 (iv).
Canada Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 178) 1°*, 7642 (iv).
Edmonton, Election *re* (remarks) 4201 (iii).
I.C.R. 'Maritime Express,' Running Time (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6831 (iv).
Legal, Mgr., Quotation *re* Separate Schools in N.W.T. (Ques.) 6187 (iv).
Liege Exhibition, and Prov. of Quebec, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 9698 (v).
London By-Election, Resignation of Member for S. York (remarks) 6384 (iv).
Newspapers Sensational Reports *re* Interviewing Prisoners (remarks) 3250 (ii).
Owen, David Thos., Patent Relief (B. 177) 1°*, 7642 (iv).

Lavergne, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Public Buildings erected since Confederation, Cost, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1398 (i).

Ry. Act (1903) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 281 (i).

SUPPLY :

Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7534 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Mitchell Bridge) 1943 (i).

Lavergne, Mr. L., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*

Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8235 (v).

Drummond Co. Ry., Expenditure *re* (remarks) 1943 (i).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1283 (i), 3172 (ii).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A., *Prince, P.E.I.*

Anglo-American Tel. Co., Agreement *re* Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7606 (iv).

——— Subsidy Increases, &c. (Ques.) 108 (i).

Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 678 (i).

Binder Twine Industry at Kingston (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 486 (i).

Canso Herring Industry and Bait Freezers, &c. (Ques.) 1146 (i).

Cascumpec Sandhills Channel, P.E.I., Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 2773 (ii).

Cornwall Canal, Employees during Election Campaign (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1223 (i).

Fisheries Protection Service Strs., Monthly Pay-roll, &c., Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1350 (i).

Fishermen for Cod Fisheries, P.E.I., Immigration of from Ireland, &c. (Ques.) 586 (i).

Hay exported from Quebec to Boston, Number of Tons (Ques.) 689 (i).

Herring Industry and Bait Freezers, Canso, Establishment of (Ques.) 1146 (i); 5425 (iii).

House of Commons, Rooms for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 253 (i).

Howard's Cove, P.E.I., Surveys, &c. *re* Wharf (Ques.) 4703 (iii).

'Lurcher' Lightship, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2747 (iii).

Marconi Station at Table Head, Delay in Operating (Ques.) 383 (i).

Marconi Tel. System on Strs. 'Stanley' and 'Minto' (Ques.) 188 (i).

Midland Harbour Range Lights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2855 (ii).

Miminegash Breakwater, Contract *re* Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 1350 (i).

Miminegash River Dredging, Commencement of Work, &c. (Ques.) 3834 (ii).

Murray Harbour Branch Ry. and Hillsborough Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2127, 2168 (ii).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Ocean and River Service, Amt. of Payments on Pay-roll, &c. (Ques.) 1349 (i).

Oyster Culture, Depletion in P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2911 (ii).

P.E.I. Mail Service, Delay, &c. (remarks) 1152 (i), 2261 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).

PE.I. Ry., West Cape Branch Survey (Ques.) 589 (i).

P.E.I. Steam Communication, Contract with Steam Navigation Co. (Ques.) 5316 (iii).

P.E.I. Steam Communication, Snow Blockade, &c. (remarks) 1753 (i).

P.E.I. Tel. : *See* 'Anglo-American.'

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Investigation *re* Soundings for Pier at Cape Carleton, &c. (M. for cor.) 2778 (ii).

——— Pet. from Travellers *re* Delay, &c. Refund of Expenditure, &c. (Qpes.) 4807 (iii).

Rural Mail Delivery, Cost of, &c. on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Ret., 2096 (ii).

Summerside Drill Shed (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1562 (i).

SUPPLY :

Fisheries (oyster culture) 2911 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (P.E.I. and G.B.) 7090; (P.E.I. and Newfoundland) 7092 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (examination of masters and mates) 2624; (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 2677 (ii).
Public Works — Dredging — P.E.I. (new dredge) 6891 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Cape Tormentine) 7497 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Apple River wharf) 1731 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Higgin's pier) 1734; (Miminegash) 1735; (Rustico) 1739; (Summerside breakwater) 1739 (i).
Public Works — Telegraphs — Mar. Provs. (Bay St. Lawrence) 7606 (iv).
Railways — G.T.P. (surveys,, construction &c.) 2286 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (general vote) 7495 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (Cardigan branch) 2171 ; (Murray Branch and bridge) 2127 (ii); (Murray Harbour) 7494; (Summerside improvements) 2176 (ii).

Tignish Breakwater, Tenders *re*, &c. (Ques.) 7018 (iv).

Wire Fencing, Inspection by Govt. (Ques.) 585, 685 (i).

Lemieux, Hon. R. (Solicitor General), *Gaspé, Nicolet.*

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5445 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3304 (ii); in Com., (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8546 ; (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8457 (v).

——— in Com. on Schedules (Stony Plain) 8160 (v).

Lemieux, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers, on Orders of the Day, 3557 (ii).
Companies' Act Amt. B. 187, 1° m., 8528 (v).
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9435 (v).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3207 (ii).
Fessenden Wireless Tel. Co. of Canada incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6381 (iv).
Fisheries Industry, Commission *re* Investigation, Recommendation, &c., on M. (Mr. Ganong) 6342 (iv).
Gillies Brothers, Limited, B. 95 (Mr. A. A. Wright) in Com., 2763 (ii).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6669 (iv).
Lévis, Purchase of Land for I.C.R. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6669 (iv).
McDermot, Clara Bidwell, Relief B. 152 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 6353 (iv).
Orangemen, Attack *re* 'Yellow Dog' Quotations (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 8350 (v).
——— 'Yellow Dog,' &c., Translation (read) 8367 (v).
'Protestants driven out of Quebec,' Ref. to in Speech on Autonomy Bill, 3305 (ii).
Provident Savings Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 5975 (iv).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Defective Boilers in Dredges, Litigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2470 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 934; (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 945; (Quebec and Gaspé) 926 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal Inland Rev.) 1122 (i)..
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Hawkesbury) 6838 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Doucet's Landing) 6849 (iv); (Grande Riviere de Beaupré) 9592; (Laprairie ice piers) 9590; (Maskinonge river) 9590 (v); (Montmorency wharf) 6852 (iv); (Petite Rivière) 9591 (v); (St. Maurice River dredging) 6852 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Mitchell bridge) 1941 (i).

Lennox, Mr. H., *South Simcoe.*
Auditor General and Audit Act (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 9623 (v).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6525 (iv).
Auditor General's Resignation, Acceptance by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6522 (iv).
——— Legislation *re* Audit Act (Ques.) 590 (i).
Audit Office and Treasury Board, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 1935 (i).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4112, 4136 (iii).
——— (election of members) in Com., 5778 (iii).
——— (laws, courts, &c.) 5930 (iii).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Autonomy B. 69 (schools) on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8365 (v).
——— (subsidy to provs.) in Com., 6088 (iv).
Autonomy Bill, Official Report of Division (remarks) 5432 (iii).
——— Pets. circulated in Quebec (remarks) 2574 (ii).
Cabinet, ex-Ministers' Annuity B. 203 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 9738 (v).
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers, on Orders of the Day (remarks) 3580 (ii).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co's B. 22 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 1100 (i).
Campaign Literature and Franking Privilege, &c. (remarks) 1813 (i).
Canadian Cattle, British Embargo, Par. in Montreal 'Star' (read) 454 (i).
Cardinal Canal, Claims of Contractors: in Com. of Sup., 1221 (i).
Cement, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8988 (v).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 654, 672, 1082, 1467 (i).
Cornwall Canal Employees during Election Campaign (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1225 (i).
Criminal Code Amt. (B. 23) 2° m., 733 (i).
Dom. Lands Act, Regulations *re* Yukon Ter., on M. (Mr. Oliver) to approve, 9784 (v).
Fruit Marks Act. (staple commodities) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5982 (iv).
Geological Survey Museum, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 760 (i).
Glanders among Horses, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6698 (iv).
Grain Carrying via I.C.R., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1920 (i).
G. T. Ry., Appeal to Judicial Committee, &c. (Ques.) 9080 (v).
G. T. P. Ry., Plans deposited with Dept. *re* Terminals, on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 2823, 2833 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act (guarantee bonds) Amt. B. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8677 (v).
I.C.R., Supplies purchased, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2249 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9753; in Com., 9793 (v).
Live Stock Record Associations incorp. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5922 (iii).
Military Camp at S. Simcoe, Establishment of (remarks) 9712 (v).
Murray Harbour and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2146 (ii).
Northwest Territories B. 160 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 8763; in Com., 8768 (v).
Orangemen, Attack *re* 'Yellow Dog', Quotations from Quebec Newspapers (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 8365 (v).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5741, 5970 (iv).

Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1311 (i).

Ry. Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com. on Res., 495; in Com. on Res., 575; in Com., 1602; on M. for 3° (amt.) 1802; Neg. (Y. 47; N. 93) 1805 (i).

Railway Commission, Board of, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1528 (i).

——— staff salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1541 (i).

——— Rep., Opinion of Min. of Jus. *re* (remarks) 6233 (iv).

——— Rep. of Board, Preparation of (remarks) 2007 (ii).

——— Rep., Inquiry for, 2685 (ii), 6136 (iv).

Rural Mail Delivery, Establishment in Can., Probable Cost, &c. (M. for reps., &c.) 2067 (ii).

Saskatchewan, Prov. of : *See* 'Autonomy.'

Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 326, 1202, 1789; on M. for 3° (amt.) 1882; on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) to M. for 3°, 1872 (i).

Senate and House of Commons Indemnity B. 202 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9727 (v).

Statutes Revision, Indexing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8673 (v).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock records) 6682 (iv).

Canals—Cornwall (enlargement) 1220; Galops (enlargement) 1220 ; Grenville (guide piers) 1500; North Channel (dam) 1230; Trent (construction 1420; (surveys) 1484; Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1311; (stone protection) 1497; (surveys) 1237 (i).

Indians—Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6522 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse repairs) 6642; (Port Arthur, &c., fog alarms) 6645 (iv).

Miscellaneous (revision of statutes) 8673 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Toronto warehouse) 1589; Ottawa (museum) 760 ; Que. (Montreal P.O., improvements) 1129; (Montreal P.O., pneumatic system) 1138 (i); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Barrie pier) 9595 (v).

Quarantine (cattle) 6690, 6698 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (traffic arrangements) 1920 (i); P.E.I. (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2146 (ii); Ry. Commission (maintenance) 1528 (i).

Trent Valley Canal, Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 1311 (i).

Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) on M. for 3°, 1779 (i).

Vancouver Dry Dock, Suppression of Portion of Cor. (remarks) 1317 (i).

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) on M. for 3°, 8826 (v).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Water Meters Inspection B. 188 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Res., 8675 (v).

Waterways and Transportation Problem, Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 1311 (i).

Yukon Regulations : *See* 'Dom. Lands Act'.

Leonard, Mr. J. E. E., *Laval.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5393 (iii).

——— in Com., sec. 2 (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8617; (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8427; on M. for 3°, Amt. (schools) 8857; (Amt.) 8882; neg. (Y. 6; N. 124) 8882 (v).

Militia Officers gazetted *re* Examinations (Ques.) 8886 (v).

Political Crisis in Quebec, Explanation asked for, 822 (i).

——— Par. from 'Le Journal' (remarks) 753 (i).

——— 'Le Soleil's' Attitude (remarks) 830 (i).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Terrebonne) 7394 (iv).

Trading Stamps, Res. from Boards of Trade *re* Legislation (Ques.) 6903 (iv).

Lewis, Mr. E. N., *West Huron.*

Anticosti Lightships, Expenditures *re* (Ques.) 1850 (i).

'De Lévis' Str., Hydrographic Surveys, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 914 (i).

Fisheries Protection Steamers, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1347 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service Steamers, Ports of Call, &c. (Ques.) 1850 (i).

Lighthouse Service, Aids to Navigation, Applications *re* Improvements, &c. (M. for ret.*) 917 (i).

Lurcher and East Point Lightships, Price, to Contractors, Renewals, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2333 (ii).

——— Memoranda to Dep. Min., &c. (M. for copies*) 2333 (ii).

Ocean and River Service Strs., Names and Tonnage, &c. (Ques.) 1347 (i).

P.E.I. Mail Service, Delays, &c. (remarks) 1153 (i)..

Public Works, Contracts awarded, Lowest Tenders, &c. (M. for ret.*) 916 (i).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Miscellaneous (inspection, &c.) 1513; Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1280 (i).

Waterways and Transportation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1280 (i).

Logan, Mr. Hance J., *Cumberland.*

Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Conspiracy, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. on B. 36, 531 (i).

Cables of the Empire, Cor. *re* with Govt. (M. for copies*) 1397 (i).

Logan, Mr. Hance J.—*Con.*
Calgary, Red Deer and Battleford Ry. Co.'s (B. 19) 1° m., 318 (i).
Dominion Annuity Co.'s incorp. B. 82 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 2768 (ii).
House of Commons, Rooms for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 252 (i).
Immigration, Fraudulent Representations (B. 120) 1° m., 2323 (ii); in Com., 9699 (v).
Judges' Appnmt. and Promotion, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. on B. 36, 531 (i).
Montevideo, Imprisonment of British Seamen (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2691 (ii).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1707 (i).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3172; on Amt. (Mr. Stewart) to M. for 3°, 3397 (ii).
Personal Explanation *re* Ottawa City Voting, 562 (i).
Ry. Commissioners (chairman) Appnmt. of B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com. on Res., 531 (i).
SUPPLY :
Marine Hospitals (shipwrecked seamen) 2688 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Apple River wharf) 1733 (i).
Telephone Systems, Investigation *re* on M. (Sir Wm. Mulock) for Sel. Com., 2683 (ii).
Voting at Ottawa Elections (personal explanation) 562 (i).

Loggie, Mr. W. S., *Northumberland, N.B.*
I.C.R. Freight Rates, Increases, &c. on Explanation of Min. of Rys., 6133 (iv).

Macdonald, Mr. E. M., *Pictou.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 9 (i).
Anthracite Coal imported into Canada, Amount, &c. (M. for ret.*) 9697 (v).
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) in Com., on sec. 16 (schools) on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8288 (v).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 46) 1° m., 728 (i).; in Com., 4236; 3° m., 4412 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 58 (Mr. Lamont) on Sen. Amts., 9078 (v).
Govt. Steamers, Coal Supply (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2605 (ii).
G.T.Ry. and Can. Atlantic Ry. Purchase (B. 45) 1° m., 727 (i); in Com., 2765, 3649, 3879 (ii), 4123, 4202 ; on M. for 3°, 4229 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers—N.S., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).
I.C.R. Employees Pensions (remarks) *re*, 9029
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9750 (v).
'Lady Laurier,' Number of Crew, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2616 (ii).

Macdonald, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
'Lurcher' Lightship, Expenditure *re* Accident (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2755 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 3992 (ii).
Naturalization and Aliens Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8690 (v).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1709 (i).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5747 (iii).
Ottawa City Act Amt. B. 180 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8687 (v).
Pictou Cattle Disease, Investigation and Experiment *re* Cause, &c. (Ques.) 9079 (v).
SUPPLY :
Fisheries (dog-fish experiments) 9174 (v).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Magdalen Islands) 907; (P.E.I. and Mainland) 921 (i).
Militia (permanent force) 9167 (v).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 2602 ; (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 2659 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Phinney's Cove) 9567; (Tatamagouche) 9580; (Toney river) 9581 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 9509 (v).

Macdonnell, Mr. A. C., *South Toronto.*
Alexandria P.O., Contract *re* Delay, &c. (Ques.) 1760 (i).
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 2421 (ii).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5240 (iii).
Canadians' Mining Rights in S. Africa (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9530 (v).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr Fisher) in Com., 647, 1085, 1471 (i).
Commercial and Manufacturing Industries, Statistics *re* (remarks) in Com. on B. 5 1085 (i).
Dredging Vessels, Cost of Buliding (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6892 (iv).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) on M. for 1°, 986 (i).
Immigration of Skilled Labour and Toronto Labour Council, on M. (Mr. Foster) 7510 (iv).
I.C.R., Pension Scheme for Old Age (Ques.) 2492 (ii).
——— Legislation *re* (remarks) 9288 (v).
Life Insurance Companies Funds, Total Amount, Par Value, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3204 (ii).
Monterey Electric and Gas Co.'s (B. 89) 1°*, 2005 (ii).
Paper Goods Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 68) 1°*, 1421 (i).
Port Stanley Harbour, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1760 (i).

Macdonnell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Rondeau Harbour Works, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1761 (i).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 351, 372 (i).
South Africa and Canadian Mining Rights: *See* 'Canadians Mining,' &c.
Statutes, Revision of, Completion, &c. (remarks) 745 (i).
SUPPLY:
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7542 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (heating) 6823 (iv); General (armouries) 1657; (clerk of works 1647; Ont. (Toronto barracks) 1589; (Toronto, drill hall) 1582; (Toronto, warehouse) 1583 (i).
Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (new dredges) 6891 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Pointe au Baril route) 6888; (Port Dover) 7564; (Toronto, breakwater) 7567; (Toronto, eastern entrance) 7565 (iv).
Toronto Drill Hall, in Com. of Sup., 1582, 1657 (i).
Toronto Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 1583 (i).
Toronto Harbour, Eastern Entrance, Fog Signals, Alarms, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
——— Expenditure for 1880 to 1904 (M. for ret.*) 403 (i).
——— Straightening Don River (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6888 (iv).
——— Tender *re* Breakwater at Eastern Gap (Ques.) 1761 (i).
Toronto Island Fog Horns, Testing, &c., Complaints *re* (remarks) 9283 (v).
Toronto Post Office, Erection of a new Building (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6833 (iv).

MacLaren, Mr. A. F., *North Perth.*
Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8206 (v).
Cornwall Canal Employees, Names, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1221 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agr. Com., 5001 (iii).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1182, 1798 (i).
Sheep Disease (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6714 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance) 1539 (i).

Maclean, Mr. A. K., *Lunenburg.*
American Fishermen on N.S. Coasts, Protection *re* (remarks) 7907 (iv).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5276 (iii).
Autonomy B. 69 School Clause Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5856 (iii).

Maclean, Mr. A. K.—*Con.*
Coal, Anthracite, Quantity used, Total Expenditure, &c. (Qeus.) 192 (i).
SUPPLY:
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and W. Indies) 7203 (iv).

Maclean, Mr. W. F., *South York, Ont.*
Address, The, 42 (i).
Alien Labour: *See* 'Naturalization.'
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 745 (i).
Arctic Expedition, Capt. Peary's Voyage, &c. (remarks) 4753 (iii).
Autonomy (Alberta) B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5481; (subsidy) 5515; on M. for 2°, 5401; (objections) 5424 (iii).
——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5607 (iii).
——— (B.N.A. Act) 5729, 5749 (iii).
——— (C.P.R. lands) 6050 (iv).
——— Crown lands) 8172 (v).
——— (distribution of seats) 7727; Newspaper Rumours, Quotations (read) 7744 (iv).
——— (Hudson Bay Co. rights) 6049 (iv).
——— (lands vested in Crown) in Com., 5986, 6008 (iv).
——— (laws, courts, &c.) in Com., 6102 (iv).
——— (readjustment of representation) in Com., 5754 (iii).
——— (Senate representation) in Com., 5678 (iii).
——— on Schedules, sec. 25 (Athabasca) 8163; (Saskatchewan) 8161; (Stony Plain) 8157 (v).
Autonomy Bills, Alberta Boundaries, Letter *re* Naming of Province (read) 5637 (iii).
——— Franchise System (remarks) 5476 (iii).
——— (remarks) on Introduction of Min. of Int. *re* Election, 5235 (iii).
——— Par. in 'Le Soleil' (M.) to adjn., 1745 (i).
——— Res. *re* (remarks) 1594 (i).
——— Unconstitutionality of, &c. (M.) to adjn., 2199 (ii).
See 'Manitoba.'
Bank Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8689 (v).
Blair, Mr., Resignation, &c. (remarks) 55 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ry. B. 36, 497 (i).
Budget, The., Date of Delivery (remarks) 4920 (iii).
Business of the House, Motions for Supply, &c. (remarks) 1241 (i).
Cabinet ex-Ministers, Annuity B. 203 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 9738 (v).
Cabinet Vacancy, Minister of Public Works (M.) to adjn., 5471 (iii).
See 'Public Works,' 'Ministers.'
C.A.R. and I.C.R.: *See* 'G.T.R.'
Canada Southern Bridge Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. German) in Com., 1287 (i).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Canadian Canals Corporation B. 72 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for 2°, 1757 (i).
Canadian Cattle, British Embargo (remarks) 456 (i).
Canadian Hard Wheat, Drawback by U. S. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 746 (i).
C.P.R. Land Taxation, *re* Municipalities, Judgment of Sup. Court (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2022 (ii).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 635 (i).
Commercial Agents in Quebec, Tax collected, &c. (remarks) 9811 (v).
Corporations, Trusts, &c. (remarks) in Deb. on Address, 42 (i).
Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 190 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9764 (v).
Express Cos. : *See* 'Ry. B. 4.'
Facer Steel Car Co.'s B. 27 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 1285 (i).
Fessenden Wireless Tel. Co. of Canada incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6380 (iv).
Fitz-Simons, Jane Marie, Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 6379 (iv).
Franking Privilege, Abuse of, &c. (remarks) 1808 (i).
Freight Rates, Discrimination, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 891 (i).
See 'Ry. B. 4.' &c.
Glanders among Horses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6693 (iv).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3362 (ii).
Gov. Gen.'s Instructions, Changes, &c. (remarks) 227 (i).
G. T. Ry. Arbitration B. 199 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 1°, 9279 (v).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 2765, 3649, 3880 (ii).
G. T. Ry. and Can. Atlantic Ry., Purchase of, &c. (remarks) 728 (i).
G.T.P. Ry., Interim Report (remarks) 6310 (iv).
——— Surveys, O.C. *re* Commission (remarks) 229 (i).
——— Surveys, Reps. in Ry. Dept., &c. (remarks) 2009 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers—N.S., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).
Highway Crossings : *See* 'Ry. B. 2.'
House of Commons, Rooms for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 239, 251 (i).
Hudson Bay, Sovereignty of Can. (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5608-5609 (iii).
Imperial Guarantee and Accident Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2771 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act (guarantee bonds) Amt. B. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8679 (v).
Insurance Cos., Legislation *re* (remarks) in Com., on B. 200, 9689 (v).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Res., 9740 (v).
Killam, Judge, Appnmt. as Chairman of Ry. Commission (remarks) on B. No. 36, 497 (i).
Labour Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com. on Res., 279; in Com., 705; on M. for 3°, 1779 (i).
Live Stock Record Associations, Delay to Farmers, &c. (remarks) 5577 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions, Information *re* System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 924 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Demands *re* Separate Schools from M'gr. Sbarratti, 3852 (ii).
——— on M. to adjn., 3983 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. W. J. Roche) for Copies, 1768 (i).
Ministers, Absence of (remarks) 1285 (i).
Naturalization and Aliens Act Amt. (B. 184) (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8689 (v).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Erection of Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5706 (iii).
N.W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 8 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 462 (i).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 1891 (i); on M. for 3°, 2325, 2714 (ii), 6346 (iv).
Oats, Rolled, in Com., on B. 190, 9764 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2725 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 9818 (v).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) on M. to ref., to Sel. Com., 1889; in Com., 1283 (i), 2951, 3170 (ii); on Amt. (Mr. Stewart) to M. for 3°, 3394 (ii).
——— Letter from W. A. Littlejohn, Toronto City Clerk (read) 3170 (ii).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5737 (iii), 5964 (iv).
Political Debts, Payment of, &c., Ref. to Speech on Man. Boundaries, 3857 (ii).
Port Arthur and Fort William Telephone System and Board of Railway Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Copies of Cor., 1387 (i).
P.E.I. Ry. and Murray Branch, Expenditure up to 1st Jan., 1905 (Ques.) 106 (i).
Private Bills—Extension of Time, on M. (Mr. Grant) 449 (i).
Provincial Rights, Par. in 'Le Soleil' (M.) to adjn., 1745 (i).
Public Buildings, Govtl. Policy *re* (remarks) 1027 (i).
Public Works, Acting Minister of, Unconstitutionality of, &c. (remarks) 1936 (i).
See 'Cabinet.'
Ry. Act, 1903 (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 299 (i).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Railway Act (express companies) (1903) Amt. (B. 4) 1°*, 9 (i); on M. for Adjnmt. (remarks) 3246 (ii).
——— M. to withdraw, 3743 (ii).
——— (remarks) 109, 1619 (i).
Ry. Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 566; on M. for 2°, 745; on M. for Com., 497; in Com., 1597 (i).
——— (amt.) *re* Express Cos., 1619 (i).
———Appnmt. of Chairman, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 320 (i), on Ques. of Order, 320 (i).
——— Ques. of Order *re*, 514 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 76 (Mr. Campbell) on M. for 2°, 1757 (i).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 53; in Com., 54; in Com., 328 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Indemnity B. 202 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9731 (v).
Sifton, Hon. C., Resignation *re* (remarks) 1856 (i).
Sovereign Fire Assurance Co. of Can., B. 26 (Mr. E. F. Clarke) in Com., 1755 (i).
Spirits in Bond, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8679 (v).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock records) 6682 (iv).
Canals—Trent (Holland river) 9360; surveys) 9354 (v).
Canals—Welland (electric light plant) 9377 (v); (Port Colborne elevator) 1273 (i).
Chinese Immigration (salaries) 981 (i).
Dom. Lands (surveys) 9306 (v).
Geological Survey (surveys, &c.) 8669 (v).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7543 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 864; (Can. and S. Africa) 974; (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 945 (i); (St. John, &c., and W. Indies) 8691 (v).
Northwest Mounted Police (pay of force) 8660 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Canso) 1027 (i); Ottawa (additions to H. of C.) 9546 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Point Prim Island) 1736 (i).
Railways—G.T.P. (construction) 9498; (surveys, plans, &c.) 9493 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 9385 (v); (general vote) 7450, 7469 (iv); (rolling stock) 9501 (v).
Quarantine (cattle) 6693 (iv).
Telephone Grievances and Rep. of Telephone Com. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9533 (v).
Telephone Com. Rep. (remarks) 9687 (v).
Telephone Lines, Pet. *re* Municipal Control, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1244 (i).
Telephone Systems, Investigation into, on M. (Sir Wm. Mulock) for Sel. Com., 2683 (ii). *See* 'Port Arthur.'

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Timber Regulations *re* Cutting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9297 (v).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3659 (ii).
U.S. Tariff Drawbacks on Raw Materials, on M. for Sup., 746 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8639 (v).
Wire Fencing : *See* 'N.W.T.'

Macpherson, Mr. R. G., *Vancouver City*
Bills from Senate (M.) to place on Order Paper, 8001 (v).
Canadian Cattle, British Embargo (remarks) 455 (i).
C.P.R. Steamers, Coal Loading Methods (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2615 (ii).
Century Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 49) 1°*, 817 (i); in Com., 2765 (ii).
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9434 (v).
House of Commons, Rooms for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 251 (i).
Inter-Imperial Parlt. between G.B. and Her Colonies, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2357 (ii).
Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Ry. Co.'s Pet. (presented) 3744 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3172 (ii).
——— Postponement, 1338 (i).
Pet. *re* Autonomy Bill, Ques. of Privilege, 2680 (ii).
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1317 (i).
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Prefontaine) in Com., 2119 (ii).
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 7427 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Chinese Immigration (salaries) 983 (i).
Immigration (medical inspection, B.C.) 9230 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Royal Mint) 609 (i); Harbours and Rivers, B.C. (Langley) 7575 (iv).
Trading Stamps : *See* 'Criminal Code.'
Vancouver and Coast Kootenay Ry. Co.'s (B. 131) 1°*, 4081 (iii).
Vancouver Dry Dock, Suppression of Portions of Cor. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1317 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8317, 8649 (v).
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s (B. 42) 1°*, 625 (i).
Yukon, Reforms *re* Govt. of Country: (remarks) on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 7067 (iv).

McCarthy, Mr. L. G., *North Simcoe.*

Autonomy Bill, 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4086 (iii).

——— in Com. (Hudson Bay Co. rights) 5949 (iii).

——— (laws, courts, &c.) 5935, 5940 (iii).

Autonomy B. 69, Attack *re* 'Orangeism' (remarks) in Com., 5909 (iii).

——— (M.) to adjn. Debate, 4078 (ii).

Edmonton Election, Date of, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5893 (iii).

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 115) 1°*, 2185 (ii); in Com., 7621, 7677; 3° m., 7853, 7857 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 3963 (ii).

Midland Harbour Range Lights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2736 (ii).

Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2718 (ii).

Parry Sound Buoy Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2732 (ii).

Sifton, Hon. C., Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill (remarks) 1860 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. (B. 6) 1°*, 58; 2° m., 315; M. to ref. to Special Com., 316 (i).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Trent (surveys) 9358 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoys) 2732 (ii).

McCarthy, Mr. M. S., *Calgary.*

Acres of Undisposed Lands in Provisional District, N.W.T. (M. for ret.*) 601 (i).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5495 (iii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3332 (ii); on M. for 3°, amt. (distribution of seats) 8857; neg. (Y. 42; N. 97) 8859 (v).

——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5604, 5669 (iii).

——— (Crown Lands) 8262 (v).

——— (distribution of seats) 7734 (iv); Amt. to ref. to Judges, 7744; moved, 7770, 7819, 7931 (iv).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8017 (v).

——— (election of members) 5766, 5809 (iii).

——— (H. of C. representation) 5752 (iii).

——— (laws, courts, &c.) 5944 (iii).

——— (readjustment of representation) 5753 (iii).

——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8494 (v).

——— (seat of government) 5781 (iii), 8247 (v).

——— in Com., on Schedules (Athabasca) 8163; (Cardston) 8149; (Gleichen) 8153; Amt. 8166; (High River) 8155; Medicine Hat) 8149 (v).

Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) in Com., (distribution of seats) 8727 (v).

McCarthy, Mr. M. S.—*Con.*

Autonomy Bill, Mr. Haultain, Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2515 (ii).

——— Schedules, Preparation of (remarks) 5477 (iii).

Edmonton Election, Voters' Lists, Printing of (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5863 (iii).

Experimental Farms, Establishment of, in Alberta, N.W.T. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6170 (iv).

Lesser Slave Lake P.O., Establishment of Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 7018 (iv).

——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 69 8163 (v).

Mange among Horses, Cost of enforcing Law (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6719 (iv).

Manitoba Boundary Extension, Pets., Memorials, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2067 (ii).

Northwest Territories Representation Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8773; Amt., 8774 (v).

N.W.T. Voters' Lists, Inquiry for Ret., 2594 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 6170 (iv).

Northwest Mounted Police (Yukon) 8668 (v).

Quarantine (cattle) 2310 (ii), 6719 (iv).

Vats for dipping Quarantine Cattle (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2312 (ii).

Voters' Lists in N. W. Ters., used in Dom. Election, 1905, (M. for ret.*) 601 (i).

McColl, Mr. J. B., *West Northumberland, Ont.*

Water Meters Inspeotion B. 188 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 9408 (v).

McCool, Mr. C. A., *Nipissing.*

Gillies Brothers, Limited, B. 95 (Mr. A. A. Wright) in Com., 2764 (ii).

Metal Volatilization Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 183) 1°*, 7810 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Lake Temiscaming) 7559; Que. (Canton Fabre) 7288 (iv).

Temagami Ry. Co.'s (B. 91) 1°*, 3005; in Com., 3135 (ii).

Vibert, Philip, Relief (B. 172) 1°*, 7095 (iv).

McIntyre, Mr. G. H., *South Perth.*

Agriculture and Colonization Com., 6th Rep. (presented) 8097 (v).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5179 (iii).

Autonomy Bill, Official Report of Division (remarks) 5428 (iii).

Cattle, Canadian, Embargo, &c., 6th Rep. of Agriculture, &c., Com. (presented) 8097 (v).

House of Commons, Improvements in, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1570 (i).

Ry. Act (crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 3231 (ii).

McIntyre, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
St. Mary's and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 15) 1°*, 317 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (House of Commons improvements) 1570 (i).
Quarantine (cattle) 2313 (ii).

McIsaac, Mr. C. F., *Antigonish.*
Harbours and Rivers—N.S., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9563 (v).
Public Accounts Com., (M.) 582 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings, &c. (remarks) 404 (i).
SUPPLY :
Ocean and River Service (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 2668 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 851, 1016 (i); (Phinney's Cove) 9563 (v).
Winter Mail Service, P.E.I., in Com. of Sup., 2668 (ii).

McKenzie, Mr. D. D., *Cape Breton North and Victoria.*
'Agnes G. Donohue,' Str., Seizure, &c. (remarks) 1507 (i).
'Arthur Binney,' Fishing Schooner, Small-pox Quarantine (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2307 (ii).
Autonomy (Alberta) Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3713 (ii).
Autonomy Bill in Com., Resignation, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 8480, 8486 (v).
Autonomy B. 69, School Clauses (remarks) in Com. 5898, 5912 (iii).
'Canada-Cape Breton,' Collision, Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2636 (ii).
Canadian Fast Mail Service, Quotation and Telegrams (read) M. to adjn., 9773 (v).
Govt. Steamers, Coal Supply (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2613 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers, N.S., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9575 (v).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9742; in Com., 9793 (v).
'Lady Laurier,' Number of Crew at Halifax (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 2617 (ii).
McDermot, Clara Bidwell Relief B. 132 (Mr. Campbell) on M. for 3°, 6376 (iv).
Montevideo, Imprisonment of British Seamen, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2689 (ii).
Small-pox on American Ships, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2689 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 2613 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Sydney Mines) 1046; (Sydney P.O.) 1045 (i); Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Boisdale wharf) 9585 (v).
Quarantine (organized districts) 2307 (ii).

McKenzie, Mr. P. H., *South Bruce.*
Agriculture Committee, 3rd Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 4984 (iii).
——— 6th Rep. Cattle Embargo (M.) to conc., 8998 (v).
Bruce County Armouries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1658 (i).
Canadian Cattle Embargo in G.B. (M.) to conc. in 6th Rep. of Com., 8998 (v).
Railway Rates, Discrimination, &c., on M. to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Com., 4984 (iii).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 374 (i).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture (experimental farms) 6175 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—General (armouries) 1658 (i).
Walkerton and Lucknow Ry. Co.'s (B. 25) 1°*, 493 (i).

McLean, Mr. A. A., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Anthracite Coal used by Govt. in each Province, Quantity, Amount paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1398 (i).
Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8204 (v).
Curley, Thos., Mitchell, &c., Claims for Damages *re* Murray Harbour Branch (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9489 (v).
Gillis, N. J., Emplymt. by Govt. at St. Louis Exhibition, &c. (Ques.) 3361 (ii).
Grain carried to Halifax, via I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1918 (i).
Halifax Fishery Award, Claims of P.E.I., &c. Memorial, Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 1386 (i).
I.C.R. Dining Cars, Losses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 2255 (ii).
——— Murray Harbour Branch, Amount due Contractors, &c. (Ques.) 2064 (ii).
'James W,' Schooner, Rescue of Crew by SS 'Durango' (remarks) 4198 (ii).
Lobster Fisheries, Res. of Board of Trade, Moncton (read) in Com. of Sup., 2909 (ii).
Marconi System, Establishment of on Govt. Steamers, (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 2623 (ii).
'Minto,' Govt. Steamer, Coal Loading, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 2603 (ii).
Morrison, Hector D., Customs Officer Pinette, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2330 (ii).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2130 (ii).
——— Claims for Land Damages from T. Curley, &c. (M. for copies*) 2334 (ii).
New London Branch Ry., P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2178 (ii).
North Lake P.O., Removal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9612 (v).

McLean, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Pinette, Customs Officer, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2330 (ii).

Power, Jas., Postmaster at Wheatley River, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4374 (iii).

P.E.I. and Mainland Steam Communication, Delay in Mail Service (remarks) 2203, 2261 (ii).

P.E.I., Dredging, Number and Names of Harbours, &c. (Ques.) 1148 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Investigation *re* Pier at Cape Carleton, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 2808 (ii).

——— Delays, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2648; Cor. (read) 2649; Res. from Delegates (read) 2651 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry. Claims for Damages *re* Murray Harbour Branch (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9489 (v).

Railway Commission, Board of, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1532 (i).

Savage Harbour, P.E.I., Proposed Improvement (Ques.) 3361 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7. (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1182 (i).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 2447 (ii).

Fisheries (hatcheries) 2904 ; (protection service) 2909 (ii).

Immigration (agents, G.B.) 7700 (iv); (medical inspection) 9236 (v).

Legislation (laws, printing, &c.) 6948 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Marconi stations) 2870 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Manchester Line) 933; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 927 (i); (P.E.I. and G.B.) 7088; (St. John and W. Indies) 7197 (iv).

Miscellaneous (consolidation of statutes) 7247 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 2598; (schools of navigation) 2646; (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 2648 (ii).

Post Office (mail service) 9612 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Cape Tormentine) 7497 (iv); P.E.I. (Higgin's pier) 1734; (Rustico) 1738 (i); Telegraphs—Dom. (generally) 7636 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 1918 (i); (general vote) 7495 (iv); (steel rails) 2003 (i).

Railways—P.E.I. (air brakes) 2178; (Charlottetown station) 2026 (ii); (Georgetown accommodation) 9489 (v); (Morrell bridge span) 2177; (Murray harbour branch) 2041; (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2130; (Vernon River branch line) 2177 (ii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance) 1532 (i).

Weights and Measures (electric light inspectors) 1696 (i).

Timber Sales in Man. and N.W.T. Advertisements *re* (Ques.) 7097 (iv).

Truro Dining Room, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2255 (ii).

McLennan, Mr. A., *Inverness.*

Lobster and Herring Industry, Rep. of Commission (Ques.) 4371 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Inverness) 1040 (i); Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Inverness Mines) 7404; (Mabou bridge) 7408; (Margaree) 7410 ; (Port Hood) 7414 ; (Scott's bay) 7417 (iv).

Martin, Mr. A., *Queen's, P.E.I.*

Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 679 (i).

Bait Freezers, Mar. Canada, Number, Location, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1769 (i), 2067 (ii).

Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 671 (i).

Charlottetown, P.E.I. Ry. Station, Cor. and Reps. *re* Construction (M. for copies*) 194 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 4810 (iii).

——— Site, &c. (Ques.) 60 (i).

Cold Storage Bait Freezers, Mar. Can., Number, Location, &c. (M. for ret.) 1769 (i), 2067 (ii).

Commercial Agencies in Can., Location, &c. (M. for ret.*) 403 (i).

Fruit Growers Ass'on, P.E.I., Govt. Intention (Ques.) 381 (i).

Grand View Station, Murray Harbour Branch, P.E.I. Ry., Location, &c., Cor. (M. for copies*) 1770 (i).

Halifax Fishery Award, Distribution to Provinces, &c. (Ques.) 1593 (i).

Lambert's Pier, P.E.I., Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 4373 (iii).

Lawson, Mr. Henry, Postmaster at Stanhope, Dismissal, Cor., &c. (M. for copies.*) 1398 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1062 (i).

Live Stock Record of Can., Nationalization, &c. (Ques.) 1848 (i), 2185 (ii).

Morell River Ry. Bridge, P.E.I., Complaints *re* (Ques.) 5035 (iii).

Murray Harbour and Hillsboro Bridge Branch, P.E.I. Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7494 (iv).

Murray Harbour Branch, P.E.I. Ry., Completion, &c. (Ques.) 189 (i).

——— Delegation *re* (Ques.) 265 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9482 (v).

North Lake P.O., Removal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9613 (v).

P.E.I., Additional Subsidy in 1901, Inquiry for Ret., 4810 (iii).

P.E.I. and Mainland SS. Communication, Inspection of SS. 'Stanley' (Ques.) 687 (i).

——— Mail Service, Delays, &c. (remarks) 280 (i).

——— Terms of Union, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 9698 (v).

Martin, Mr. A.—*Con.*
P.E.I. Ry., Train Service (remarks) 697 (i).
——— Tunnel Surveys, Proposal to Delegation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6643 (iv).
P.E.I. Communication with Mainland, Delays, &c., Tel., (read) 831 (i).
——— Fisheries, Supervision, &c. (Ques.) 1762 (i).
——— Mount Stewart Shipping Facilities, Wharf Accommodation, &c. (Ques.) 1763 (i).
P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines, Construction and Surveys, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 916 (i).
P.E.I. Ry. Stanley Bridge, &c., Surveys *re* (Ques.) 266 (i).
P.E.I. Steam Communication with Mainland, Tidings of SS. 'Stanley' (remarks) 1338, 1595 (i).
P.E.I. Subsidy, Additional Grant, Cor., &c., *re* (M. for copies*) 3205 (ii).
P.E.I. and West Indies SS. Subsidy, Amount paid, Representations *re* (Ques.) 591 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Inspector's Rep. of Str. 'Stanley,' &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 916 (i).
Railways and Canals, Can., Subsidies, Construction, Expenditure, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 916 (i).
Railway and Steamboat Accidents, 1904, Investigation *re* Causes, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1397 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5026 (iii).
Rustico Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1593 (i).
St. Peter's Breakwater, P.E.I., Tenders *re*, &c. (Ques.) 5035 (iii).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 354 (i).
Stanhope P. O., Dismissal of Mr. H. Lawson, Cor., Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 1398 (i).
——— (Ques.) 1062 (i).
Stanley Bridge, P.E.I. Ry., Total Cost, Claims for Damages, &c. (Ques.) 587 (i).
SUPPLY:
Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1704 (i).
House of Commons (stationery) 6595 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 977; (Magdalen Islands) 907; (Pictou and Montague Bridge) 926; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 929 (i), 7088 (iv); (P.E.I. and Mainland) 920; (P.E.I. and Nfld.) 940 (i), 7093; (St. John and W. Indies) 7194 (iv).
Militia (depots) 9113 (v).
Ocean and River Service (ice breaking steamers) 9618 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Inverness) 1042 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Miminegash) 1735 (i); (Mount Stewart) 9585 (v); (New London) 1735; (Point Prim Island) 1736; (repairs, &c.) 1737; (Wood Island) 1743 (i).
Public Works—Telegraphs—B.C. (Kamloops) 7610 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 1913 (i); (general vote) 7495 (iv); P.E.I. Cardigan branch) 9482 (v); (Charlottetown accommodation) 2025 (ii); (Charlottetown track extension) 6434 (iv); (Hillsborough bridge) 2038; (Murray branch) 2038 (ii).
Sydney, I.C.R., Station, Collections for Freight, &c. (M. for ret.) 1767 (i).
Wheatley River, P.E.I. Postmaster, Dismissal of James Power, Cor. (M. for copies*) 9697 (v).

Martin, Mr. T., *North Wellington.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 1°, 5083 (iii).
Farmers' Bank of Canada (B. 124) in Com., 4700 (iii); on Sen. Amts. 6609 (iv).
Mutual Reserve Ins. Co., Payment of Claims, &c. (Ques.) 2332 (ii).
Officials dismissed for Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6867 (iv).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1182 (i).

Miller, Mr. H. H., *South Grey.*
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2849 (ii).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4292 (iii).
——— in Com., sec. 2 (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8624 (v).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 8364 (v).
Cement, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8991 (v).
Criminal Code (summary appeals) Amt. B. 45 (Mr. Porter) on Amt. (Mr. Bureau) *re* Race Courses, 5138 (iii).
Dredging Contracts, Mr. McKay's Interests *re* (remarks) 5599 (iii).
Farmers' Bank of Canada (B. 124) 1°*, 2681 (ii).
House of Commons, Rooms for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 254 (i).
Killam, Judge, Appmt. as Chairman of Ry. Commission (remarks) on M. for Com. on Res., 561 (i).
Man. Boundaries Extension, 'Scurvy Politician' Quotation *re*, 3863 (ii).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9475 (v).
Orangemen, Attack *re*, 'Yellow Dog' quoted in Newspapers (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 8364 (v).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) on Amt. (Mr. Stewart) to M. for 3°, 3396 (ii).

Miller, Mr. H. H.—*Con.*
Postmaster, Reduction of Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iv).
Ry. Commissioner, Apptmt. of Chairman B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com. on Res., 561 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Com., 5029 (iii).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 349 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rents) 6821; Miscellaneous (cement testing) 7617 (iv).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1383 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*
Acetylene Gas Explosion : *See* 'Scout.'
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 739 (i), 2414 (ii).
Atwater Bridge over Lachine Canal, Contract *re*, &c. (Ques.) 7261, 7422 (iv).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3064 (ii); in Com., 8176 (v).
——— on M. for 3° (Amt.) Dual Language, 8839 (v), Neg. (Y. 7; N. 140) 8855 (v).
——— in Com., (Alberta boundaries) 5602 (iii).
——— (B.N.A. Acts) 8526 ; Amt., Dual Language) 8530, 8613 (v).
——— (election of members) 5777 (iii).
——— (laws, courts, &c.) 8241 (v).
——— (readjustment of representation) 5756 (iii).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8425, 8441 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8505 (v).
Autonomy (Saskatchewan) B. 70 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., sec. 2 (B.N.A. Act) Amt. 8702 (v).
Autonomy *re* N.W. Ters., Cor. *re* (M. for copies) 599 (i).
——— French and English Language, Notice of Motion, 7582 (iv).
See 'Provincial,' 'Separate Schools.'
Blair, Hon. A. G., Letter *re* Resignation (M. for copy*) 601 (i).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4243 (iii).
'Canada,' Str., Expenditure *re* Equipment, Names of Employees and Payments to, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1399 (i).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 991, 1003; in Com., 629, 1091 (i).
——— Order (Ques. of) *re* Resolution, 629 (i).
Choquette, Judge, Date of Resignation, and Apptmt. to Senate (Ques.) 1344 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Clarke, Mr. E. F., Late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 2110 (ii).
Coal Contracts for Penitentiaries, Montreal Firms, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 478 (i).
Cote St. Paul Water Power, Lease to J. Frothingham (Ques.) 3360 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) on M. for 1°, 986 (i); in Com., 3208 (ii).
Fish imported into New York, Prohibition *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6191 (iv).
Fishing Rights in Estuaries, Jurisdiction by Govt. (Ques.) 1346 (i).
Godbout, Mr. J., Lighthouse-keeper, Political Partisanship *re* Dom. Elections (Ques.) 1343 (i).
Govt. Legislation (remarks) on M. to take in Wednesdays, 821 (i).
G.T. Pacific Questions, Answers by Govt. (remarks) 1595 (i).
Highland Cadet Corps, Montreal, Letter (read) 7813 (iv).
Hudson Bay Expedition, Payments of Salaries: (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6729 (iv).
Huot, Mr. J., Payments to *re* L'Ange Gardien Beach (Ques.) 1343 (i).
Ice Breaker : *See* 'Montcalm.'
Immigration and Salvation Army, Cor. *re* (Ques.) 7684 (iv).
Immigration Office, G.B., Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 592 (i).
Immigration, SS. Subsidies, Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7699 (iv).
——— Ten Years' Contract, &c., Inquiry for, 8387 (v).
See 'North Atlantic.'
Immigrants, Farmer, Bonus paid by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 7811 (iv).
Isle Bizard Wharf Abutments, Expenditure *re* (M. for ret.*) 2067 (ii).
Jacques Cartier Surveys, Cost, Reps. &c. (Ques.) 593 (i).
Joliette Ry. Surveys, Total Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1346 (i).
Kingston, Lighthouse Depot, Establishment of (Ques.) 914 (i).
Lachine Canal, Cote St. Paul, Use of Water Power (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1515 (i).
Lachine Canal Water Privilege, Lease to Wm. Parkyn, &c. (Ques.) 5132 (iii).
Levis, Purchase of Land for I.C.R. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6670 (iv).
Manufacturing Industries, Statistics *re* (remarks), 1091 (i).
Meteorological Service, Names on Pay-roll, &c. (M. for ret.*) 917 (i).
Military Hospital, St. Johns, Que., Contract *re* Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 5687 (iii).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Mint, Royal of Canada, Establishment of, Cor. with Imp. Govt. (M. for copies*) 916 (i).
——— Inquiry for, Cor. (remarks) 2595 (ii), 7424 (iv), 8387 (v).
'Montcalm,' used by Dept. for St. Lawrence Ship Channel (remarks) in Sup., 2450 (ii).
Montreal and other Harbours, Dues and Charges, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Permanent Sheds, Cor. between Govt., &c. (M. for copies) 153 (i).
Montreal Inland Revenue Building, Addition and Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1122 (i).
Montreal P. O., St. Catherine St. Branch P.O., Rents paid and Unsanitary Condition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 201 (i).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness, Collections, &c. (M. for ret.) 402 (i).
Naval Militia for Canada, Total Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1346 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., and Contract *re* Immigration (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7705 (iv).
——— Inquiry for, &c., 7906 (iv).
——— Protests *re* (remarks) 8887 (v).
See 'Immigrants.'
N.W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 8 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 464 (i).
Northwest Territories B. 160 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8769 (v).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5740 (iii), 5967 (iv).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 2534 (ii).
Parole System for Convicts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 470 (i).
Prescott Lighthouse Depot, Total Area, &c. (Ques.) 1148 (i).
Preston, W. T. R., Immigration Agent, Salary, &c., Reps., &c. (Ques.) 452 (i).
——— Employees, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 592 (i).
Provincial Autonomy *re* N.W. Ters., Cor. between Govt. of N.W.T., &c (M. for copies) 599 (i).
See 'Autonomy:'
Public Accounts Com., Meetings, &c. (remarks) 403 (i).
Public Buildings in Villages, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1101 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. Prefontaine) in Com., 1243 (i).
Quebec Harbour Works, Transfer to Marine Dept., in Com. of Sup., 771 (i).
Quebec Political Crisis, Explanation asked for, 822 (i).
Railway Commission (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1606 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Railway Commission, Official Cars, Legal Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 593 (i).
Railway Surveys in Joliette Co., Engineers, Salaries, Instructions, &c. (M. for ret.) 2065 (ii).
Royal Mint: *See* 'Mint.'
St. Francois Wharf, Expenditure *re* in Sept., Oct. and Nov., 1904 (Ques.) 1343 (i).
Ste. Genevieve and Isle Bizard, Expenditure *re*, Cor., &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 601 (1).
St. Ignace Channel Dam, Plan, &c. (Ques.) 592 (i).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Dredging, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2450 (ii).
St. Paul Land and Hydraulic Co.'s Lease, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 2777 (ii).
Salmon, Capt., Resignation, &c., on M. (Mr. Ames) for Cor., 395 (i).
'Scout' Str., Explosion of Acetylene Gas, Appnmt. of Experts on Commission (remarks) 4841 (iii).
Separate Schools, Circulars issued by Jacques Cartier Club (personal explanation) 2410 (ii).
Sorel Shipyard, Expenditure *re* Wages, Amount expended in supplies, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1399 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2457 (ii).
Statistics, Collection, &c., Information, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 1003 (i).
Submarine Signal Co., Boston, Contracts with, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 917 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 1827; (exhibitions) 1833; (Year-book) 1474 (i).
Immigration (agents, G. B., &c., salaries) 7685 (iv).
Justice—Yukon (living allowances) 128 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and France) 7094; (Canada and New Zealand 7094 (iv); (Can. and S. Africa) 979; (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 947; (Quebec and Natashquan) 967; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 950; (wrecking plant) 963 (i).
Ocean and River Service (schools of navigation) 2641 (ii).
Penitentiaries (coal contracts) 478; (parole system) 470 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—General (clerk of works) 1646 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Regina P. O.) 1639 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (museum) 761 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Actonvale) 1101; (Dom., renewals, &c.) 1107; (Grosse Isle) 1108; (Longueuil) 1113; (Magog) 1115; (Montreal, barracks) 1118; (Montreal, Inland Rev.) 1119; (Montreal P. O., improvements) 1127; (Quebec, trachoma hospital) 1138 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Grande Piles) 7327 (iv); (harbour improvements) 771 (i); (Portneuf wharf) 7314; (Repentigny wharf) 7314 (iv); (St. Lawrence Channel) 2450 (ii).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Supreme Court Rep., Delay in Printing, Cor., &c. (M. for copy*) 1398 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1341 (i).

Telegraph Lines in Canada, Americanizing of, *re* Alien Labour Act (M.) to adjn., 7642 (iv). *See* 'G.N.W.'

Trachoma Hospitals, Generally, Establishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1138 (i).

Trading Stamps Legislation, &c. (Ques.) 7020 (iv).

——— (remarks) 5134 (iii).

Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P.'

Transportation Problem and Wharf Building, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).

Vegetables, Canned, Preserved, &c.; Value of Imports, (M. for stmnt.*) 279 (i).

Verdun, Damage by Floods, Cor. from Board of Trade, Montreal (M. for copies*) 457 (i).

Veterans, 1866 and 1870, Grant of Land (remarks) 6047 (iv).

Wrecking Plant 'Lord Strathcona' in Com. of Sup., 963 (i).

Morin, Mr. J. B., *Dorchester.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5534 (iii).

Ballot Boxes, Payment to Mr. Cayouette *re* (letter read) 989 (i).

——— (remarks) 1337 (i).

'Champlain,' Str., Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 149 (i).

See 'Montcalm.'

Chateau-Richer, Expenditure by Govt. for Public Works (M. for stmnt.*) 109 (i).

——— Obstruction, Removal of (remarks) 1154 (i).

Disraeli Wharf, Wolfe Co., Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1729 (i).

Dorchester Co., Returning Officers, Appnmt. of, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 916 (i).

Drummond Co. Ry., Expenditure *re* (remarks) 1941 (i).

G. B. and Her Colonies, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2410 (ii).

I.C.R., Time Table, Connections at Montreal (remarks) 6831 (iv).

Man. Boundaries, Mgr. Sbaretti's Explanation, on M. to adyn., 4073 (iii).

'Montcalm,' Str., Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 150 (i).

See 'Champlain.'

Quebec Citadel Wall, Repairs to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6726 (iv).

St. Abdon Post Office, Establishment of, Recommendation *re* (Ques.) 6653 (iv).

Ste. Marguerite Pastmaster, Dismissal of L. Laflamme (Ques.) 6477 (iv).

Morin, Mr. J. B.—*Con.*

St. Moise Station, Population *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1979 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rents) 6822 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Lévis) 1112, (Montmagny) 1117 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Apple River wharf) 1729 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Beauce wharf) 9591 (v); (Château Richer) 7290 (iv); (Disraeli wharf) 9593 (v); (Doucet's landing) 7300 (iv); (Grande Riviere de Beaupré) 9592 (v); (Harbour commissions) 6726; (Lake St. Peter pier) 6460; (L'Ile d'Alma) 7307 (iv); (Maskinongé river) 9590 (v); (Mille Vaches) 7310; (Montmagny wharf) 7311; (Montmorency wharf) 6852 (iv); (Peribonka river) 9591; (St. Alphonse wharf) 9591 (v); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 6458 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (Mitchell bridge) 1941; (St. Cyrille, diversion of line) 1969 (i).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm., K.C.M.G. (Postmaster General), *North York, Ont.*

Alien Labour, Employment of at Sault Ste. Marie on Govt. Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1416 (i).

Atlantic Fast SS. Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 893 (i).

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3400 (ii); (C.P.R. lands) in Com., 6081 (iv).

See 'Manitoba.'

Ballot Boxes, Payment to Mr. Cayouette (remarks) 1338 (i).

Bisonnette vs. Crown, Illegal Stamping of Letters, Cor. read, in Com. of Sup., 194 (i).

Brantford Post Office Improvements, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 220 (i).

Campaign Literature and Franking by Ministers of Crown (remarks) 1809 (i).

Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 3°, 4413 (iii).

Canada and Mexico SS. Communication, &c. (remarks) 67 (i).

See 'Mexico.'

Château Richer Public Works, Dates of Payment (Ans.) 3202 (ii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F., Late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 2042 (ii).

Coldwater and Lovering Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ans.) 1848 (i), 2594 (ii).

Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4266 (iii).

Dundas, Ry. Mail Clerk, Reinstatement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).

Elevators on Welland Canal, at Port Colborne, in Com. of Sup., 1272, 1300 (i).

Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 1401 (i).

Facer Steel Car Co.'s B. 27 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 1285 (i).

Mulock, Hon. Sir William, K.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Farmington and Wilmot Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 2330 (ii).
Fessenden Wireless Tel. of Can. incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6607 (iv).
Fitz-Simons Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 6378 (iv).
Franking Privilege, Abuse of, *re* Circulars of Dental Institute (remarks) 1807 (i).
——— Use of Stamps, &c. (remarks) 5135 (iii), 5963 (iv).
Free Mail Delivery, Total Cost (Ans.) 729 (i).
Glenn Ross P.O., Abolition of (Ans.) 1149 (i).
Goderich Mail Contract, Tender *re*, &c. (Ans.) 2493 (ii).
Grain Survey Boards, Toronto and Montreal, Stmts., Names, &c. (Ans.) 910 (i).
G.T. Pacific Commission, Staff and Salaries (Ans.) 688 (i).
Green, Samuel H., Postmaster at Kaslo, B.C., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2331 (ii).
House of Commons P.O., Delay in Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 199 (i).
International Postal Supply Co., Rent of Stamping Machines (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).
Kent, Miss A., Postmistress at Kent, N.S., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2331 (ii).
Kentvale Postmaster, Sureties, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 5978 (iv).
Kingston, N.B., and Jubilee Station Mail Contract, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 5133 (iii).
Labour Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 705 (i).
Letter Carriers, Bonuses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 215 (i).
——— Payment for Sick Leave (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 176 (i).
——— Uniforms, Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
Leverette, Geo. Milton, Postmaster, Kitley, Partisan Conduct *re* Election (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6241 (iv).
Logberg Printing Co., Payments to (Ans.) 4373 (iii).
Maccan Mail Contract, Amount paid, (Ans.) 188 (i).
Mail Bags, Locks, Repairs, &c., Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 205, 209 (i).
Mail carried free by Rys, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 186 (i).
Mail Carriers, System of Payments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).
Mail Contracts, Tenders *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 179 (i).
Mail Subsidy paid to Star Line *re* River St. John (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 181 (i).
Mail Subsidies *re* Newfoundland Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).

Mulock, Hon. Sir William, K.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, M'gr. Sbarretti's Memorandum, &c. (personal explanation) 3846 (ii).
——— 'Malicious Fabrication' *re* Charges, 4035 (ii).
Manitoba Voters' Lists returned to Clerk of Crown (remarks) 1406 (i).
Melbourne and Upper Melbourne Mail Contract, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 4372 (iii).
Mexico and Canada, Exports of Canadian Goods, &c. (remarks) 897 (i).
See 'Canada and Mexico.'
Mileage *re* Mail Carriage, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 184 (i).
Ministers, Absence of (remarks) 1285 (i).
Money carried Through Mail, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 4809 (iii).
Montreal Postal Station (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1128 (i).
Montreal Post Office, Complaints *re* Registered Letters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 183 (i).
——— Illegal Stamping of Letters (cor. read) in Com. of Sup., 194 (i).
——— Improvements, New Station (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 223 (i).
——— Pneumatic System Installation, in Com. of Sup., 1134 (i).
——— St. Catherine St. Branch, Unsanitary Condition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 202 (i).
——— Stealing of Cheques, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 198 (i).
Moosejaw and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 20 (Mr. Scott) in Com., 2715 (ii).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1709 (i).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fence, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5696 (iii).
——— Papers *re* Contract, on Inquiry for Ret., 5962 (iv).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2055; on M. for 3°, 2714 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2720 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1284 (i), 2954, 3178 (ii).
Owen Sound P.O., Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1029 (i).
Père Marquette Ry., Emplymt. of Aliens, Judge Winchester's Rep. (presented) 6232 (iv).
Pneumatic Tube System, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 217 (i).
Port Arthur and Fort William Telephone System and Board of Ry. Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Copies of Cor., 1389 (i).

Mulock, Hon. Sir William, K.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1272, 1300 (i).
Postage on Newspapers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 179 (i).
Postage Stamps, Bank Notes, &c., Contracts, *re* (remarks) in Com., of Sup., 204 (i).
Postal Business, Alberta District, on M. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) for Ret., 600 (i).
Postal Rates Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 222 (i).
Postmasters acting as Dep. Ret. Officers (remarks) in Com. of Spu., 6241 (iv).
Powers, Jas., Postmaster at Wheatley River, P.E.I., Dismissal, &s., (Ans.) 4374 (iii).
P.E.I., Additional Subsidy in 1901, on Inquiry for Ret., 4811 (iii).
P.E.I. and Mainland, Delay of Mail (explanation) 2261 (ii).
——— Letter from Mr. Pottinger (read) 1153 (i).
——— (remarks) 2204 (ii).
P.E.I. Communication with Mainland, (remarks) 832 (i).
——— Contract with Steam Nav. Co. (Ans.) 5316.
——— Winter Mail Service, in Com. of Sup., 2662 (ii).
Public Works Portfolio, Appnmt. of Minister (remarks) 5961 (iv).
Ry. Act (crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 3246 (ii).
Ry. Act (express companies) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for Adjnmt., 3247 (ii).
——— (remarks) 109 (i).
Reports and Rets., on Inquiry for, 1242 (i).
Resignation of Conservative Ministers in 1896 (remarks) 835, 844 (i).
Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 103 (Mr. Tobin) on M. for 2°, 2296 (ii).
Royal Mint, Ottawa, in Com. of Sup., 618 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery, Cost of Establishment, &c., on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Rep., 2079 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 221 (i).
St. James Division Branch Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 218 (i).
St. John and St. Martin's, N.B., Mail Contract (Ans.) 2776 (ii).
Ste. Marguerite Postmaster, Dismissal of L. Laflamme (Ans.) 6477 (iv).
Sarnia Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 862 (i).
Shelburne Postmaster, Dismissal, &c., on M. (Mr. Barr) for Cor., 597 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1044 (i).
Sherbrooke, Postal Rate and Delivery (Ans.) 379 (i).
Stanhope, P.E.I., Dismissal of Postmaster Lawson (Ans.) 1062 (i).

Mulock, Hon. Sir William, K.C.M.G.—*Con.*
SUPPLY :
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1272, 1300 (i).
Civil Govt.—Labour Dept. (salaries, &c.) 100 (i); Post Office—(contingencies) 6240 (iv); (salaries) 95 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Mexico) 895 (i).
Ocean and River Service, (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 2662 (ii).
Post Office (compassionate allowance *re* Patrick Callery) 6628 (iv); (detective service) 209; (inspectors' salaries) 144; (inspector W. A. Cairns salary) 6629 (iv); (letter carriers) 173; (mail service) 5629 (iv); (provisional allowance) 166; (ry. mail clerks) 139; (salaries) 165; Yukon (mail service) 203; (salaries) 214 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 849; (Canso) 1029; (Shelburne) 1044 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Sandwich) 1579; (Toronto postal station) 1592; (Toronto warehouse) 1584 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Royal Mint) 618 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal military buildings) 1126; (Montreal P.O., improvements) 1127; (Montreal P.O., pneumatic system) 1134.
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Apple River wharf) 1730; (Harbour improvements) 774 (i).
Tay Canal, Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 1301 (i).
Telephone Systems, Investigation into: (M.) for Sel. Com., 2681, 2841 (ii).
——— (M.) to add Names, 4186 (iii).
Thessalon Postmaster, Appnmt. and Sureties (Ans.) 6106 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 6201 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Cor., 3202 (ii).
——— Further Papers *re* Irregularities (presented) 6232, 6646 (iv).
Toronto Examining Warehouse, in Com. of Sup., 1584 (i).
Toronto Postal Service, Pneumatic Tubes (remarks) 5807 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1591 (i).
Transportation Problem *re* Waterways (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1272, 1300 (i).
Trent Canal Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1471 (i).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1385 (i).
Uniforms for Letter Carriers, Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 206 (i).
Victoria Harbour Mail Contract (Ans.) 2191 (ii).
Waverley Postmaster, Duties and Residence, &c. (Ans.) 5427 (iii).
——— Personal Duties (remarks) 5807 (iii).
Welland Canal, Leases for Water Power, on M. (Mr. German) for Ret., 2098 (ii).
Wire Fencing : *See* 'N.W.T.'

Northrup, Mr. W. B., *East Hastings.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3121, 3136 (ii).
Autonomy Bill, Mr. Haultain's Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2508 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9758 (v).
Madoc and Eldorado Ry. Bonus, &c. (Ques.) 7261 (iv).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5969 (iv).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 327 (i).
Selkirk Ret. Officers, Occupation, &c. (Ques.) 1761 (i).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 713 (i).
Yukon Representation, Ret. of Member-Elect Delay (remarks) 453 (i).

Oliver, Hon. Frank (Minister of the Interior), *Edmonton.*
Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 118) 1°*, 2185 (ii).
Athabasca Ry. and Oil Co.'s incorp. (B. 117) 1°*, 2185 ; in Com., 3135 (ii).
Atlas, furnished by Interior Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9308 (v).
Auditor General's Resignation, Acceptance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6520 (iv).
Autonomy (Alberta) B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5485 ; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3152 (ii).
——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries), 5612 (iii).
——— (Compensation *re* Lands) 5817 (iii).
——— (Crown Lands), 8262 (v).
——— (distribution of seats), 7728 (iv) ; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden), 8017 (v) ; on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) *re* distribution of seats, 7771, 7818, 7938 (iv).
——— (lands vested in Crown), 5992 (iv).
——— (school clause amts.), 5865 (iii).
——— (seat of govt.), 8244 (v).
——— (subsidy to provs.), 6088 (iv).
Autonomy B. 69, in Com., on Schedules (Athabasca) 8163 ; (Cardston) 8149 ; (Edmonton city) 8160 ; (Gleichen) 8154, 8166 ; (Lethbridge) 8150 ; (Macleod) 8150 ; (Medicine Hat) 8148 ; (Saskatchewan) 8161 ; (Stony Plains) 8157 ; (Sturgeon) 8162 ; (Vermilion) 8155 (v).
Autonomy (Saskatchewan) B. 70 in Com., sec. 12 (distribution of seats) 8712 (v).
Autonomy B. 69, Attack on "Orangeism" (remarks) in Com., 5874 (iii).
——— Census *re* Rural and Town Population, &c., on Inquiry (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8092 (v).
Bell, Dr., Appnmt. as Director of Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9304 (v).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s (B. 22) 1°*, 378 ; in Com., 1100 (i).
Congdon, Mr., Appnmt. as Legal Adviser to Yukon Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7717 (iv).
Dom. Lands Act, Reglations *re* Yukon Ter., (M.) to approve, 9784 (v).
Dom. Lands Official Salaries, List read in Com. of Sup., 9290 (v).
Doncaster Indian Reserve, Abolition of (Ans.) 7812 (iv).
D. R. Fraser Co.'s incorp. (B. 119) 1°*, 2185 (ii).
Douhobor Homestead Entries *re* Village Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
Edmonton Election, Date of, &c. (remark) in Com. on B. 69, 5891 (iii).
——— Printing of Voters' Lists (remarks) 5865 (iii).
"Emigration of State Children ; Reply to Ques. (read) 5576 (iii).
Geological Survey Director, Appnmt. of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9303 (v).
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale to Mr. F. W. Grant (remarks) 6480 (iv).
——— Jurisdiction of, Memorandum (read) 6478 (iv).
Grazing Leases, &c., on Inquiry for Ret., 8530 (v).
Half-Breed Scrip, Applications from N. Ouellet, &c., Purchase of, &c. (Ans.) 9079 (v).
Half-Breed Scrip to Non-residents (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6500 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 6564 (iv).
——— (reply) to Hon. Mr. Foster, 7667 (iv).
——— Further Issue of Patents (remarks) 8003 (v).
——— Further Instructions laid on Table, 9075 (v).
——— Further Papers laid on Table, 9179 (v).
——— Inquiry for Copy of Instructions (Mr. Foster) 8181 (v).
——— Memo. from Mr. Coté (read) 6403 (iv).
——— on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Papers, 7423 (iv).
See 'Nixon.'
Homestead Entries, Bogus Applications (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9270 (v).
——— Sales to Settlers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9269 (v).
Homestead Inspectors and Govt. Officials acting as Political Organizers in N.W.T. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9256 (v).
——— Policy *re* Politicians (remarks) in Com-of Sup., 6407 (iv).
Immigration Agents, Tabulated Statement (read) 9308 (v).
Immigration, B.C., Medical Inspection, O.C., &c. (read) in Com. of Sup., 9331 (v).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
Immigration, Bonuses paid to Transportation and Booking Cos. (Ans.) 7811 (iv).
——— Bonuses to Steamships (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9318 (v).
See 'North Atlantic.'
——— Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7710 (iv).
——— Offices in G.B., Memorandum from Toronto Trade and Labour Council (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9312 (v).
Immigrants deported from Can., &c. (remarks) in Com .of Sup., 7702 (iv).
Immigrants entered at Vancouver and Victoria, Statement (read) in Com. of Sup., 9332 (v).
Immigrant Farmers, Bonuses paid by Govt. (Ans.) 7811 (iv).
Immigrants from English Workhouses, Proposal of Mr. Neill, &c. (Ans.) 6188 (iv).
Immigration of Children (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9324 (v).
Indian Agents acting as Magistrates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6546 (iv).
Indian Reserve Sales, on M. (Mr. Hughes) 6564 (iv).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6552 (iv).
Jamieson, Dr., Payment to *re* Berens Agency (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6552 (iv).
Land Titles Act (1894) Amt. (B. 162) 1° m., 6104 (iv); in Com., 9082 (v).
Leach, R. E. A., Dom. Lands Agent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9251 (v).
Lesser Slave Lake Post Office (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 8164 (v).
Meadow Creek Ranching Co., Patent *re* Lands (Ans.) 6476 (iv).
Medical Inspection *re* Indians, Payments, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6552 (iv).
Middle Forks Falls, Location of, Conditions of Sale, &c., (Ans.) 9079 (v).
Moose Mountain Indian Agency, Rep. of Inspection (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9337 (v).
Nixon, Jos., Appnmt. as Lands Agent at Macleod, N.W.T., (explanation) 6110 (iv).
——— Charges against, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8107 (v).
——— Investigation at Macleod (remarks) 9075, 9789 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to reduce Salary, 9316, 9770 (v).
See 'Half-Breed,' &c.
North Atlantic Trading Co., and Contract *re* immigration (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7705 (iv), 9320 (v).
——— prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9440 (v).
——— Contract with, *re* Immigrants (remarks) 7907 (iv), 8182 (v).
See 'Immigration.'
N.W.T., Govt. Officials, Interference in Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9717 (v).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
N.W.T., Grazing Leases, Number issued, &c. (Ans.) 5478 (iii)
Northwest Irrigation Act Amt. (B. 161) 1° m., 6104 (iv); 2° m. and in Com., 8775 (v).
Porter, S., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9252 (v).
Railway Belt Lands, B.C., Settlement of Complaints *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9296 (v).
Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Boundaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9298 (v).
Roads and Road Allowances in Alberta and Saskatchewan (B. 195) 1° m, 9075; in Com., 9525; on Sen. Amts., 9819 (v).
Russian Priests canvassing for Conservatives in Dom. Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9264 (v).
St. Lawrence Islands, Cor. *re* Disposal of, &c. (Ans.) 6477 (iv).
Salvation Army Colonies, Rider Haggard's Rep. (Ans.) 6188 (iv).
Saskatchewan Bill, Papers *re* Population, &c., Laid on Table, 8267 (v).
See 'Autonomy.'
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Issue of Patents *re* Homestead entries (Ans.) 8267, 8655 (v).
Schukin, Ivan, Cancellation of Homestead Patent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
Smart, Jas. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6419 (iv).
Stoney Indians Depleting Game, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6549 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.—Interior (mines branch) 6264 (iv); (salary increases) 9070 (v).
Dom. Lands (Banff, pamphlets *re*) 6424 (iv); (Banff Park waterworks) 9306 (v); (contingencies) 6406 (iv), 9289 (v); (homestead inspectors) 6407 (iv), 9253; (land agents) 9251; (maps, &c.) 9308; (Mines branch, smelting ore) 9303; (national boundary fence) 8672; (outside salaries) 9251 (v); (maps, printing, &c.) 6425; (roads and bridges) 6423 (iv); (salaries, outside service) 9290 (v); (surveys, maps, &c.) 6406 (iv); (surveys) 8671, 9306; (tree culture) 9298 (v).
Geological Survey (assay apparatus) 8671; (maps, &c.) 8670; (salaries) 9249; (surveys) B.C.) 8669; (surveys, &c.) 8669 (v).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6385 (iv); (agents in Can. and G.B.) 9308; (tabulated statement (read) 9308 (v); (agents, G.B., salaries) 7685 (iv) 9226; (detention hospital, B.C.) 9227 (v); (interpreters) 7701 (iv); (medical inspection, B.C.) 9331; (O.C., read) 9330; (seed grain) 9307 (v).
Indians—B.C.(Dom. exhibition at New Westminster) 9339 (v); (industrial schools) 6556 (iv) 9339 (v); (medical attendance) 6555 (iv); (miscellaneous) 9339; (Pemberton Band) 9339 (v); (travelling expenses) 6556 (iv).
Indians—General (Dr. Bryce, salary) 6558; (printing) 6558 (iv).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (annuities) 6538 (iv); (implements) 9336 (v); (live stock) 6539; statement (read) 6543; (provisions, &c.) 6550 (iv), 9338 (v); (seed grain) 6539; (surveys) 6552 (iv).

Indians—Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6517 (iv).

Indians—N.B. (medical attendance) 6516; seed grain) 6516; (salaries) 6515 (iv); (supt., salary) 9336 (v).

Indians—N.S. (general vote) 6514 (iv).

Indians—N.W.T. (inspectors) 6548 (iv).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (legal expenses) 9336; (park improvements) 9335; (Treaty No. 9) 9336 (v).

Indians—P.E.I. (medical attendance) 6538 (iv).

Miscellaneous (Alaska boundaries) 7719; (assay office, B.C.) 7721; (Keewatin lunatics) 7720; (litigation expenses) 7720; (maps, &c., N.W.T.) 7721; (Yoho park) 7719 (iv).

N.W. Ter. Govt. (Torrens system) 9249 (v).

Scientific Institutions (astronomical observatory) 9248 (v).

Yukon Ter. Govt. (additional allowance to Maj. Wood) 9250 (v); (local council grant) 7718 (iv), 9250 (v); (salaries, &c.) 7716 (iv).

Timber Licenses on Indian Lands, Govt. Procedure (Ans.) 9281 (v).

Timber Regulations *re* Cutting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9297 (v).

Toronto Observatory, Removal to Ottawa (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9249 (v).

Turriff, J. G., Employment by Govt. (Ans.) 8267 (v).

Yukon Regulations: *See* 'Dom. Lands Act.'

Yukon Ter. Orders in Council (prop. res.) 9724 (v).

Osler, Mr. E. B., *West Toronto.*

Acetylene Gas Cos., Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1053 (i).

Apples, Packing for Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 743 (i).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4404 (iii).

——— in Com., (election of members), 5766 (iii).

Autonomy Bill, Mr. Haultain's Letter to Prime Minister on M. for Sup., 2513 (ii).

Ballot Box Frauds in Dom. Elections, on M. (Mr. Porter) to Com. of Sup., 9218 (v).

Carpets purchased by Govt. for Parlt. Buildings, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 8266 (v).

Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 633 (i).

Clarke, Mr. E. F., Late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 2109 (ii).

Drummond Co. Ry., Expenditure *re* (remarks) 1941 (i).

Elevator at Port Colborne, in Com. of Sup., 1277, 1309 (i).

Estimates, Obstruction of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9272 (v).

Osler, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*

Govt. Officials and Political Organizers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9272 (v).

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3650 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Surveys, Reps. in Ry. Dept., (remarks) 2021 (ii).

Immigration of Children (remarks) in Com. of of Sup., 9324 (v).

Immigration Office in G.B., Complaints of Toronto Trade and Labour Council, Memorandum (read) 9309 (v).

I.C.R., Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1953 (i).

Japan Trade Relations with Canada, on Stmnt. (Mr. Fisher) 7913 (iv).

Killam, Judge, Appnmt. as Chairman of Commissioners (remarks) on M. for Com. on Res., 562 (i).

Labour Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 709 (i).

Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 4033 (ii).

Moncton Shops, I.C.R., Capacity, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1965 (i).

North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, Termination of (prop. res.) 9437; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 76) 9480 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9320 (v).

——— Notice of Motion, in Com. of Sup., 9329 (v).

N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Erection of Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5712 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5584 (iii).

N. W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 8 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 462 (i).

Ottawa Public Buildings, Rentals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6818 (iv).

Parole System for Convicts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 472 (i).

Pilotage Act (Quebec) Amt. B. 171 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 7444 (iv).

Plains of Abraham, Que., Erection of Tank on Martello Towers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 431 (i).

Port Colborne, Elevator on Welland Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1277, 1309 (i).

Ry. Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com. on Res., 562 (i).

Ross Rifle Factory, Tank on Martello Tower (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 431 (i).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1168 (i).

South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9345 (v).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Trent (Holland River) 9360; (surveys) 9356; (surveys of dams) 9377 (v); Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1271, 1309 (i).

Osler, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Dom. Lands (agents' salaries) 9253; (homestead inspectors) 9253 (v).

House of Commons (messengers) 248 (i).

Immigration (agents in G.B. and Can.) 7699 (iv), 9309 (v); (medical inspection, B.C.) 9229; (seed grain) 9307 (v).

Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (implements) 9337 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Marconi stations) 2870 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 974; (Quebec and Natashquan) 968; (St. John and Minas Basin) 971 (i).

Militia (pay and allowance) 431 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (fuel) 6822; (rents) 6818 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (immigration building) 1050; (St. John quarantine) 1053 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (repairs, &c.) 6816; (treasury vaults) 6825 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Country Harbour) 7398; (Cow Bay) 7399; (Culloden) 7401; (Inverness Mines) 7403 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Barrie pier) 9595 (v).

Railways—G.T.P. (salaries, &c.) 2293; (surveys, construction, &c.) 2281 (ii); (surveys, plans, &c.) 9490; (terminals, &c.) 9499 (v).

Railways—I.C.R. (Campbellton) 1969; (Drummondville improvements) 1961 (i); (general vote) 7475 (iv); (Halifax terminals) 2034 (ii); (Mitchell bridge) 1941; (Moncton accommodation) 1947; (Newcastle improvements) 1967; (rolling stock) 1986 (i), 2037 (ii), 9514 (v); (steel rails, fastenings, &c.) 1988; (Sydney Mines extension) 1987 (i).

Railways—P.E.I. (Cardigan branch) 9484 (v).

Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3653 (ii).

Toronto, Centre, Issue of Writ, Registration *re* (remarks) 3251 (ii).

Toronto Island Fog Horns, Complaints *re* (remarks) 9286 (v).

Toronto Trade and Labour Council, Memorandum *re* Immigration Office in G.B. (read) in Com. of Sup., 9309 (v).

Transportation Problem *re* Waterways, in Com. of Sup., 1277, 1309 (i).

Wire Fencing: *See* 'N.W.T.'

Paquet, Mr. E., *L'Islet.*

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. to M. for 2°, 4798 (iii).

Dom. Notes, Printing in English and French, &c. (Ques.) 6826 (iv).

Gas and Electric Light Inspection at Three Rivers, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1760 (i).

I.C.R. Time Tables, Printing in English and French (Ques.) 6827 (iv).

St. Angel, Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1759 (i).

Parent, Mr. Geo., *Montmorency.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s. Speech (seconded) 17 (i).

Parmelee, Mr. C. H., *Shefford.*

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4886 (iii).

Battleford and Lake Lenore Ry. Co.'s (B. 75) 1° m., 1671 (i).

Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8231 (v).

Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 18) 1°*, 317 (i).

Paterson, Hon. William (Minister of Customs), *Brant.*

Agricultural Imports to U.S. 1903-4 (Ans.) 909 (i).

Allans SS. Contracts *re* Cold Storage, Cor., &c. (read) in Com. of Sup., 865 (i).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 892 (i).

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3045 (ii).

——— in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8081 (v).

Autonomy B. 69, School Clause Amts, (remarks) in Com., 5870 (iii).

——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 6836 (iv).

See 'Manitoba.'

Binder Twine, Manufacture in Can. for Home Consumption (Ans.) 1759 (i).

Budget, on The, 8934 (v).

Canso, Establishment of Bait Freezers, &c. (Ans.) 1147 (i).

Cattle Embargo, &c. (remarks) in Com of Sup., 902 (i).

Cement, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9765 (v).

Cement, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8985 (v).

Civil Service Insurance Act, Statement, &c. (presented) 54 (i).

Coatsworth, Customs Collector, Salary, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 261 (i).

Customs Collections on Sunday (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 413 (i).

Customs Collector, Victoria, B.C., Appnmt. of, &c. (Ans.) 271 (i).

Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 190 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9764 (v).

Discrimination *re* Freight Rates, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 889 (i).

Dumping Clause, Amts. to (remarks) in Com. on B. 190, 9767 (v).

——— Customs, Instructions *re*, on M. (Mr. Kemp) for Copies, 695 (i).

Dredges imported, Entries at Customs, &c. (remarks) *re* Ques. of Mr. Bennett, M.P., 5596 (iii).

Paterson, Hon. William—*Con.*
Dredging Plant, &c., Imported into Canada, Valuation, &c. (Ans.) 5425 (iii).
Edmonton Election, Opposition to Min. of Int. (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5884 (iii).
Fisher, P. G., Retirement, &c. (Ans.) 264 (i).
Furness, Withy & Co., Contract *re* S. African Trade, in Com. of Sup., 971 (i).
Hamilton Cove P.O., Mail Service and Revenue (Ans.) 7422 (iv).
Harvey, N.B., Customs Collector, Appnmt. of (Ans.) 9697 (v).
Hay exported from Quebec to Boston, Number of Tons (Ans.) 689, 1065 (i).
Herring Industry, &c. at Canso, &c. (Ans.) 1147 (i).
Imports and Exports, Total Amount for Home Consumption, 1904 (Ans.) 380 (i).
Imports from United Kingdom, Amounts, &c. (Ans.) 267 (i).
McMichael, Mr., Customs Inspector, Duties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 406 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions, Information *re* System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 923 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, Mr. Borden's Visit to Bishop Langevin in Winnipeg, &c., 4020 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 4018 (ii).
Meteorological Building, Toronto, Erection of (Ans.) 1149 (i).
Morrison, Hector D., Customs Officer, Pinette, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2330 (ii).
Oats, Rolled, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9764 (v).
Preferential Tariff, Amounts, Volue of Imports, &c. (Ans.) 152 (i).
Prescott Lighthouse Depot, Total Area, &c. (Ans.) 1149 (i).
Pub. Accounts (presented) 50 (i).
'Reptile Press,' &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1576 (i).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. S. Hughes) 5209 (iii).
Revenue collected in N.W. Ters., on M. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) for Ret., 601 (i).
Rolled Oats : *See* 'Oats.'
Rouse, David, Appnmt. as Customs Collector, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 452 (i).
Ste. Famille Wharfage Dues, Abolition of (Ans.) 1150 (i).
St. François and Quebec SS. Subsidy, Request *re* (Ans.) 1504 (i).
Saskatchewan, Prov. of : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Sault Ste. Marie Bonded Warehouse for Soft Coal, Establishment of (Ans.) 5688 (iii).
Savage Harbour, P.E.I., Proposed Improvement (Ans.) 3361 (ii).
Shaw, Mr. J. B., Retirement, &c. (Ans.) 264 (i).

Paterson, Hon. William—*Con.*
S. Africa and Can SS. Subsidy, Contract *re* in Com. of Sup., 971 (i).
Supply (M.) for Com., 50 (i)
SUPPLY :
Chinese Immigration (salaries, &c.) 981 (i).
Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 77, 90; Customs (contingencies) 405; (salaries) 78 (i), 9069 (v); Finance (salaries) 78; Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office (salaries) 70; Sec. of State (salaries) 74; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 96 (i).
Customs (commutation *re* navy and army) 6724 (iv); (contingent expenses) 256 (i); (Foote, J., gratuity, &c.) 6434 (iv); (inspectors' salaries) 405 (i); (remission of duty *re* army and navy goods) 6812 (iv); (revenue cruisers) 409 (i); (Shadwell, Mrs. J. B., gratuity) 6435; (Turner, Mrs. J., gratuity, &c.) 6435 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and G.B.) 967 ; (Baddeck and East Bay) 934 ; (Canada and G.B.) 864; (Canada and Mexico) 895; Canada & South Africa) 971; (Grand Manan and Mainland) 922; (Halifax and Canso) 937; (Halifax and Liverpool) 902; (Halifax and Nfld.) 906; (Magdalen Islands) 906; (Manchester Line) 932; (Montreal, Quebec and G. B.) 932; (Murray Bay and Riv. Ouelle) 938; (Paspébiac and Gaspé) 944; (Petit de Grat) 966; (Pictou and Cheticamp) 935; (Pictou and Montague Bridge) 926; (Port Mulgrave, &c.) 934; (P.E.I. and G. B.) 927 ; (P. E. I. and Mainland) 920 ; (P. E. I. and Newfoundland.) 940 ; (Port Mulgrave and Canso) 935; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 936; (Quebec and Gaspé) 926; (Quebec and Natashquan) 967; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 948; (St. John, N.B. and Belfast) 902; (St. John and Digby) 904, 966; (St. John, N.B., and Glasgow) 902; (St. John and Halifax) 923; (St. John, Halifax and London) 904; (St. John and Minas Basin) 926, 971; (St. John and Westport) 966; (St. Stephen and Black Bay) 936; (Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence) 937; (Victoria and San Francisco) 906; (Victoria and Vancouver) 938; (wrecking plant) 957 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 848 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Bridgeburg) 1550 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Printing Bureau) 1575 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (semaphores) 1986 (i).
Thompson, Capt. Thos., Dismissal as Preventive Officer (Ans.) 1763 (i).
Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 321 (i).
Trade and Navigation Rep. (presented) 50 (i).
Watson, Mr., Customs Collector at Collingwood, Superannuation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 408 (i).
Ways and Means (M.) for Com., 50 (i).
Woodstock Armoury, Ownership of Land, &c. (Ans.) 4921 (iii).
Wrecking Plant, 'Lord Strathcona', in Com. of Sup., 957 (i).
Yukon Customs, Living Allowances (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 411 (i).

Perley, Mr. G. H., *Argenteuil.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3739 (ii).

——— in Com. (distribution of seats) 7735; (iv); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8072 (v); on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7864, 7970 (iv).

Carillon Canal Fishway, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 2064 (ii).

——— Establisment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2910 (ii).

Carillon Works, Emplymt. of Labourers, Affidavit read *re* Political Influence (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6856 (iv).

Greece's Point Wharf, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2063 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7301 (iv).

Grenville Canal, Appnmt, of Supt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1509 (i).

Grenville Canal Wharf, Price of Lumber (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1514 (i).

Hull Wharf, Total Cost, (Ques.) 2064 (ii).

Immigrants, Austrian, Stranded at Ottawa, (remarks) 4845 (iii).

Lumber purchased by Govt., Prices paid, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2711 (ii).

Militia Orders *re* Civil Servants (remarks) 1260 (i).

Ottawa Buildings and Civic Taxation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1663 (i).

Ottawa Improvement Commission, Number of Employees (Ques.) 382 (i).

Parry Sound Buoy Contract, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2858 (ii).

Ry. Act (1903)—(highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 281, 308 (i).

Railway Commission Board, Names of Employes, &c. (M. for ret.*) 403 (i).

Robert & Co., Lumber purchased from, Prices (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2711 (ii).

Saw Logs, Export Duty (remarks) on M. for Sup., 752 (i).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Grenville (guide piers) 1499; (inspection) 1509 (i).

Fisheries (protection service) 2910 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 2611 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (rentals &c.) 1663; Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Apple River) 1727 (i); Que. (East Templeton) 7300; (Montmorency wharf) 6856 (iv).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of (prop. res.) 1351, 1383 (i).

——— (M.) for special Com., 8636 (v).

——— Rep. (presented) 9392 (v).

——— (M.) to conc. 9522 (v).

Wharfs in N.S., Expenditure *re* (remarks) 2611 (ii).

Wharfs, Policy of Govt. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1727 (i).

Piche, Mr. C., *Montreal, St. Mary's.*

Central Trunk Ry. Co.'s (B. 81) 1°*, 1671 (i).

Halifax Fishery Award, Amount received by Can. Govt. (Ques.) 8886 (v).

Montreal Bridge Terminal Co.'s (B. 138) 1°*, 4550; 2° m., 4703 (iii).

Montreal Grain Warehouses, Preparation of Plans (Ques.) 1345 (i).

——— Grain Conveyors, Engineers' Plans, &c. (Ques.) 2187 (ii).

——— Permanent Sheds, Plans *re*, Preparation of (Ques.) 2186 (ii).

Montreal Postal Facilities, East End Extension (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).

Ottawa River Ry. Co.'s Change of Name (B. 81) 1°*, 1671 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal P.O., Pneumatic system) 1133 (i).

Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 8696 (v).

Pickup, Mr. S. W. W., *Annapolis.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Victoria beach) 7418 (iv).

Porter, Mr. E. G., *West Hastings.*

Autonomy Bill No. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4726 (iii); in Com., sec. 16 (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8474 (v).

Ballot Box Frauds in West Hastings Dom. Elections, on M. for Sup., 9199 (v).

Criminal Code, 1892 (summary appeals) Amt. (B. 66) 1°* 1336 (i); 2° m., 4260; in Com., 4260; Amt. in Com., 5137 (iii); 3° m., 9699 (v).

Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9425 (v).

Glenn Ross P.O., Abolition of, &c. (Ques.) 1149 (i).

Oxford Elections, Resignation of Mr. D. D. McKenzie (remarks) in Com. on Autonomy Bill, 8474 (v).

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond (Minister of Marine and Fisheries), *Maisonneuve.*

"Acadia," Str., Disposal of Fittings, &c. (Ans.) 1849 (i).

Acetylene Gas Lights, Number, Annual, Saving &c. (Ans.) 1593 (i).

See 'Carbide,' 'Scout.'

Advances by O.C., Total Amount (Ans.) 267 (i).

'Agnes G. Donohue' Schr. Seizure of (remarks) 1508 (i).

Aids to Navigation, Res. from Boards of Trade, Programme (read) in Com. of Sup., 6641 (iv).

American Fishermen on N.S. Coasts, Protection *re* (remarks) 7908 (iv).

Anticosti Lightships, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1350 (i).

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*
Atlantic Fisheries Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 270 (i).
Beaujeu Bank Pier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Bicquet Lighthouse Keeper, Name, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 3202 (ii).
Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Conspiracy, &c., Denials, &c., 544 (i).
British American Fish Corporation, Lease to *re* N. Western Lakes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).
Bronte Light, Installation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2869 (ii), 9176 (v).
Brother's Light, Salary of Keeper (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2702 (ii).
'Canada-Cape Breton,' Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2625 (ii).
Carbide purchased for Lighthouses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2710, 2743 (ii).
Carillon Dam Fishway, Establishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2911 (ii).
Castonguay, Dismissal and Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 5689 (iii).
'Champlain' Str., Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 150 (i).
See 'Ice Breaker,' 'Montcalm.'
Cold Storage Bait Freezers, Location, Number, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Ret., 1770 (i).
——— Amount expended (Ans.) 1505 (i).
Cowie, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. *re* Herring Experiments (Ans.) 5425 (iii).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3210 (ii).
Fish-breeding Establishments in Lake Winnipeg (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6636 (iv).
Fishery Overseers, Colchester Co., N.S., Number and Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 5978 (iv).
Fisheries Protection Service, Enforcement of the Law (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6633 (iv).
——— Steamers, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1347 (i).
——— Service, Weekly, &c., Pay-roll, Amt. of Payments (Ans.) 1350 (i).
Fishing Regulations in Ont., Conflict with Dom. (remarks) 4752 (iii).
Fishing Rights in Estuaries, Jurisdiction *re* (Ans.) 1347 (i).
Fish imported into New York, Legislation *re* Prohibition of, on M. (Mr. Demers) to Com. of Sup., 6190 (iv).
Godbout, Mr. J., Lighthouse-keeper, Political Partisanship (Ans.) 1343 (i).
Govt. Steamers, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 1349 (i).
——— Estimate of Expenditure (read) 2597 (ii).
——— Purchase of Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2617 (ii).

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*
Govt. Steamers, Purchases of Supplies, Statement (read) 2619 (ii).
Grain Warehouses, Montreal, Preparation of Plans (Ans.) 1345 (i).
Halifax Fishery Award, Amount received by Can. Govt. (Ans.) 8886 (y).
——— Distribution *re* Provinces (Ans.) 1593 (i).
Halifax Lightship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2709 (ii).
Harbour controlled by Commissioners, Names &c., (Ans.) 1063 (i).
Herring and Lobster Industry, Investigation, &c., Rep. *re* (Ans.) 4371, 5425 (iii).
Hodgins, Jonathon, Resignation from Harbour Commission, Montreal (Ans.) 151 (i).
Hospital Dues *re* Sick Mariners (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2687 (ii).
Hurley, J. M., Fishery Inspector (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2895 (ii).
Icebreaker 'Montcalm', Accident to (statement) 4752 (iii).
See 'Montcalm.'
Lake Manitoba Closed to Fishing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2901 (ii).
Lemieux, Jos., Appnmt. to Lightship Service (Ans.) 1762 (i).
Lepreaux Point Lightkeeper, Dismissal, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 6475 (iv).
Life-saving Crew, Grand Manan, N.B., Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 4921 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service Steamers, Ports of Call, &c. (Ans.) 1850 (i).
Lighthouse Depot at Prescott, Contract *re* Erection (Ans.) 1340 (i).
Lighthouse Supply Depots (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2710 (ii).
Lobster Fishing, N.B., Open Season in 1903-4-5 (Ans.) 1504 (i).
Lowe, Mr., Refusal *re* Ship 'Neptune' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6472 (iv).
Lumber purchased by Govt., Quantity and Prices, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2711 (ii).
'Lurcher,' Lightship, Accident to, Statement (read) 2851 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2747 (ii).
See 'Salmon.'
'Maisonneuve' Str., Expenditure *re* by Govt. (Ans.) 1850 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2745 (ii).
Manitoba Lake, Closing *re* Fishing, &c., Protests, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6631 (iv).
Marconi Stations, List of Stations (read) 2869 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6625 (iv).
——— System on Strs. 'Stanley' and 'Minto,' &c. (Ans.) 188 (i).

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*
Marconi Station, Table Head, Delay in Operating (Ans.) 383 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 111 (i), 2594 (ii).
Marine Insurance, Decrease in Rates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2865 (ii).
Marine Supplies, Purchase of, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 2594 (ii), 4753 (iii).
Markey, F. H., Fishing Rights in Western Lakes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).
Meteorological Survey, Toronto, Removal to Ottawa (statement) 9812 (v).
Midland Govt. Dock, Tenants, Rent, &c., (Ans.) 5482 (iii).
Midland Dock, on Protest (Mr. Bennett) *re* Govtl. Action (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9559 (v).
Midland Harbour Range Lights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2734 (ii).
——— Statement (read) 2852 (ii).
'Montcalm,' Accident to (statement) 4752 (iii).
——— rep. of Capt. Koenig (read) 2451 (ii).
——— Experiments *re* Ice-breaking (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6626 (iv).
——— Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 150 (i).
See 'Champlain.'
Montevideo, Seamen in, Imprisonment, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2689 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners (B. 192) 1° m., 9028; in Com., 9288 (v).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Appnmt. of Commissioners (Ans.) 150 (i).
Montreal Harbour, Grain Conveyers, Engineers' Plans, &c. (Ans.) 2187 (ii).
——— Sheds, Cor. between P. W. St. George and Mar. Dept. *re*, on M. (Mr. Ames) 693 (i).
——— Sheds, Plans and Specifications *re* (Ans.) 2187 (ii).
——— Raising of Sunken Elevator (Ans.) 151 (i).
Montreal Inland Revenue Building, Addition, Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1123 (i).
Moose Lake, License to Fish (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).
Ocean and River Service Strs., Names and Tonnage, &c. (Ans.) 1348 (i).
——— Total Expenditure on Pay-roll (Ans.) 1349 (i).
Oshawa Harbour Revenue (Ans.) 1504 (i).
Parry Sound Buoy Contract, Statement (read) 2856 (ii).
Parry Sound Gas Plant, Purchase of Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2726 (ii).
Pilotage Act Amt. (B. 171) 1° m., 7018; 2° and in Com., 7440 (iv).
Pilotage Commission, Sydney Harbour, Benefit Fund for Pilots, &c. (remarks) 9037 (v).
Pound Net Licenses issued by Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2892 (ii).

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*
P.E.I. Fisheries, Supervision *re* (Ans.) 1762 (i).
P.E.I. Mail Service, Ice Boats, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2673 (ii).
——— Statement of Trips made (read), 2675
P.E.I. and Mainland SS. Communication, Inspection of 'Stanley' (Ans.) 687 (i).
——— (remarks) 1338 (i).
P.E.I. Steam Communication with Mainland (remarks) 1595 (i).
P.E.I. and Mainland Winter Service, Delegation *re* Tunnel, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6644 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. (B. 37) 2° m., 1242; in Com., 1243 (i).
Reid, Capt., Rep. *re* Submarine Signals (read) 2886 (ii).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 1242 (i), 2263 (ii).
St. George, Mr. P. W., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 152 (i).
St. Lawrence Channel Improvements, Aids to Navigation, 2859 (ii).
——— Allan SS. Co., Res. *re* (read) 2860 (ii).
——— Res. from Montreal Board of Trade (read) 2860 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Ship Channel, Rep. of Capt. Koenig, *re* 'Montcalm' (read) 2451 (ii).
——— Suction Dredge, Description *re* (read) in Com. of Sup., 6447 (iv).
See 'Sorel.'
Salmon Canning Fisheries, B.C., Suspension, &c., Representations, &c. (Ans.) 270 (i).
Salmon, Capt., Rep. of Mr. Douglas Stevens in Answer to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2878 (ii).
——— Rep. *re* 'Lurcher' Accident (laid on table) 2878 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Ames) for Cor., 388 (i).
See 'Lurcher,' 'Stevens.'
Salmon Hatcheries and Provincial Fishing Licenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2906 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie Dry Dock Construction, Total Amount expended (Ans.) 5427 (iii).
'Scout' Str., Claims *re* Compensation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6463 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2700 (ii).
Seamen's Act Amt. (B. 147) 1°*, 4750 (ii); 2° m., and in Com., 7424 (iv), 9030 (v).
——— Victoria Board of Trade, Res. (read) 7432 (iv).
Seamen's Act Amt. (B. 38) 2° m., and in Com., 2114-5 (ii); wthdrn., 4749 (iii).
Seamen's Act B. 38, Memo from Victoria Board of Trade (read) 2117 (ii).
'Seguin,' Str., Purchase by Govt. (Ans.) 3834 (ii).
Small-pox, on Ships, Prevention, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*

Sorel Shipyards, Dredge Building, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6450 (iv).

——— Purchase of Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2457 (ii).

South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9587 ; on Sen. Amts., 9815 (v).

Steam Communication with P.E.I., Delay in Mails, &c. (telegram read) 1753 (i).

Steel Sheds, Montreal Harbour, Approval of Plans, &c. (Ans.) 151 (i).

Stevens, Douglas, Answer to Capt. Salmon's Rep. *re* Lurcher Accident, in Com. of Sup., 2878 (ii).

Submarine Signalling Bell, Shore Stations, Reps. of U.S., &c. (read) 2871 (ii).

——— Rep. of Capt. Reid (read) 2886 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 102 (i), 2443 (ii), 6266 (iv), 9050 (v).

Fisheries (bait freezers, Mar. Provs.) 9620 (v) ; (bounty distribution) 6636 (iv); (dog-fish experiments) 9173 (v) ; (fish-breeding stations) 6636 (iv) ; (fish curing) 9173 ; (Fishery Commission) 9172 (v) ; (hatcheries) 2904 (ii) ; (inspectors' disbursements) 6630 (iv) ; (inspectors' salaries) 2878, 2890 ; (oyster culture) 2912 (ii) ; (protection cruiser 'Petrel') 6630 (iv) ; (protection service) 2907 (ii) ; (Venning, R. N., honorarium) 6630 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies) 2705 ; (aids to navigation) 2759, 2850, 2859 (ii) ; ('Arctic' patrol boat) 9177 (v) ; (buoys) 2730 ; (engineers' salaries) 2760 (ii) ; (ice boats) 9177 (v) ; (keeper's salaries) 2697 (ii) ; (lighthouse repairs) 6636 (iv), 9035 ; (light-keepers salaries) 9175 (v) ; (maintenance, lightship) 2706 ; (Marconi stations) 2869 (ii) ; (Parry Sound buoy) 9175 (v) ; (pilotage) 2760 (ii) ; (Port Arthur, &c., fog alarms) 6645 ; ('Scout,' repairs) 6643 (iv) ; (signal service) 2760 : (submarine signals) 2871 (ii) ; (N. W. M. Police patrol boat) 9178 ; (wrecking plant, Mar. Provs.) 9177 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Mexico) on conc., 6910 (iv).

Marine (hospitals) 9172 ; (naval militia) 9178 (v) ; (St. John, N.B.) 6628 (iv) ; (sick seamen) 2686, 2688 (ii).

Ocean and River Service ('Aberdeen' boilers) 6464; (Arctic expedition) 6468 (iv); (examination of masters and mates) 2623 : (Govt. steamers) 2595 (ii) ; (Harrison. Capt., allowance, &c.) 6466 (iv) ; (hydrographic surveys) 2679 (ii), 6623; (ice breaking steamers) 6464 (iv), 9034, 9617 (v) ; (life-saving rewards) 2624 (ii); (Mr. Lowe's honorarium) 6473; (maintenance *re* steamers) 6463 (iv) ; (meteorological service) 2679 ; (obstruction, removal) 2647 (ii) ; ('Quadra' repairs) 9171 (v) ; (schools of navigation) 2639 ; (tidal surveys) 2648 (ii) ; (winter mail service) 6467 (iv) ; (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 2648 (ii) ; (wrecks investigation) 6466 (iv).

Public Works Buildings—Que. (Montreal barracks) 1118 ; (Montreal Inland Rev.) 1123; (Montreal military buildings) 1126

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Dredges (new plant) 9171 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (compensation to Jos. Paul) 6463 (iv); (Lake St. Peter piers) 6453 (iv), 9171 (v) ; (St. Lawrence channel) 2448 (ii); (St. Lawrence ship channel (suction dredge) 6436 (iv).

Scientific Institutions (hydrographic surveys) 9172; (purchase of steamer) 9172 (v).

Steamboat Inspection (gratuities) 6628 (iv) ; (salaries) 2695 (ii).

Toronto Island Fog Horns, Testing, &c., Complaints *re* (remarks) 9283 (v).

Transportation Commission, Progress *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6438 (iv).

Verdun, Protection *re* Floods, on M. (Mr. Monk for Cor., 459 (i).

Vessels, Registered, List of : Rep. (presented) 6907 (iv).

Wireless Telegraph Regulation (B. 186) 1° m., 8177; in Com., 9031 (v).

Pringle, Mr. R. A.. *Stormont.*

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4273 (iii).

——— in Com. (readjustment of representation) 5762 (iii).

——— (school clause amt.) 7172 (iv).

Ballots, Dom Elections, Printing, &c. for Carleton, Glengarry, &c. (Ques.) 587 (i).

Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 641 (i).

Cornwall Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1554, 1659 (i).

Cornwall Basin, Dredging Contract, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 588 (i).

——— Dredging, Contract *re*, Advertising (Ques.) 686 (i).

——— Employees during Election Campaign (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1224 (i).

——— Employees for October and Nov., 1904 (Ques.) 107 (i).

Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9759 (v).

Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s (B. 92) in Com., 5736 (iii). 5963 (iv) 5971.

Port Burwell Work, Contractor, Prices paid, &c. (Ques.) 589 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Contract *re* Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1410 (i).

——— Dredging, U.S. and Canadian Contractors, Prices paid, &c. (Ques.) 589 (i).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Galops (channel completion) 1230, Sault Ste. Marie (oenstruction) 1410; (Welland (obstruction, &c.) 1231; (Port Colborne, deepening) 1232; (Port Colborne, entrance) 1230; Welland (surveys) 1234 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Chatham armoury) 1552; (Cobourg armoury) 1558 (i).

Welland Canal Deepening, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 588 (i).

Proulx, Mr. E., *Prescott.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) in Com. (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8515 (v).

Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4271 (iii).

Reid, Mr. J. D., *Grenville.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5301 (iii).

Burritt's Rapids Locks, Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 8384 (v).

Canada Eastern Ry., Total Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1923 (i).

Cardinal Canal Swing Bridge and Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1418 (i).

Dredging Contracts, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1419 (i).

Maps, Sale by Govt., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1476 (i).

St. Lawrence Channel, Capt. Leslie's Wrecking Plant, Bonus to, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2476 (ii).

St. Louis Exhibition, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1832 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 1832 (i).

Canals—Cornwall (lock repairs) 1494; Galops (leakage) 1492; Welland (stone protection) 1497; Williamsburg (steam plant) 1494 (i).

Indians—Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6521 (iv).

Quarantine (Grosse Isle steamer) 1839; (public health organized districts) 1843; (Public Works, Health Act) 1845; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 1845 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (Sydney accommodation) 1912 (i).

Riley, Mr. G., *Victoria City, B.C.*

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) on M. for 3°, 9041 (v).

Roche, Mr. Wm., *Halifax.*

'Agnes Donahoe,' Schr., Seizure by Uruguay Govt., Telegram (read) 6137 (iv).

Canadian Fast Mail Service, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to adjn., 9781 (v).

Halifax Lightships (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2708 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers, N.S., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9573 (v).

'Lady Laurier,' Number of Crew, Names (read) 2665 (ii).

Militia Act (permanent force) Amt. B. 170 (Sir Frederick Borden) on M. for 2°, 9186 (v).

Montevideo, British Seamen, Imprisonment (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2691 (ii).

Musquodoboit Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6226 (iv).

See 'Stewart.'

North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9476 (v).

Roche, Mr. Wm.—*Con.*

St. John, Halifax and W. Indies Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iv).

Stewart, Mr. J. S., Charges against (remarks) 9614 (v).

See 'Musquodoboit.'

SUPPLY :

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lightship maintenance) 2708 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and W. Indies) 7190 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Phinney's Cove) 9573; (Porter's Lake) 9583 (v).

Railways—I.C.R. (Halifax terminals) 2036 (ii).

Roche, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*

Acreage in Provisional Districts of Alberta, Sask., &c., Disposed of, &c. (M. for ret.*) 601 (i).

Alberta District, Postal Business, &c. (M. for ret.) 599 (i).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5563 (iii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3672 (ii).

——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5624 (iii).

——— in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8038, 8083 (v).

——— on M. for 3°, Amt. (distribution of seats) 8860 (v).

Autonomy Bill, Mr. Haultain's Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2524 (ii).

——— Schedules, Population and Votes cast (remarks) 5575 (iii).

British America Fish Co., Contract *re* Fishing in Western Lakes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).

Cattle Quarantine, Man., System *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2316 (ii).

Fish-breeding Establishments in Lake Winnipeg (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6635 (iv).

Fishing Rights in Nelson River, &c., Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).

Glanders among Horses, Jurisdiction *re* Compensation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6705 (iv).

G. T. P. Ry., Route proposed West of Winnipeg, Plans, &c. (Ques.) 729 (i).

Homestead Inspectors acting as Liberal Organizers (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 9254 (v).

See 'Nixon.'

Immigration, Govt. Policy *re* bonusing Steamships (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9318 (v).

Indian Agents acting as Magistrates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6550 (iv).

Lake Manitoba closed to Fishing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2901 (ii).

Lake Winnipeg Fish Hatcheries, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2905 (ii).

Leach, R. E. A., Dom. Lands Agent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9252 (v).

Roche, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*
Leach, Mr. (Ques.) 1065 (i).
Logberg Printing Co., Winnipeg, Payments to (Ques.) 4373, 4457 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Pets., &c., *re* (M. for copies) 1768 (i).
——— Res. passed by Man. Legislature (remarks) 4082 (ii).
Manitoba Lake, Closing *re* Fishing, Protests, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6751 (iv).
Markey, F. H., Lease *re* Fishing Rights in N.W. Lakes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).
Marquette Voters' Lists, Original Copy (M. for copy*) 97 (i).
Milk River Ranche Co., Quarantine *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2312 (ii).
Minnedosa Drill Hall, Representations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9170 (v).
Moose Lake, License to Fish (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).
Nixon, Mr., Dom. Lands Agent, Charges against, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8122 (v).
See 'Homestead.'
North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonus *re* Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9318 (v).
North Thompson River, B.C., Improvements, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 5783 (iii).
Northwest Ters., Surveys, Number of Miles, Total Cost, &c. (M. for ret.) 1396 (i).
Postal Business, Alberta District (M. for ret.) 599 (i).
Ret. Officers, Deputy, Payments *re*, Letter from Mr. E. Walker (read) 6560 (iv).
Revenue collected, Customs and Inland Rev., in N.W. Ters., &c. (M. for ret.) 600 (i).
Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Boundaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9298 (v).
Russian Priests canvassing for Conservatives in Dom. Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9264 (v).
Saskatchewan, Prov. of: *See* 'Autonomy.'
SUPPLY:
Customs (collectors' salaries) 407 (i).
Dom. Lands (land agents) 9252; (tree culture) 9298 (v).
Fisheries (fish-breeding stations) 6635 (iv); (hatcheries) 2905 (ii); (inspectors' disbursements) 6630 (iv); (inspectors' salaries) 2896 (ii).
Immigration (agents' salaries) 9318 (v).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (annuities) 6538; (live stock) 6539 (iv).
Indians—Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6518 (iv).
Justice—Man. (judges' salaries, &c.) 123; Yukon (living allowances) 129 (i).
Legislation—Franchise Act (voters' lists) 6898 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Fernie) 1641 (i).
Roche, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 1634; (Dom. renewals) 1634; (Winnipeg, immigration) 1635; (Winnipeg, militia) 1635; (Winnipeg P.O.) 1636; (Virden drill hall) 1634 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Edmonton jail) 1638; (Moosejaw) 1638; (Regina P.O.) 1640 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Dauphin) 7569 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines—N.W.T. (Qu'Appelle and Edmonton) 6893; Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 6896 (iv).
Quarantine (cattle) 2312 (ii); (contagious diseases, Man.) 1843; (Winnipeg, &c., Hospitals) 1846 (i).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1368 (i).
Voters' Lists for Man. Constituencies, Printing, &c. (Ques.) 60 (i).
——— Printing and Proof-reading, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6898 (iv).
See 'Marquette.'
Water Rights Reservations, N.W.T., Rep. of Mr. Burley, &c. (M. for copies*) 1398 (i).
Young, Thos., and McNab, G. C., Homestead Inspectors, Canvassing for Liberal Candidate (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9254 (v).
See 'Homestead.'
Ross, Mr. D., *Yale-Cariboo.*
Autonomy Bill, Separate Schools Pets. (remarks) 2319 (ii).
Man. Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 4068 (ii).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2050 (ii).
Railway Belt Lands, B.C., Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9296 (v).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) in Com., 1777 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Navigation Co.'s (B. 139) Pet. (presented) 3743 (ii); 1°*, 4550; 2° m., 4700 (iii); in Com., 8315, 8637; 3° m., 8818, 9040 (v).
Schaffner, Mr. F. L., *Souris.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2° 4622 (iii).
Autonomy Bill, Mr. Haultain's Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2548 (ii).
Binder Twine Industry at Kingston, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 483 (i).
Boissevain Postmaster, Mr. A. McKnight, Dismissal &c. (Ques.) 2327 (ii).
Man. Public Buildings, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 857 (i).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6771 (iv).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 346 (i).

Schaffner, Mr. F. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 857 (i) ; Roads and Bridges—N.W.T. (colonization roads) 7597, 7598 (iv).

Timber Licenses on Indian Lands, Govt. Procedure (Ques.) 9280 (v).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1373 (i).

Schell, Mr. J. T., *Glengarry.*

Great Northern Ry. of Canada (B. 71) in Com., 4258 (iii).

Schell, Mr. M. S., *South Oxford.*

Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 680 (i), 2435 (ii).

Brantford and Woodstock Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 63) 1°*, 1241 (i).

Canadian Cattle, Embargo in G.B., on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Com., 9015 (v).

Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5007 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. 1179 (i).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1366 (i).

Scott, Mr. W., *West Assiniboia.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5502 (iii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3591 (ii).

——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries), 5627 (iii).

——— (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8598 (v).

——— (C.P.R. lands) 6058 (iv).

——— (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8073 (v).

——— on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7772, 7891, 7924 (iv).

——— (election of members), 5777 (iii).

——— (lands vested in Crown), 6010 (iv).

——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8509.

——— (seat of govt.) 8245 (v).

——— (subsidy to provs.) 6099 (iv).

——— on M. for 3°, Amt. (C.P.R. taxes) 8777; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* schools, 8809 (v).

Autonomy (Saskatchewan) B. 70, in Com. (distribution of seats) 8711 8725 ; in Com. on schedule (Grenfell) 8757 ; (Lumsden) 8757; on M. for 3°, 8866 ; (Amt.) 8873 ; Neg. (Y. 11 ; N. 126) 8881 (v).

Autonomy B. 69, Edmonton Election, Date of Contest, &c. (remarks) in Com., 5890 (iii).

——— Statement *re* Net Revenue of Public Lands in N.W.T. (read) 5505 (iii).

Edmonton Election, Voters' Lists *re* (remarks) in Com. on Bill 69, 5853 (iii).

Scott, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Moosejaw and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s (B. 20) 1°*, 317 (i) ; in Com., 2715, 2762 (ii).

Northwest Territories Elections, Interference of Govt. Employees (remarks) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* B. 156, 8772 (v).

Northwest Territories Representation Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8769 (v).

Regina and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 41) 1°*, 625 (i).

Saskatchewan Bridge Co.'s (B. 111) 1°*, 2184 (ii).

Sifton, Hon. C., *Brandon.*

Autonomy Bill, B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3092 (ii).

Resignation, Personal Explanation, 1851 (i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 2447 (ii).

Sinclair, Mr. J. H., *Guysborough.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5121 (iii).

Binder Twine, Home Consumption, Manufacture in Can., &c. (Ques.) 1759 (i).

Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4262 (iii).

Fog Horn Nuisance at Toronto Island (remarks) 9287 (v).

Lifeboat Crews, N.S., Number, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 912 (i).

'Lurcher' Lightship, Accidents to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2754 (ii).

Presbyterian College Board (B. 123) 1°*, 2681 (ii).

Public Buildings, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).

Safety of Ships (B. 21) 1° m., 319 ; in Com., 731 (i).

Small-pox Epidemic in N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (hatcheries) 2907 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lightkeeper salaries) 2698 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 974 ; (Port Mulgrave and Canso) 936 (i).

Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 2688 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Canso) 1033 (i) ; Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Half Island cove) 9584 ; (Tatamagouche) 9579 (v).

Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 9513 (v).

Steamboat Inspection (fees *re*) 2696 (ii).

Sloan, Mr. W., *Comox-Atlin.*

Esquimalt Naval Station, Abandonment by Imp. Govt (Ques.) 188 (i).

G.T. Pacific Ry., Surveys, B.C., Information *re* (Ques.) 3009 (ii).

Sloan, Mr. W.—*Con.*
Halibut Fisheries, B.C., American Encroachments, &c. (Ques.) 585 (i).

Smith, Mr. R., *Nanaimo.*
Alien Labour Act, Appeal *re* Judge Anglin's Decision (Ques.) 8147 (v).
Associated British Canadian Society, and Labour Dept., Complaints *re* Graeme Hunter (Ques.) 2188 (ii).
B.C. Immigration Legislation, Disallowance *re* (Ques.) 189 (i), 6474 (iv).
Celeste Joly, Patent Relief (B. 107) 1°*, 2184 (ii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s (B. 90) 1°*, 2005 (ii).
Hunter, Graeme, Complaints *re* Immigration Frauds (Ques.) 2188 (ii).
Labour Union Labels (B. 10) prop. Res., 272 (i); in Com. on Res., 272; in Com., 701, 918, 1770, 1774; 3° m., 1779 (i).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. R. F. Sutherland) *North Essex.*
Address from Gov. Gen. (read) 6 (i).
——— Reply to from His Ex. (read) 1340 (i).
Assent to Bills, Mess. from His Ex., 6084 (iv).
See 'Bills.'
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) on Amt. (Mr. Léonard) to M. for 3° (ruling) 8857 (v).
Autonomy Bill, Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Minister, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 2570 (ii).
——— Members' remarks checked, 2277 (ii).
——— Official Report of Division (remarks) 5430 (iii).
——— Presenting Pets. (remarks) 2319 (ii); (ruling) 2320 (ii).
——— on Resignation of Hon. C. Sifton (remarks) 1864 (i).
See 'Man. Boundaries,' 'Order, Ques. of,' 'Petitions.'
Bills, Assent to, Com. from Gov. Gen. Sec. (read) 6991 (iv).
——— Mess. from His Ex., 6084 (iv).
Blair, Mr., Resignation, Conspiracy, &c., Ques. of Order, *re* Denials from Minister's (ruling) 546 (i).
Borden, Mr. R. L., Notification of Election, 583 (i).
Campaign Literature and Franking by Ministers of Crown (remarks) 1810 (i).
Carleton Electoral District, Vacancy, &c. (issue of warrant) 98 (i).
Controverted Elections, Lisgar, Judges' Certificate (presented) 9 (i).
Debates, French Edition, Delay in Issuing, &c. (remarks) 240 (i).
Edmonton Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 5131 (iii).

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*
Edmonton Electoral District, Vacancy (notification) 4200 (iii).
——— Issue of Writ, 4200 (iii).
Fitz-Simons, Jane Marie Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 6378 (iv).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 3°, 4228 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry. Surveys, Rep. *re* &c., Members remarks checked, 2021 (ii).
G. B. and Her Colonies, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 2401 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Ingram) 2402 (ii).
House of Commons, Desks for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).
——— Purchases, Audit of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).
——— Rooms for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 238 (i).
——— Supplies, Furniture, Purchase of, Res. from Internal Economy Com. (read) 6614 (iv).
Lévis Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 7175 (iv).
Lévis Vacancy, Issue of Writ (notification) 6474 (iv).
Library of Parlt., Joint Rep. (presented) 8 (i).
London Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 8001 (v).
——— Issue of Writ (notification) 6473 (iv).
Man. Boundaries, Ques. of Order, Naming Member, 3858 (ii).
——— Question of Order, 'Political Debts, Payment of,' &c., 3857 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order *re* 'Scurvy Politicians,' 3863 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex., Estimates, Suppl. (presented) 6165 (iv).
Mess. from His Ex. (Opening of Parliament) 4 (i).
Messengers, House of Commons (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 240 (i).
Order, Ques. of, Man. Boundaries, Ruling *re* Naming Members, on Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 3879 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 13 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., Members remarks checked, 3190 (ii).
Oxford, N., Electoral Division, Certificate of Election (notification) 8177 (v).
——— Issue of Writ (notification) 6046 (iv).
Petition presented *re* Autonomy Bill: (Ruling *re* Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Macpherson) 2681 (ii).
Petitions, Presenting of, Endorsement *re* (remarks) 2490 (ii).
Private Bills Pets., Extension of Time for Receiving (remarks) 318 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen. Sec. (read) 9815 (v).
Quebec Centre, Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 110 (i).
Ry. Act (1903) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2° (remarks) *re* Translation, 282 (i).
Ry. Commissioners B. 36, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 558 (i).
Railway Commission, Appnmt. of Chairman, on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Debate, on prop. Res. (ruling) 320 (i).
Returning Officers, Instruction *re* Form of Oath, on Ques. of Order (Mr. S. Hughes) 7361 (iv).
Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 103 (Mr. Tobin) on M. for 2°, (remarks) 2297 (ii).
Rooms for Members, Re-arrangement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 250 (i).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) ruled out of order, 1868 (i).
Senate and House of Commons, Conferences *re* Amts. to Bills, Mess. (read) 9028 (v).
Speaker, Election of (remarks) 3 (i).
Speech from the Throne (read) 6 (i).
Steward for Speaker's Rooms (remarks) 240 (i).
SUPPLY :
House of Commons (additional messenger) 6614; (committee expenses) 6594; (expenditure) 6592 (iv); (contingencies) 239, 250 (i); (leather trunks) 6606 (iv); (messengers) 240 (i) ; (pages) 6613 (iv) ; (salaries) 238 (i); (Sergeant-at-arms, salaries) 240 (i), 6610 (iv); (sessional clerks) 239 (i), 6595 (iv) ; (sessional messengers) 6612 ; (stationery) 6594 (iv).
Telephone Grievances, &c., on M. (Mr. Maclean) Ques. of Order, 9534 (v).
Toronto Centre, Electoral District, Certificate (notification) 4370 (iii).
——— Vacancy (notification) 2841 (ii).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) on M. for 3°, 1779 (i)
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) on M. for 3°, on Ques. of Order (rulings) 8828, 8829 (v).
Vibert, Philip Relief B. 172 (Mr. Hall) on M. for 2°, (remarks) 7261 (iv).
Wright Electoral Division, Certificate of Election (notification) 1846 (i).
——— Vacancy (remarks) 98 (i).
Yukon Ter. Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 2322 (ii).

Speaker, Deputy (Mr. C. Marcil), *Bonaventure.*
Autonomy B. 69, Members' remarks checked, 5654, 5660 (iii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) *re* Misstatement of Facts by Mr. Belcourt (ruling) 3520 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. Deputy—*Con.*
Autonomy B. 69, Ques. of Order (Mr. A. Johnston) Resignation of Mr. D. D. McKenzie, 8475 ; (ruling) 8476 (v).
——— School Clauses, Irrelevancy of Debate, 5832 (iii).
Cabinet, Ex-Ministers Annuities B. 203 (Mr. Fielding) in Com.; Amt. (read) 9796 (v).
Carleton County, Electoral District, Certificate (notification) 583 (i).
Census and Statistics B. 5, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) Ruling reserved, 632 (i).
Fessenden Wireless Tel. of Can. incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6608 (iv).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45, Ques. of Order (ruling) 4221 (iii).
Mess. from His Ex., Suppl. Estimates (read) 8718, 9392 (v).
Nicolet Electoral District, Certificate *re* Pet. (notification) 9081 (v).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2052 (ii).
Orangemen, Attack *re*, on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. Lavergne) 8365 (v).
Port Arthur, &c., Dredging Contract, on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Irrelevancy of Debate (ruling) 4666 (iii).
Provident Savings Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 5974 (iv).
Ry. Commission (chairman) B. 36 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. (ruling) 1632 (i).
Seeds, Sale B. 7, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 361 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., Amt. (Mr. Borden) read, 9587 (v).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3656 (ii).
Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Zimmerman) Amt. (read) 4259 (iii).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. D. Ross) on M. for 2° (remarks) 4701 (iii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*
Acetylene Gas Co.'s Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1054 (i).
Alien Labour Investigation *re* G.T.P., Inquiry for Rep., 821 (i).
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 676, 738 (i), 2413 (ii).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5436 (iii).
Autonomy for N. W. Ters. B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 1430 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3010 (ii).
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to sec. 16 (schools) 8811; on Amt. (Mr. Scott), C.P.R. land taxes 8789 (v).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Autonomy B. 69, in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5654 (iii).
——— (B.N.A. Act) 5730 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language) 8547, 8594 (v).
——— (C.P.R. lands) 6072 (iv).
——— (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8027 (v); on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7981 (iv).
——— (H. of C. representation) 5751 (iii).
——— (lands vested in Crown) 5918 (iii), 5995 (iv).
——— (laws, courts, &c.) 5928 (iii). 6101 (iv), 8243 (v).
——— (readjustment of representation) 5757 (iii).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8473; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8295; on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 8341; (Mr. Lamont) 8493 (v).
——— (Senate representation) 5681 (iii).
——— (subsidy to provs.) 6086 (iv).
Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) on M. for 3°, Amt. (schools) 8884 (v).
Autonomy Bill, Approval of Cabinet, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2275 (ii).
——— *re* Attack on 'Orangeism' (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5873 (iii).
——— Cor. ref. to by Prime Minister, Inquiry for, 2593 (ii).
——— on Mr. Haultain's Letter, Ques. of Order *re*, 2569, 2590 (ii).
——— Official Report of Division (remarks) 5429 (iii).
——— Pets. presented *re* (personal explanation) 2320 (ii).
——— Printing, &c. (remarks) 1788 (i).
——— Printing before 3rd Reading (remarks) 8762 (v).
——— School Clauses Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5836 (iii).
——— School Clauses, Amts, *re* Explanation (remarks) 5822 (iii).
——— "Yellow Dog," Quotation from Halifax 'Chronicle,' in Com., 5873, 5879, 5901 (iii).
See 'Lt.-Govs,' 'McKenzie, D.D.,' 'Pets.,' 'Separate,' 'N.W.T. B. 160,' 'Yellow Dog.'
Ballots, Blank, Dom. Elections, Procedure *re* Printing, &c. (Ques.) 911 (i).
——— Method of Issuing Complaints *re* S. Lanark and Ottawa (Ques.) 1342 (i).
Bank Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 7642 (iv).
Bank Notes, Printing and Circulation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6263 (iv).
Bills from the Senate, on M. (Mr. Macpherson) to place on Order Paper, (remarks) 8001 (v).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Binder Twine Industry at Kingston (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 482 (i).
Blair, Mr., Resignation, &c., Ques. of Order, 553 (i).
B. C. Customs Collector, Appmnt. of (Ques.) 270 (i).
B. C. Judgeship, Appnmt. of W. W. B. McInnes (Ques.) 382 (i).
Britton, Judge, Rep. *re* Investigation, Inquiry for, 1152, 1242 (i).
Cabinet, ex-Ministers', Annuities B. 203 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9792 (v).
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers, on Orders of the Day, 3572 (ii).
Cabinet Vacancies, N. W. Ters. Representation (remarks) 3252 (ii).
Cadet Corps of Montreal (remarks) 7815 (iv).
Campaign Literature, franked by Ministers of Crown (remarks) 1820 (i).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 3°, 4413 (iii).
Canada Eastern Ry., Total Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup.., 1925 (i).
Canada Southern Bridge Co.s B. 29 (Mr. German) in Com., 1286 (i).
Canadian Cattle Ehbargo in G. B., on M. to conc. in 6th Rep., 9004, 9017 (v).
Canadian Fast Mail Service, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to adjn., 9780 (v).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 993 (i); in Com., 638, 1069 (i).
Child Immigration, Mrs. Close's Scheme (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2127 (ii).
Civil Service Appointments since 1896, Inside Service (M. for ret.*) 2333 (ii).
Civil Service Appnmts., Permanent and Temporary, &c. since July 1st, 1896 (Ques) 585 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 5808 (iii), 6232, (iv), 8002, (v).
Clarke, Mr. E. F., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 2111 (ii).
Customs Collector at Victoria, B.C., Appnmt. of (Ques.) 270 (i).
Cold Storage, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8202, 8238 (v).
Congdon, Mr., Legal Adviser to Yukon Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7717 (iv).
Consumption: *See* 'Tuberculosis.'
Country Postmasters, Increases in Salaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 143 (i).
Debates, Official, 4th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) 4984 (iii).
——— on M. to conc. in 7th Rep., 9802 (v).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) in Com. 4977 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act, Yukon Regulations on M. (Mr. Oliver) to approve, 9786 (v).
Express Cos.: *See* 'Ry. B. 4.'
Freight Rates: *See* 'Ry. Rates.'

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Georgian Bay Indian Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 236 (i).
Gold Medal Furniture Co.'s Patent Relief B. 102 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3399 (ii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3891 (ii).
G.T.P. Ry., Surveys, Reps. *re* (remarks) 229 (i).
Grazing Leases, &c., Inquiry for Rets., 8529 (v).
G. B. and Her Colonies, Inter-Imperial Parlt., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2405 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order, 2401 (ii).
Half-Breed Scrip, Further Papers *re*, 9029 (v).
Harbours and Rivers, N.S., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9570 (v).
Hersey, A. H., Relief B. 167 (Mr. T. G. Johnston) in Com., 7682 (iv).
House of Commons Employees, Inquiry for Ret., 5209 (iii).
House of Commons P.O., Complaints *re* Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 199 (i).
Immigration : *See* 'North Atlantic.'
I. C. R. Freight Rates, Increases, &c., on Explanation of Min. of Rys., 6124 (iv).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. 9793 (v).
Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Ry. Co. Pet., on M. (Mr. Galliher) 3744 (ii).
Killam, Judge, Appnmt, as Chairman of Ry. Commission, on M. for Com. on Ry. B. No. 36, 509 (i).
Labour Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., on Res., 277 ; in Com., 703 (i).
Letter Carriers Uniforms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).
Lt. Governors of Alberta and Saskatchewan B. 193 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9033 (v).
Live Stock Record Ass'ns. incorp. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 5078 (iii).
L'Union St. Joseph of Ottawa, on M. (Mr. Belcourt) to present Pet., 2491 (ii).
McKenzie, D. D., Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill, on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. Johnston) 8479 (v).
Mail Bags, Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 213 (i).
Mail Carriers, System of Payments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).
Mail Contracts, Tenders *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 179 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions, Information *re* System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 924 (i).
Mallein Test for Cattle (remarks) in Com, of Sup., 2317 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Memorandum of Mgr. Sbarretti *re* Separate Schoo's, 3873 (ii).
——— on M. to adjn., 4005 (ii).
Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Mileage *re* Mail Service, Additional (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 184 (i).
Military Camps, Indemnity *re* Injuries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9158 (v).
Militia Estimates, on General Statement, in Com. of Sup., 9145 (v).
Montreal Post Office, Illegal Stamping of Letters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 197 (i).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1707 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9469, 9471 (v).
N.W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 8 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 459 (i).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5583 (iii).
——— on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5696 (iii).
N.W.T. Grazing Leases, Number issued, &c. (Ques.) 5478 (iii).
Northwest Irrigation Act Amt. B. 161 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 6104 (iv).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2323 (ii).
Northwest Territories (Rupert's Land) B. 160 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 8763, 8766 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3135 (ii).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5748 (iii), 5966 (iv).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1890 ; in Com., 1284 (i), 2532, 3176, 3194 ; on Amt. (Mr. Stewart) to M. for 3°, 3396 (ii).
Owen Sound P.O., Site chosen by P.M.G. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1029 (i).
Oxford, N., Electoral Vacancy (notification) 5961 (iv).
Parliament Grounds Paving Contract, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5794 (iii).
Pets. *re* Autonomy Bill, Signature *re* (remarks) 2261, 2322 (ii).
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Conmee & Bowman's Tender, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4463, 4659 (iii).
Port Arthur Harbour Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 808 (i).
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1321 (i).
Private Bills, Extension of Time, on M. (Mr. Grant) 318, 448 (i), 2491 (iii).
'Protestants driven out of Quebec,' Reply to Mr. Lemieux *re* Speech on Autonomy Bill, 3306 (ii).
Provident Savings Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 5975 (iv).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Public Buildings, Govtl. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1028 (i).
Quarantine Officers, Examination of Ships, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2306 (ii).
Quebec Political Crisis (remarks) 830 (i).
Questions answered by Ministers (remarks) 1068 (i).
Railways and Canals Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1674 (i).
Ry. Act (express companies) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for Adjnmt., 3248 (ii).
Railway Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com., 509 ; in Com., 1601 ; on M. for 3°, 1804 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1623 (i).
Railway Commission, Appnmt. of Chairman, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on Ques. of Order, 320 (i).
Railway Commission, Board of, Maintenance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1536 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Com., 5004 (iii).
Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 103 (Mr. Tobin) on M. for 2°, 2296 (ii).
Roads and Road Allowances for Alberta and Saskatchewan B. 195 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 9526 (v).
Salmon Canning Fisheries, B.C., Suspension, &c., Representations, &c. (Ques.) 269 (i).
Saskatchewan, Prov. of : *See* 'Autonomy B. 70.'
Seeds Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 322, 361, 1162, 1201, 1797 ; on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) to M. for 3°, 1878 (i).
——— Ques. of Order, 361 (i).
Separate Schools, Circulars addressed to Orange Lodges (remarks) 2405 (ii).
Separate Schools, Pets. from E. Assiniboia, Ques. of Priv., 2412 (ii).
Sifton, Hon. C., Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill (remarks) 1860 (i).
Small-pox Epidemic in Man., Expenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2306 (ii).
South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) on M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 9073 (v).
Speeches of Members, Delay in Printing Bureau, &c. (remarks) 7723 (iv).
Sunday Observance, Govt. Legislation *re* (Ques.) 8656 (v).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (aids to societies) 1829 ; (Can. exhibits, Imperial Institute) 1838 (i); (exhibitions) 6270; (experimental farms) 6176 (iv); (public health organized districts) 1843 (i).
Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 1334; Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1321 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Charges of Management (bank notes) 6263 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Sec. of State (salaries) 6249 (iv).
Dominion Police (salaries) 138 (i).
Indians—Ont. (medical attendance) 225; (St. Regis lock-up) 237; (surveys, &c.) 236 (i).
Justice—Yukon (sheriff's allowances) 132 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G. B. and Can.) 868; (P.E.I. and G.B) 932; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 951; (wrecking plant) 959 (i).
Militia (permanent force) 9113 (v).
Miscellaneous (Alaska surveys) 7720; (maps, &c., N.W.T.) 7721 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Arctic expedition) 6469 ; (expenditures, &c.) 6466; (Mr. Low's honorarium) 6473 (iv).
Post Office (letter carriers) 174; (mail carriers uniforms) 212 ; (provisional allowance) 168 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg postal station) 9549 (v) ; N.S. (Canso) 1028 (i) ; Ont. (Owen Sound) 9547; Ottawa (additions, &c., H. of C.) 9545 (v) ; (Museum) 755; Que. (Montreal military buildings) 1125 ; (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 1141 ; (trachoma hospitals) 1139 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S (Phinney's Cove) 9559; (Porter's Lake) 9584 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur) 808; (Port Colborne) 815 (i).
Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay surveys) 9547 (v).
Quarantine (cattle) 2309 (ii); (Grosse Isle steamer) 1839; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 1845; (William's Head) 1841 (i).
Railways—G.T.P. (construction) 9498 (v); (surveys, construction, &c.) 2298 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (double tracking) 1933; (expenditure, &c.) 1925 (i).
Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance) 1536 (i).
Yukon Govt. (local govt grant) 7718; (salaries, &c.) 7716; (school grant) 7719 (iv).
Telephone and Telegraph Systems, Govt. Control (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 187 (i).
Telephone Lines, Pet. *re* Municipal Control, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1251 (i).
Thermographs *re* Cold Storage on Atlantic Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 868 (i).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3653 (ii).
Tobacco Industry, Inspection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1686 (i).
Transportation Commission, Rep. of Mr. Bertram (remarks) 1288 (i).
Treadgold Concession, Rep. of Judge Britton (remarks) 821 (i).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1363 (i).
——— Joint Com., Rep., on M. (Mr. Perley) to conc., 9523 (v).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 277, 703 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. D. Ross) on M. for 2°, 4701 (iii) ; in Com., 8315 ; on M. for 3°, 8818 (v).
——— Pet., on M. (Mr. D. Ross) 3743 (ii).
Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 8696 (v).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9545 (v).
Wire Fencing : *See* 'N.W.T. Boundary.'
Wrecking Plant, and 'Lord Strathcona' in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
"Yellow Dog" applied to Orangemen, Quotations, &c. (read) in Com. on B. 69, 8350 (v).
Yukon : *See* 'Congdon.'

Staples, Mr. W. D., *Macdonald.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4312 (iii).
See 'Man.,' &c.
Bernier, Mr. J. P., Postmaster at St. Claude, Man., Dismissal, &c., Cor. *re* (M. for copy*) 1397 (i).
Fairford River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7570 (iv).
Glanders among Horses, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6695 (iv).
Half-Breed Scrip, Application from N. Ouellette, &c., Purchase of, &c. (Ques.) 9078 (v).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, M'gr Sbarretti's Memorandum *re* Separate Schools (remarks) 3851 (ii).
——— Letter of Mr. Rogers sent to Prime Minister (remarks) *re* Mr. Paterson's Charges, 4022 (ii).
Man Public Works, Claims for Damages, Pet *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7571 (iv).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6740, 6793 (iv).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1176 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture (live stock records) 6688 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg immigration) 1635 (i) ; Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Dauphin) 7570 (iv).
Quarantine (cattle) 6695 (iv).
Veterinary Surgeons in Man., Number (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6704 (iv).
Voters' Lists for Macdonald, &c. (M. for copy*) 697 (i).

Stewart, Mr. R., *Ottawa.*
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4241 (iii).
Central Counties Ry Co.'s (B. 64) 1°*, 1336 (i).
Fitz-Simons, Jane Marie Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 6377 (iv).
Stewart, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 2532, 2950, 2961, 3177, 3182 ; Letter from Sec. Treas, D. R. Street (read) 3183 ; (amt.) 3201 ; on M. for 3° (amt.) 3393 (ii) ; Neg. (Y. 56 ; N. 80) 3398 (ii).
Owen, Thomas David, Patent Relief (B. 177) in Com., 8652 (v).

Stockton, Mr. A. A., *St. John City and County.*
Admiralty Court Registrars, &c. Fees, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 125 (i).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5380 (iii).
——— on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. R. L Borden) to sec. 16, Schools, 8814 (v).
——— in Com. (laws, courts, &c.) 5814, 5935 (iii).
——— (school clause amt.) 7129 (iv).
——— School Clauses Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5832 (iii).
Blair, Mr. Resignation of, Conspiracy &c., Denial *re* Election Speaking, 557 (i).
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers (remarks) on Orders of the Day, 3578 (ii).
Collingwood Govt. Dock, Conroy Bros. Cheque (remarks) 6583 (iv).
Criminal Code (summary appeals) Amt. B. 45 (Mr. Porter) on Amt. (Mr. Bureau) *re* Race Courses, 5138 (iii).
Debates and Internal Economy Committees (remarks) 9804 (v).
Dredging, System of Hiring Dredges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6844 (iv).
Fisheries Industry, Commission *re* Investigation, Recommendation, &c., on M. (Mr. Ganong) 6341 (iv).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3884 (ii), 4203 (iii).
Halifax and Esquimalt Garrison (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9114 (v).
I.C.R., Freight Arrangements and Traffic, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2222 (ii).
——— Freight Rates, Increases, &c., on Explanation of Min. of Rys., 6127 (iv).
——— Time Table, Changes and Delays (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6832 (iv).
Judges of the Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9740 ; in Com., 9793 ; on Amt., 9798 (v).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6662 (iv).
McKenzie, Mr. D. D., Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill, on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. Johnston) 8478 (v).
Martineau Defalcations, Collection of Guarantee Bonds (remarks) 114 (i).
Moncton Harbour Master, Appnmt. of Mr. D. Robertson (Ques.) 2329 (ii).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 23 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2057 (ii).

Stockton, Mr .A. A.—*Con.*
N.W.T. Govt. Officials, Interference in Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9729 (v).
Opposition Leader, Indemnity to : *See* 'Senate and House of Commons.'
Ry Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 563 (i).
Robertson, Mr. D., Appnmt. as Harbour Master at Moncton (Ques.) 2329 (ii).
St. John Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 775 (i).
Seamen's Act (shipping masters) Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 9031 (v).
Senate and House of Commons Indemnity B. 202 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9728 (v).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 1830 ; (Archives) 1825 (i).
Immigration (agents' salaries) 9317 (v).
Indians—N.B. (supt's. salary) 9336 ; Ont. and Que. (legal expenses) 9336 (v).
Justice—Exchequer Court (salaries) 125 ; Yukon (living allowances) 127 (i).
Militia (Canadian garrisons) 9114 (v).
Penitentiaries (parole system) 470 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Dipper harbour) 9588 ; (St. John harbour) 9589 ; (St. John tidal waters) 9590 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (harbour improvements) 775 (i) ; (Maskinongé River dredging) 6844 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (revenue collections) 2222 (ii).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 4683 (iii).
Trading Stamps, Legislation *re* Suppression (Ques.) 5426 (iii).
Transportation Commission and St. John Harbour, Reps. to Govt., &c. (M. for copies*) 9698 (v).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) on M. for 3°, 9048 (v).

Talbot, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 2425 (ii).
Demers, Mr. L. J., Late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 5140 (iii).
Franking Privileges, Abuse of, *re* Jacques Cartier Club (remarks) 9798 (v).
I.C.R., 'Maritime Express,' &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6832 (iv).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 65) 1°*, 1336 (i).
Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Ry. Co.'s (B. 191) 1°*, 9072 (v).
Man. Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 4070 (ii).
Military School at Quebec, Improvement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9162 (v).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses *re* Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9322

Talbot, Mr. O. E.—*Con.*
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3196 (ii).
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at Elections, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7348, 7369 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Militia (permanent force) 9127, 9162 (v).
Trans-Canada Ry. Co., Claims for Surveys, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9494 (v).

Talbot, Mr. P., *Strathcona.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4176 (iii).
——— in Com. (distribution of seats) 7734 (iv) ; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8040 (v) ; on Amt. (Mr. S. McCarthy) 7830, 7877 (iv).
——— (lands vested in Crown) 6040 (iv).
——— (subsidy to provs.) in Com., 6089 (iv).
——— in Com. on Schedules (Gleichen) 8154 (v).
Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 74) 1°*, 1671 (i).
SUPPLY:
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (provisions, &c.) 6551 (iv).

Taylor, Mr. G., *Leeds.*
Acetylene Gas System, Saving in Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
See 'Scout.'
Agricultural Statistics, Expenditure (remarks) 990 (iv).
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 2426 ; in Com., 2849 (ii).
Atlantic SS. Service, Shipping Space and American Shippers (remarks) 5428 (iii).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4896 (iii).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 8362 (v).
——— on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Scott) *re* C.P.R. Land Taxes, 8787 (v).
Autonomy B. 69, Attack on 'Orangeism' (remarks) in Com., 5897 (iii).
——— School Clauses, Min. of Justice quoted, in Com., 5898 (iii).
Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) on Amt. (Mr. Scott) to M. for 3°, 8879 (v).
See 'Edmonton.'
Binder Twine Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7222 (iv).
Campaign Literature and Franking Privilege, &c. (remarks) 1815 (i).
Canadian Shippers *re* Atlantic SS. Contract with Armours, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 45, 4235 (iii).
Cement, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8986 (v).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 990 ; in Com., 666 (i).
—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) 660 (i).
Census, Total Expenditure for Completion, Dismissal of Staff, &c. (Ques.) 588 (i).
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9428 (v).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 4551 (iii).
—— on M. to conc. in 7th Rep of Com., 9809 (v).
Dredging, System of Hiring Dredges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6846 (iv).
Edmonton Election, Date of Contest, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5891 (iii).
Electoral Atlas, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6722 (iv).
Estimates, Criticism of and Obstruction, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9273 (v).
Estimates of the Interior Dept., Obstruction by Minister (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9265 (v).
Freight Rates : *See* 'I.C.R.,' 'Ry. Com.,' 'Tariff.'
Fruit Marks Act, Inspectors appointed, Names, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 736 (i).
Fruit Inspectors, Number, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 588 (i).
Fitz-Simons, Jane Marie Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 6377 (iv).
Gananoque Armoury Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1656 (i).
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale to Mr. F. W. Grant) on M. for Sup., 6486 (iv).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 3°, 4235 (iii).
House of Commons, Rooms for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 254 (i).
Hurley, J. M., Fishery Inspector, Duties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2895 (ii).
I.C.R., Advertising Expenditures *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2244 (ii).
—— Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1961 (i).
—— Freight Rates and Traffic Arrangements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2242 (ii).
—— Freight Rates, Ref. to Gananoque and Fredericton, Reply to Min. of Railways, 6585 (iv).
—— Freight Rates, Increases, &c., on Explanation of Min. of Rys., 6120 (iv).
—— and G.T.R. Arbitration *re* Traffic Arrangement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1929 (i).
—— Supplies, Purchase of Oil, &c (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2249 (ii).
Interior Dept., Dep. Minister, Resignation, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 4370 (iii).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*
Leverette, Geo. Milton, Postmaster, Kitley, Dep. Ret. Officer *re* Election, Partisan Conduct *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6240 (iv.)
Logberg Printing Co., Payments to, (remarks) *re* Question, 4374 (iii),
Manufacturers' Association, Commercial Literature as Campaign Literature, Franked by M.P.'s (remarks) 1815 (i).
Metric System, Letter from Gananoque Teacher (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1695 (i).
Military Accountant of Militia Council (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 434 (i).
Miltimore, Lt. J. M., Application for Permission to attend Cavalry School, Toronto (Ques.) 6383 (iv).
Murray Harbour Branch Ry. and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2159 (ii).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5704 (iii).
Orangemen, Attack *re* 'Yellow Dog' in Quebec Papers (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 8362 (v).
Ottawa Public Buildings, Rentals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6818 (iv).
Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5802 (iii).
Port Arthur Dredging Contract, Time for Tenders (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6876 (iv).
Portland Cement bought at Quebec, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 435 (i).
Postmaster acting as Dep. Returning Officer, Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6240 (iv).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Works Employees, Political Partisans (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6861 (iv).
Railway Commission, Freight and Passenger Rates, Advancement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1544 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Com., 4996 (iii).
Resignations of Conservative Ministers in 1896 (personal explanation) 845 (i).
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at Elections, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7365 (iv).
Rideau Canal Extension (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1523 (i).
Riviere Ouelle Spur Line (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1982 (i).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Expenditures *re* (remarks) 2455 (ii).
'Scout,' Str., Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2700 (ii).
—— Investigation *re* Explosion of Acetylene Gas, &c. (remarks) 4842 (iii).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Seeds Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 361, 1214 (i).

Sifton, Hon. C., Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill (remarks) 1862 (i).

Smart, Jas. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6422 (iv).

——— Resignation, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4370 (iii).

Starkey, W. W., Duties *re* Cattle Diseases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6718 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Year Book) 1476 (i).

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1275 (i).

Charges of Management (bank notes) 6261 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 103 (i); Post Office (contingencies) 6240 (iv).

Dom. Lands (Banff, pamphlets *re*) 6424 (iv); (homestead inspectors) 9265 (v); (maps, printing, &c.) 6425 (iv).

Fisheries (inspectors' salaries) 2892; (protection service) 2907 (ii).

Immigration (agents, G.B., &c., salaries) 7685 ; (agencies, salaries) 6384 (iv) ; (bonuses to SS. Cos.) 9329 (v); (contingencies) 7710; (printing, &c.) 7710 (iv).

Indians—B.C. (travelling expenses) 6556 (iv); Man. and N.W.T. (provisions) 9338 (v); Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6521; N.B. (medical attendance) 6516 (iv); Ont. and Que. (park improvements) 9335 (v).

Interior—Miscellaneous (litigation expenses) 7720 (iv).

Legislation—Debates (expenditure) 6594 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (keepers' salaries) 2697 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 979 (i).

Militia (Accountant of Board) 434 (i).

Miscellaneous (Alaska boundaries) 7719; (legal expenses, *re* Martineau case) 6723; (legal service, Mr. Patterson) 6723 ; (maps, *re* N.W.T.) 7721; (printing, &c.) 6723 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (Arctic expedition) 6472; (Harrison, Capt., allowance, &c.) 6466 (iv).

Penitentiaries (Archibald, W. T., Parole Officer) 6721 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (engineers, firemen, &c.) 6822; (fuel) 6822; (furniture) 6817; (rents) 6818 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—General (armouries) 1656 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Richibucto) 6732 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (London drill hall) 6732 (iv); (military college) 1561 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (elevator attendants) 1667 (i); (grounds) 6817 (iv); (lighting) 1667 (i) ; (repairs, &c.) 6815 ; (Rideau Hall) 6824 (iv); (steel shelving) 1564 (i); (telephones) 6814 (iv).

Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (new plant) 7578; Dom. (repairs to vessels) 6890 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Dauphin) 7571; (Lake St. Francis) 7572; (Narrows Lake) 7572; (Selkirk) 7573 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. Clifton breakwater) 7497 ; (Dipper harbour) 7498; (Mud Cove) 7500; N.B. (Quaco harbour) 7501 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Inverness Mines) 7405; (Margaree harbour) 7411; (Port Hawkesbury) 6837 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Barry's Bay wharf) 6873; (Blind River dredging) 6871; (Fort William and Port Arthur) 6900 ; (general vote) 6729 ; (Grand River dredging) 6873 ; (Haileybury wharf) 6887 ; (Honora wharf) 6887 ; (Little Current channel) 6886 ; (Otonabee River) 6886 ; (Owen Sound harbour) 6886 ; (Point Edward dredging) 6869 ; (Whitby harbour) 6880 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Grand Machins) 7304 ; (harbour works) 6728 ; (Lake St. Peter pier) 6459 ; (Little Rapids dam) 6839; (Montmorency wharf) 6853 (iv); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 2455 (ii); (St. Louis Feeders) 7386; (Yamaska Lock) 6868 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Deep Waterways Commission) 6895 ; (engineers, &c.) 6895 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Ottawa (bridges) 6889 (iv).

Public Works—Telegrams—Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 6896 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (Drummondville improvements) 1961 (i) ; (Halifax terminals) 2032 (ii) ; (St. Fabien subway) 1982 ; (Sydney accommodation) 1912 (i).

Railways—P.E.I. (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2159 (ii) ; (working expenses) 6901 (iv).

Yukon Govt. (salaries, &c.) 7716 (iv).

Tariff *re* Freight Rates, Advancement of remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1544 (i).

Trading Stamps : *See* ' Criminal.'

Ventilation in Chamber of Commons (remarks) 7812 (iv), 8695 (v).

Veterinary Surgeons, Emplymt. by Govt., &c., in Man. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6710 (iv).

Water Meters Inspection B. 188 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8676 (v).

Wire Fencing : *See* ' N.W.T.'

Telford, Mr. W. P., *North Grey.*

Cement in Com. on Ways and Means, 8990 (v).

Fessenden Wireless Telegraph Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 144) 1°*, 4644 (iii).

Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 143) 1°*, 4644 (iii).

Thompson, Mr. A., *Yukon Territory.*

Congdon, F. T., Appnmt. as Legal Adviser to Yukon (Ques.) 7020 (iv).

Gold of the Yukon purchased by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6264 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Miscellaneous (assay office, B.C.) 7720 (iv).

N.W. Mounted Police (Yukon force) 8662 (v).

Yukon Govt. (local Govt. grant) 7719 (iv).

Thompson, Mr. A. —*Con.*

Yukon Ter., Annexation to Provinces (remarks) 6509 (iv).

——— Legal Adviser, Appnmt. of F. T. Congdon (Ques.) 7020 (iv).

——— Reforms, &c., Necessary, on M. for Sup., 7021 (iv).

Tisdale, Hon. David, *Norfolk.*

Autonomy Bill, Official Report of Division (remarks) 5432 (iii).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 179 (Mr. Turriff) on M. to ref. back to Com., 8655 (v).

Citizens' Bank of Canada B. 133 (Mr. Barr) in Com., 5973 (iv).

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4204 (iii).

London Militia and London Elections (remarks) 7255 (iv).

Militia Act (permanent force) Amt. B. 170, on prop. Res. (Sir Frederick Borden) 6905; in Com. on Res., 6985; on M. for 2°, 7272 (iv).

Militia Estimates, Reply to General Statement, in Com. of Sup., 9136 (v).

Militia Force, Reduction of, on Explanation (Sir Frederick Borden) 6995 (iv).

Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5743 (iii).

Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Conmee & Bowman's Tender, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4478 (iii).

Postmasters as Political Partisans (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6246 (iv).

Provident Savings Association B. 134 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 5974 (iv).

Railways and Canals Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1675 (i).

Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 169 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6967; in Com., 7262 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.—Post Office (contingencies) 6246 (iv).

Militia (Military college) 9170; (permanent force) 9111; (reply to general statement) 9136 (v).

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8638 (v).

Tobin, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*

Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 103) 1°*, 2184; 2° m., 2296; in Com., 3669 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings—Que—(Sherbrooke drill hall) 1141 (i).

Turgeon, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4155 (iii); in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 8377 (v).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Miscou harbour) 7499 (iv).

Turriff, Mr. J. G., *East Assiniboia.*

Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co. (B. 83) 1°*, 1788 (i).

Athabaska Northern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 88) 1°*, 1933 (i).

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5457, 5482 (iii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3813 (ii).

——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5625 (iii).

——— (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7941 (iv).

——— (election of members) 5772 (iii).

——— (seat of govt.) 8255 (v).

Autonomy Bill, Pets. *re* Genuineness (remarks) 2260, 2320 (ii).

See 'Pet.,' 'Separate.'

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 179) in Com. (M.) to ref. back to Ry. Committee 8652 (v).

Calgary and Battleford Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 50) 1°*, 817 (i).

Doukhobors Homestead Entries *re* Village Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6414 (iv).

Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 9404 (v).

Macleod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co.'s (B. 78) 1°*, 1671 (i).

Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. (B. 28) 1°*, 493; in Com., 1890 (i), 2047, 2050, 2323 (ii); 3° m., 2714 (ii), 6346; on Sen. Amts., 7683 (iv).

Petitions *re* Autonomy Bill (remarks) 2260, 2320 (ii).

Schukin, Ivan, Cancellation of Homestead Rights (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 6414 (iv).

Separate Schools, Pets. *re* (remarks) 2412 (ii).

Walsh, Mr. R. N., *Huntingdon.*

Beauharnois Canal, Opening Waterways: in Com. of Sup., 7380 (iv).

Butter and Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Grievances *re*, &c. (Ques.) 8886 (v).

Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 675 (i).

Census in Eastern Townships, Par. in Huntingdon 'Gleaner' (read) 675 (i).

Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8221 (v).

Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5028 (iii).

Walsh, Mr. R. N.—*Con.*
St. Lawrence Islands, Govt. Control, Cor. *re* Sale, &c. (Ques.) 6477 (iv).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 334, 373, 1192, 1801 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (St. Louis Feeders) 7380 (iv).

Ward, Mr. H. A., *Durham.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4951 (iii).
Otonabee River, Damages by Floods, Claim of Mr. Clark (M. for cor.) 1396 (i).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1166 (i).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Trent (construction) 1476 ; (surveys) 1471 (i).
Trent Canal—Surveys *re*, Letter of Sir Wilfrid Laurier to Mr. Aylesworth (read) 1476 (i).
——— Claims for Damages *re*, Mr. Clark, Cor., &c. (M. for copy) 1396 (i).
——— Surveys, Rice Lake, &c. (Ques.) 153 (i).

Wilson, Mr. U., *Lennox and Addington.*
Autonomy Bill, Distribution of Printed Copies *re* (remarks) 2046 (ii).
Campaign Literature Franked by Minister of Crown (remarks) 1809 (i).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 631 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) *re* Resolutions, 631 (i).
Franking Privilege *re* Campaign Literature (remarks) 1809 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal Survey, Instructions *re*, Inquiry for Copies, 822 (i).
I.C.R., Expenditures (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2215 (ii).
——— Traffic Arrangements and Freight Diversion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2214 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Memorandum *re* Separate Schools from M'gr. Sbarretti (remarks) 3871 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order *re* Political Debts, 3858 (ii).
Messengers, House of Commons (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 240 (i).
Military Training Tramp, Central, Site, &c. (Ques.) 268 (i).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3198 (ii).
Port Arthur and Fort William Dredging Contract, Tender of Conmee & Bowman, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4480 (iii).
Railway Commission B. 36, on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1628 (i).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1798; on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1868 (i).

White, Hon. P.—*Con.*
Steward for Speaker's Rooms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 240 (i).
SUPPLY :
Civil Govt.—Labour Dept. (salaries, &c.) 101 (i).
House of Commons (messengers) 240; (salaries) 238 ; (Sergeant-at-Arms) 240 ; (sessional clerks) 239 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (archives) 605 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (revenue collections) 2214 (ii).
Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 1697; (inspections, &c.) 1694 (i).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) on M. for 3°, 1779 (i).

Wilmot, Mr. R. D., *Sunbury and Queen's, N.B.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5309 (iii).
Fisheries Hatcheries, N.B., Salmon Pond at Carleton, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 590 (i).
Hay, Free Transportation on I.C.R. O.C., &c., (Ques.) 108 (i).
St. John River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6893 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Dredging (new plant) 6893 ; Mar. Provs. (new plant) 7578; Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John tributaries) 7501; Que. (St. Jean, Orleans) 7393 (iv).
Wharfs in Tidal Waters, Contribution, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).

Wilson, Mr. U., *Lennox and Addington.*
Agriculture Committee, Meetings, &c. (remarks) 404 (i).
——— Number of Witnesses, Payments to, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1398 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Distribution (remarks) 2262 (ii).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5470 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3893 (ii).
Autonomy Bill, Official Report of Division (remarks) 5432 (iii).
——— Saskatchewan B. No. 70, in Com. on Res., 8702 (v).
Brothers Light, Keeper, Appnmt., Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2702 (ii).
Child Immigration, Mrs. Close's Scheme (Ques.) 1936 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2125 (ii).
——— Assistance by Govt. (Ques.) 1341 (i).
Dams across Rivers, Govt. Policy *re* Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6839 (iv.).
Doukhobor Homestead Entries *re* Village Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6417 (iv).
Dredging, System of Hiring Dredges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6845 (iv).
Free Mail Delivery, Total Cost (Ques.) 729 (i).

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7622 (iv).
Haggard, H. Rider, Inquiry for Rep., 9523 (v). *See* 'Salvation.'
Immigrants, deported from Can. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv).
Immigrants deported from Can., &c. (Ques.) 1847 (i).
——— Examination *re* Qualifications, &c. (Ques.) 2187 (ii).
Immigrants from English Workhouses, Proposal of Mr. Neill, &c. (Ques.) 6188 (iv).
——— Importation, 1904, &c., Number, Nationality, &c. (Ques.) 1592 (i).
Immigration, Bonus paid to Transportation or Booking Cos. (Ques.) 7811 (i). *See* 'North Atlantic.'
——— Cost of Criminal Law (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6721 (iv).
——— Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7710 (iv).
Immigration of Children to Canada, Assistance by Govt. (Ques.) 1341 (i).
Immigration of State Children, Cor. with Mr. C. Kinloch Cooke *re* (Ques.) 5478 (iii).
Immigration of Skilled Labour, and Toronto Labour Council, on M. (Mr. Foster) 7509 (iv).
Mail Delivery, Free, System, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 729 (i).
'Maisonneuve,' Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2745 (ii).
Mineral Specimens *re* Exhibitions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6271 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Inquiry for Copy of Contract, 8145 (v).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9455 (v).
——— (remarks) 7907 (iv).
Parole System for Convicts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 472 (i).
Preston, W. T. R., Visit to Canada (Ques.) 451 (i).
Private Bills, Extension of Time, on M. (Mr. Grant) 449 (i).
Public Works under Contract, Supervision Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7588 (iv).
Ry. Act (crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 3246 (ii).
Ry. Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 576 (i).
Rouse, Mr. David, Appnmt. as Customs Collector, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 452 (i).
Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 169 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6976 (iv).
Salvation Army Colonies, R. Haggard's Rep. (Ques.) 6188 (iv). *See* 'Haggard.'

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*
Schukin, Ivan, Homestead Entries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6417 (iv).
Smart, Jas. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6419 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6932; (creameries) 6939; (experimental farms) 6172; (experimental farms bulletins) 6930; (exhibitions) 1834 (i), 6271 (iv).
Canals—Trent (surveys) 6293 (iv).
Charges of Management (Receiver Gen.'s office) 6249 (iv).
Chinese Immigration (salaries) 981 (i).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 9058; (patent branch) 9057; (private secretary) 9054; (salaries) 9057 (v).
Civil Govt.—Finance (Private Secretary) 6268 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 6266 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 9058 (v).
Civil Govt.—Railways and Canals (private) sec., 9062; (salary increases) 9062 (v).
Civil Govt.—Sec. of State (salaries) 9071 (v).
Culling Timber (salaries) 7236 (iv).
Dom. Lands (Banff, pamphlets *re*) 6424; (maps, printing, &c.) 6425 (iv).
Immigration (agents, G.B., salaries) 7685; (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6385; (contingencies, &c.) 7709; (interpreters, &c.) 7701 (iv).
Legislation (H. of Commons) 6268; (voters' lists) 6722, 6954 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse repairs) 9036 (v); (salaries) 2702 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 979 (i).
Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 9050 (v).
Militia (Royal Military college) 7003 (iv).
Miscellaneous (consolidation of statutes) 7244; (Keewatin lunatics) 7720; (legal expenses *re* Martineau case) 6723 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers, repairs) 9034 (v).
Pensions (compensations) 6956 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Lloydminster immigrant sheds) 6724 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (grounds) 6817 (iv); (new deptl. buildings, site, &c.) 9608 (v); (Rideau Hall) 6823 (iv); (Rideau Hall, repairs) 9550 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Grand River dredging) 6873; (Ottawa locks) 7561; (Penetanguishene) 7563; (Point Edward dredging) 6869 (iv); (Stokes Bay) 9599; (Trenton dredging) 9600 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Canton Fabre) 7289; Que. (harbour works) 6727; (Maskinongé River dredging) 6845; (Montmorency wharf) 6853; (Ottawa River) 7375; (Little Rapids dam) 6839; (Saguenay dredging) 7379; (Sorel ice piers) 6841 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (Academy of Arts) 7238; (architects, &c.) 7619; 'Canada Gazette') 6723; (cement testing) 7614 (iv); (Ottawa river works) 7612; (Pacific cable grant) 7240; (printing, &c.) 6957; (surveys) 7611 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Dom. (traffic bridges) 7592; N.W.T. (Battle River) 7588; (colonization roads) 7597; (Shellmouth) 7592 (iv).

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Slides and Booms (working expenses) 7632 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—P.E.I. (Anglo-American Co.) 7632; Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 7635 (iv).
Quarantine (organized districts, salaries) 2303 (ii); (Winnipeg hospitals) 1846 (i).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, plans, &c.) 9490, 9497 (v).
Trade and Commerce (commercial agents) 9037 (v).
Water Meters Inspection B. 188 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8675 (v).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospitals Govt. Grant *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2318 (ii).

Worthington, Mr. A. N., *Sherbrooke.*
Ammunition, Inspection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).
Ammunition, Small Arms, &c., Control of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).
Agricultural Meetings in Eastern Townships, Purposes, &c. (Ques.) 268 (i).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5290 (iii).
Autonomy Bill, Pets. *re*, presented (remarks) 2321 (ii).
Camps for Militia Drill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 442 (i).
Camps of Instruction, Indemnity *re* Casualties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9147 (v).
Inspector General of Militia (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 437 (i).
Lennoxville Post Office, Construction of (Ques.) 4373 (iii).
Magog Post Office, Erection of (Ques.) 5784 (iii).
Melbourne and Upper Melbourne Mail Contract, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 4372 (iii).
Military Sites, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 427 (i).
Militia, Col. Drury, Duties *re* Command (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9130 (v).
Militia Medical Officer, Allowances and Independence of Parlt. Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9148 (v).
Sherbrooke Armouries, Provision for Militia (Ques.) 266 (i).
——— Immediate Erection (Ques.) 5784 (iii).
——— Purchase of Site, &c. (Ques.) 191 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 427, 1139 (i).
Sherbrooke Postal Rate and Delivery (Ques.) 378 (i).
Sherbrooke Post Office, Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 191 (i).
S. A. Veterans and King's Medal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9159 (v).
S. A. War, King's Medal to Canadians, Cor., Telegrams, &c. (M. for copies*) 3204 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Militia (annual drill) 442; (military council) 424 (i); (quick-firing guns) 9124 (v).

Worthington, Mr. A. N.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Brantford drill hall) 1550; (Chatham armoury) 1553; (Cobourg armoury) 1555; (Guelph armoury) 1556; (Kingston barracks) 1560 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Sherbrooke drill hall) 1139 (i).

Wright, Mr. A. A., *South Renfrew.*
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 682 (i), 2422 (ii).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4960, 4978 (iii); (lands vested in Crown) in Com., 6002 (iv).
Autonomy Bills, Pets. *re* (remarks) 2321 (ii).
Budget, on The, 8949 (v).
Criminal Code (trading stamps) B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9428 (v).
Gillies Bros., Limited (B. 95) 1°*, 2005; in Com., 2763 (ii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4220 (iii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3191 (ii).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. of Sup., 334, 375 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms bulletins) 6927 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and W. Indies) 7186 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bracebridge) 7547 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (general vote) 7494 (iv).

Wright, Mr. W., *Muskoka.*
Animal Diseases, Provincial and Dom. Jurisdiction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6714 (iv).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5511, 5543 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4349 (iii).
——— in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8063 (v).
Autonomy Bill, Census *re* Town and Rural Population (remarks) 8094 (v).
Bank Notes, Printing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6260 (iv).
Bracebridge Dry Dock, Supt. *re* Construction (Ques.) 6654 (iv).
Cement, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9766 (v).
Census *re* Urban and Rural Populations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6274 (iv).
Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 190, in Com., 9766 (v).
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale, Jurisdiction, &c. (remarks) 6477 (iv).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 371, 1195; on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) to M. for 3°, 1880 (i).

Wright, Mr. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock records) 6688 (iv); (quinquennial census, N.W.T.) 9609 (v); (statistics) 6274 (iv).

Canals—Trent (Holland River) 9372 (v).

Customs (expenses) 261 (i).

Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (live stock) 6545; Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6521 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 978 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 1019; Ottawa (lighting) 1669 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Depot Harbour) 7552 (iv); (Honora wharf) 9597 (v); (Lake Temiskaming) 7559 (iv); (Rossead wharf) 9600; (Severn River) 9602 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Lake St. Peter piers) 6462 (iv).

Quarantine (cattle) 6714 (iv).

Zimmerman, Mr. A., *West Hamilton.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5554 (iii).

Cadet Corps in Dom. (remarks) 7815 (iv).

Campaign Literature franked by Ministers of Crown (remarks) 1821 (i).

Zimmerman, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Cement, in Com. of Ways and Means, 8996 (v).

Grand River and Western Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 122) 1°*, 2681 (ii).

Hamilton Patronage *re* Postal Service (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6229 (iv).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 2959 (ii).

Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Forms of Oath, on Ques. of Order, 7361 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Hamilton) 7557 ; Miscellaneous (cement testing) 7615 (iv).

Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, plans, &c.) 9496 (v).

Telephone Grievances and Telephone Com., Discussion out of Order (remarks) 9535 (v).

Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo Ry. Co.'s (B. 79) in Com., 4259 (iii).

Vibert, Philip, Relief B. 172 (Mr. Campbell) 2° m., 7218; on M. for 2° (remarks) 7261 (iv).

Yukon, Reform *re* Govt. of Country (remarks) on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com of Sup., 7072 (iv).

INDEX---PART II

SUBJECTS

'Aberdeen' Boilers, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6464 (iv).

Academy of Arts : in Com. of Sup., 6959, 7238 (iv).

Acadian Historical Data, Compilation of : in Com. of Sup., 1830 (i).

'Acadia' Str., Disposition of Fittings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1849 (i).

Accountant of Militia Board : in Com. of Sup., 434 (i).

Acetylene Gas Contracts with Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 1053 (i).

——— Invention of Mr. Painchaud *re* Safety Appliances : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6308 (iv).

——— Lights, Annual Saving, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1592 (i).

——— Plant, St. John Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 1052 (i).

——— System, Saving in Expenditure, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).

Acreage in Provisional District Alberta, Saskatchewan, &c., disposed of, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 601 (i).
See 'Autonomy,' &c.

Acres of undisposed Lands, N. W. Ters.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 601 (i).

Actonvale Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1101 (i).

Additional Sidings, I.C.R., Spur Lines, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1970 (i), 6431 (iv).

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech from Throne : moved (Mr. Macdonald) 9 (i).

——— seconded (Mr. Parent) 17 (i).

——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to present, 50 (i)

——— Reply to from His Ex.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1340 (i).

ADJOURNMENTS :

Ascension Day : Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 6825 (iv).

Ash Wednesday, M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2112 (ii).

ADJOURNMENTS—*Con.*

Easter : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4750 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4375 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4458 (iii).

24th May, Adjournment for : M. (Mr. Fielding) 6384 (iv).

Admiralty Court Registrars, Fees, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 125 (i).

Administration of Justice, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6721 (iv).
See 'Justice.'

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1°*, *pro forma*, 5 (i).

Adulteration Act Amt. B. No. 197 (Mr. Bergeron) 1°*, 9179 (v).

Adulteration of Food, Centralization of Camples : Remarks (Mr. Black) in Com. of Sup., 1717 (i).

——— Violations of Act, Prosecutions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1699, 1710 (i).
See 'Inland Revenue,' &c.

Advances by O.C., Total Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 267 (i).

Advertising Car, I.C.R., Expenditure *re* : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 2257 (ii).

Advertising, I.C.R., in Newspapers, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2236 (ii).

Advisory Board *re* Militia, Constitution of, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 415 (i).

Agents, I.C.R., Dwelling Houses, Policy of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).

Agents' Houses, P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 2180 (ii).
See 'I.C.R.', &c.

'Agnes Donahoe,' Schr., Seizure by Uruguayan Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6106 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) 1507 (i).

——— Telegram read (Mr. Wm. Roche) 6137 (iv).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS :

Acadian Historical Data, Compilation of : in Com. of Sup., 1830 (i).

Academy of Arts : in Com. of Sup., 6959 (iv).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*
Agricultural Meetings in Eastern Townships, Purposes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 268 (i).
Agriculture Committee, Meetings, &c.: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 404 (i).
——— Number of Witnesses, Payments, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 1398 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com.: (Mr. Greenway) to conc., 4081 (iii).
——— 4th Rep.: Presented (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) 4984 (iii).
——— M. (Mr. Greenway) to conc., 6310 (iv).
——— 6th Rep.: Presented (Mr. McIntyre) 8097 (v).
——— M. (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) to conc., 8998 (v).
Agriculture, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 321 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 91 (i), 9053 (v).
See 'Arts,' &c.
Agricultural Exports and Imports, Duties paid, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Clements) 3203 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Clements) 909 (i).
See 'Customs,' &c.
Agricultural Statistics, Expenditure *re* : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. on B. 5, 990 (i).
Aids to Agricultural Societies : in Com. of Sup., 1829 (i).
Allan SS. Contracts *re* Cold Storage, Cor., &c.: Read (Mr. Paterson) in Com. of Sup., 865 (i).
See 'Cold Storage.'
Animals slaughtered under Diseases Act : Remarks (Mr. Foster) on conc., 6911 (iv).
Archives, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 6826 (iv).
See 'Doughty.'
——— Reconstruction of, &c. in Com. of Sup., 1823 (i).
Archives, on conc., 6918 (iv).
Buffalo Specimens for Exhibitions : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 6272 (iv).
Butter in Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 881 (i).
Canadian Cattle, Embargo in G. B. : on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Ag. Com., 8998 (v).
Canadian Exhibit, Imperial Institute: in Com. of Sup., 1836 (i).
Canadian Shippers *re* Atlantic SS. Contract with Armours', &c. : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 4235 (iii).
Cattle Quarantine : in Com. of Sup., 2309 (ii), 6690, 6911 (iv).
Census in Eastern Townships, Incorrect Rets : Remarks (Mr. Walsh) 675 (i).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*
Census, Quinquennial, *re* Alberta, &c. : in Com. of Sup. 9608 (v).
Census, Total Expenditure for Completion, Dismissal of Staff, &c. : Ques. (Mr Taylor) 588 (i).
Cold Storage *re* Atlantic Steamers, and Thermograph Records : M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8183 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2774 (ii).
See 'Thermograph.'
Cold Storage *re* Atlantic SS. Service : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 868 (i).
Cold Storage, Bait Freezers, Mar. Canada, Number, Location, &c. : M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Ret., 1769 (i).
See 'Trade and Commerce.'
Creameries : in Com. of Sup., 6938, 7014 (iv).
Criminal Statistics, Compilation of : in Com. of Sup., 1473 (i).
Dairying, Live Stock, and Fruit Industries : in Com. of Sup., 6932 (iv).
Dairy Products, Classification for Export, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 7810 (iv).
Doughty, Mr. A. G., Dom. Archivist, Salary : in Com. of Sup., 9053 (v).
Embargo on Canadian Cattle : *See* 'Canadian Cattle.'
Exhibition (Dom.) at New Westminster, B.C., Grant : in Com. of Sup., 9608 (v).
Exhibitions, Generally : in Com. of Sup., 6269 (iv).
——— Liege, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1831 (i).
See 'Liege,' 'New Westminster,' 'St. Louis.'
Experimental Farms : in Com. of Sup., 6165 (iv).
Freight Rates : *See* 'Holstein.'
Fruit Growers' Association, P.E.I., Res. *re* Maintenance of Industry : Ques. (Mr. Martin) 381 (i).
Fumigating Stations : in Com. of Sup., 1831 (i).
Gillis, N. J., Emplymt. by Govt. at St. Louis Exhibition : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3361 (ii).
Glanders, Spread among Horses, Prevention of by Govt. : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6690 (iv).
Grimsby, Establishment of Experimental Farm : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6165 (iv).
Holstein Breeders, Complaints *re* Freight Handling : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6680 (iv).
See 'Agricultural Com.,' &c.
Imperial Institute, Can. Exhibition : in Com. of Sup., 1836 (i).
Liege Exhibition : in Com. of Sup., 1831 (i).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*
Liege Exhibition, Cor. between Govt. of Quebec and Dom. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Lavergne) 9698 (v).
Live Stock Record Associations, Delay to Farmers, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5577 (iii).
——— Nationalization, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1848 (i).
Lumpjaw in Cattle, Prevention of: Remarks (Mr. Barr) on conc., 6917 (iv).
Maladie du Coit, Horse Disease: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 6702 (iv).
New Westminster, B.C., Dom. Exhibition Grant: in Com. of Sup., 9608 (v).
Patent Examiners, Salary Increases: in Com. of Sup., 9056 (v).
Patent Record: in Com. of Sup., 1472 (i).
Patent Record supplied to Members: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1827 (i).
Poultry Raising on Experimental Farm: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6183 (iv).
Quarantine, Cattle: in Com. of Sup., 1838, 6690; conc., 6911 (iv).
——— Organized Districts, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2302 (ii).
Quinquennial Census, Alberta and Saskatchewan: in Com. of Sup., 9608 (v).
St. Louis Exhibition: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 1832 (i).
Smith, Mr. E. D., Charges by Min. of Ag.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 874 (i).
——— Statements *re* Cold Storage: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) 874 (i).
Temiscamingue, Establishment of Experimental Farm: in Com. of Sup. (remarks) (Mr. Barr) 6167 (iv).
Thermograph Record, *re* Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 2778 (ii).
Thermograph Records *re* Atlantic Steamers: M. (Mr. Henderson) for Copies, 1767 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 868 (i).
——— Ret. laid on Table (Mr. Fisher) 7016 (iv).
See 'Cold Storage.'
Veterinary Inspectors employed by Govt., *re* Hog, &c., Diseases: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1933 (i).
Williams Head Quarantine Station: in Com. of Sup., 1841 (i).
Year Book: in Com. of Sup., 1474 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) 997 (i).
Aids to Agricultural Societies: in Com. of Sup., 1829 (i).
Aids to Navigation, Repairs to Lighthouses, &c.: in Com of Sup., 6636 (iv).
Aids to Navigation, Programme *re* Boards of Trade: Read (Mr Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 6641 (iv).
Aids to Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 2758 (ii).
——— *re* St. Lawrence Channel: in Com. of Sup., 2850 (ii).
——— (remarks) 2891 (ii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Alaska Boundary Demarcation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7719 (iv).
Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 118 (Mr. Oliver) 1°*, 2185; 2°*, 2298; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c., 51.)
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. No. 83 (Mr. Turriff) 1°*, 1788; 2°*, 1891 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 5132 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 52.)
Alberta, Creation of Province: *See* 'Autonomy Bill.'
Alberta District Postal Business, &c.: M. for Ret., (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 599 (i).
Alberta, Provisional District, Acreage disposed of: M. for Ret.*, (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 601 (i).
Alberta Steamer Service, Navigable Mileage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 6904 (iv).
Alexandra Bridge, Ottawa, Lighting, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 7586 (iv).
Alexandria P.O., Contract *re*, Delay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1760 (i).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 116 (Mr. Dyment) 1°*, 2185; 2°*, 3400 (ii); in Com. and 3°*, 6610 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 53.)
Algoma Copper Range Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 60 (Mr. Dyment) 1°*, 1241; 2°*, 1338 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3598 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 54.)
Aliens employed on Govt. Works at Sault Ste. Marie: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 1412 (i).
Alien Labour Act, Appeal against Judge Anglin's Declaration: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 8147 (v).
Alien Labour Investigation *re* G. T. P. Surveys: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Sproule) 821 (i).
Alien Labour Laws, Legislation *re* Amts.: Remarks (Mr. Haggart) 6232 (iv).
Aliens: *See* 'Naturalization,' 'Telegraph,' &c.
Allandale Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 9595 (v).
Allan SS. Contracts *re* Cold Storage, Cor., &c.: Read (Mr. Paterson) in Com. of Sup., 865 (i).
Allan Steamers, List of Sailings: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 885 (i).
See 'Agriculture,' 'Trade and Commerce.'
American Currency, Circulated in Canada, Prevention *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 3010 (ii).

American Fishermen on N. S. Coasts, Protection *re* by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 7907 (iv).
See 'Fisheries.'
Amherstburg Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7546 (iv).
Amherst Pier, N.S., Contract *re* Construction : Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4371 (iii).
Amherst Station Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 1983 (i).
Ammunition, Small Arms, Inspection of : in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).
Anderson and Kennedy's Lake Outlets : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Anglo-American Convention respecting Property : Remarks *re* Cor. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1068 (i).
Anglo-American Tel. Co., Agreement *re* Charges : Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 7606 (iv).
——— P.E.I., Charges, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).
——— Subsidy Increases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 108 (i).
Animals slaughtered under Diseases Act : Remarks (Mr. Foster) on conc., 6911 (iv).
Annapolis Basin SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup. 966 (i).
Annapolis and G. B. SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
Annapolis and London Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 9622 (v).
Annapolis, Queen's Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 9576 (v).
Annual Drill for Militia : in Com. of Sup., 441 (i), 6512 (iv).
See 'Militia.'
Annual Statement, I.C.R., on M. for Sup. (Mr. Emmerson) 1888, 1891 (i).
See 'I.C.R.'
Anse à Beaufils, Pier Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7285 (iv).
Anse aux Gris Fonds Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7285 (iv).
Anse à L'Ilot Landing Piers : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
Anse St. Jean Pier Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7286 (iv).
Anthracite Coal Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 136 (Mr. Galliher) M. to receive Pet., 4550 ; Pet. ref. back to Sel. Com., 4644 ; 1°*, 4807 ; 2°*, 4978 (iii) ; in Com., 5976 ; 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 56.)
Anthracite Coal (Scotch) Imported, Commercial Value, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonald) 9697 (v).
Anthracite Coal used by Govt. in each Province, Quantity, Amount paid, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1398 (i).
Anticosti Lightships, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 1850 (i).
Antigonish Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 846, 1015 (i).
Antigonish Station Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 1967 (i).
Apples, Packing of, &c.: *See* 'Staple Commodities.'
Apple River Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1727 (i), 7395 (iv).
Arbitrations and Awards *re* Canals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1508 (i).
Arbitration and Awards *re* Public Works : in Com. of Sup., 7611 (iv).
Architects for Military Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).
Architects, Public Works, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7618 (iv).
See 'Public Works.'
Archives Building, Erection of : in Com. of Sup., 603 (i).
Archives, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 6826 (iv).
——— F. W. Grey's Salary : in Com. of Sup., 6679 (iv).
——— Reconstruction of, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1823 (i).
Archives, on conc., 6918 (iv).
Arctic Expedition, Fitting of Boats, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6468 (iv).
——— Capt. Peary's Voyage : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4753 (iii).
'Arctic,' Hudson Bay Exploration, Provision for : in Com. of Sup., 9177 (v).
Arichat (west) Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Armouries, Generally, Construction of : in Com. of Sup., 1649 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 423, 1547 (i).
Armoury at Woodstock, N.B., Ownership of Land by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 4920 (iii).
Arsenals, Dominion, Establishment of : in Com. of Sup., 445 (i).
See 'Militia,' 'Dom.', &c.
'Arthur Binney,' Fishing Schooner, Small-pox Quarantine : Remarks (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 2307 (ii).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics : in Com. of Sup., 1472 1823 (i), 6165, 6269 (iv).
See 'Agriculture.'
Art Gallery, Ottawa : in Com. of Sup., 7618 (iv).
Ascension Day Adjournment : Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 6825 (iv).
Ashcroft and Cariboo Mail Service, Tenders *re* Mail Contract : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3670 (ii).
Ashcroft and Dawson Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 6896 (iv).
Ashcroft Water and Light Co., Condition of Lease *re* Lands : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2492 (ii).

Ash-Wednesday, Adjournment : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2112 (ii).
Assay Apparatus for Geological Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 8671 (v).
Assay Office, Vancouver, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7720 (iv).
Assent to Bills : *See* 'Bills.'
Assistant Receiver General's Office : in Com. of Sup., 9052 (v).
Associated British Canadian Society, Charges against Graeme Hunter : Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2188 (ii).
Astronomical Observatory, Ottawa, Fittings, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
——— Technical Officers and Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 9248 (v).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Athabaska Northern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 88 (Mr. Turriff) 1°*, 1933 (i) ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 57.)
Athabaska Ry. and Oil Co.'s incorp. B. No. 117 (Mr. Oliver) 1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 2298 ; in Com., 3135 ; 3°*, 3135 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c 58.)
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s Claims for Damages, Amounts paid, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2063 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) 7021 (iv), 9382 (v).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 892 (i).
See 'Trade and Commerce,' Allan's,' &c.
Atlantic Fisheries Investigation, Rep. *re* : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 270 (i).
See 'Fisheries.'
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 13 (Mr. Gauvreau) 1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 404 ; in Com., and 3°*, 864 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 59.)
Atlantic SS. Service, Shipping Space for American Shippers : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5428 (iii).
Atlin, B.C., Living Allowance to Judge : in Com of Sup., 9683 (v).
Atwater Bridge over Lachine Canal, Contract *re*, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7261, 7422 (iv).
Atwater Avenue Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 1240 (i).
Audit Act Amts., Govtl. Intention : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6112 (iv).
Audit Act and Aud. Gen.'s Resignation : on M. for Sup. (Mr. Lennox) 9623 (v).
Audit Act, Legislation *re* : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2190 (ii).
Audit Act and Treasury Board, Legislation *re* : Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1935 (i).
Auditor General's Office : in Com. of Sup., 77, 91 (i) ; 6721 (iv).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Part I. : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 109 (i).
——— Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 271 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Additional Copies, Letter from Aud. Gen. to Sec. of State : Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4271 (iii).
——— Distribution *re* : Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 2262 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1151 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 51, 97 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Resignation, Acceptance by Govt., and Audit Act Amts. : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6522 (iv).
Aud. Gen.'s Resignation and Legislation *re* Audit Act : Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 590 (i).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. Foster) 9541 (v).
Autonomy (Alberta) for N.W Ter., B. No. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1°, m., 1421 (i) ; Res. prop., 2913 ; 2° m., 2915, 2963, 3010, 3091, 3136, 3252, 3363, 3400, 3450, 3591, 3598, 3672, 3745, 3893 (ii), 4078, 4086, 4136, 4273, 4375, 4414, 4480, 4552, 4598, 4703, 4753, 4811, 4846, 4922, 4978, 5037, 5083, 5113, 5140, 5211, 5317, Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Neg. (Y. 59, N. 140) 5401 ; 2 m., 5423 ; in Com., 5423 ; in Com., on Res., *re* Subsidy, 5434 ; Amt. (Mr. Fielding) *re* Subsidy, 5470, 5479 ; Res. ref. to Com. on Bill, 5575 ; in Com., on B., 5601, 5719, 5749, 5808, 5927 (iii) ; Explanation (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 5983, 6048, 6086, 7103 ; Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Dual Language, 7583 (iv) ; 8530 (v) ; in Com., 7724, 7817, 7864, 7916, (iv), 8004 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Distribution of Seats, 8004 ; in Com., 8148 ; Amt. (Mr. Barker) *re* Preamble, 8173 ; in Com., 8240 ; Amt. (Mr. Lake) 8259 ; in Com., 8268 ; Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier *re* School Clause, No. 2, 8269; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Amended School Clause, 8292 ; in Com., 8317 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) *re* School Clause, 8341 ; Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) *re* School Clause, 8387 ; Amt. (Mr. Lamont) *re* School Clause, 8493 ; in Com., 8530 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) to Amt. (Mr. Monk) 8593 ; 3° m., 8777 ; Amt. (Mr. Scott) *re* C.P.R. Taxes, 8792 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Schools, 8804 ; Neg. (Y. 41, N. 109) 8816 ; Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) *re* Schools, 8831 ; Neg. (Y. 7, N. 138) 8832 ; Amt. (Mr. Sam. Hughes) *re* Schools, 8833, Neg. (Y. 37, N. 106) 8834 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) *re* Schools, 8835, Neg, (Y. 7, N. 132) 8837 ; Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Dual Language, 8839 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) to Amt., 8852, Neg. (Y. 7, N. 140) 8854 ; Amt. Neg. (Y. 7, N. 140) 8855 ; Amt. (Mr. Leonard) 8857 ; Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) *re* Distribution of Seats, 8858 ; Neg. (Y. 42, N. 97) 8859 ; Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) *re* Distribution of Seats, 8860 ; Amt. (Mr. Lake) *re* Crown Lands, &c., 8863 ; Amt. (Mr. Barker) *re* Preamble, 8864 ; 3° agreed to on division, 8866 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 3.)

Autonomy B. 69, 2° m., 2915 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2979 ; Neg., (Y. 59, N. 140) 5400.

Debate :

(Mr. R. L. Borden) 2963 ; Amt., 2979 ; (Mr. Fielding) 2979 ; (Mr. Sproule) 3010 ; (Mr. Paterson) 3045 ; (Mr. Monk) 3064 ; (Mr. Sifton) 3092 ; (Mr. Northrup) 3121 ; 3136 ; (Mr. Oliver) 3152 ; (Mr. Bourassa) 3252 ; (Mr. Blain) 3284 ; (Mr. Lemieux) 3304 ; (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 3332 ; (Mr. Foster) 3363 ; (Sir Wm. Mulock) 3400 ; (Mr. Lancaster) 3424 ; (Mr. L. P. Demers) 3450 ; (Mr. Bergeron) 3462 ; (Mr. Belcourt) 3498 ; (Mr. Lake) 3532 ; (Mr. Scott) 3591 ; (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3672 ; (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) 3713 ; (Mr. Perley) 3739 ; (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3745 ; (Mr. S. Hughes) 3766 ; (Mr. Turriff) 3813 ; (Mr. U. Wilson) 3893 ; (Mr. Béland) 3906 ; (Mr. Barr) 3921 ; (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 4086 ; (Mr. Lennox) 4112, 4136 ; (Mr. Turgeon) 4155 ; (Mr. P. Talbot) 4176 ; (Mr. Pringle) 4273 ; (Mr. Miller) 4292 ; (Mr. Staples) 4312 ; (Mr. Lamont) 4329 ; (Mr. W. Wright) 4349 ; (Mr. Bickerdike) 4360 ; (Mr. Alcorn) 4375 ; (Mr. Beauparlant) 4395 ; (Mr. Osler) 4404 ; (Mr. Hall) 4409, 4415 ; (Mr. Boyce) 4433 ; (Mr. Fisher) 4481 ; (Mr. Ames) 4504 ; (Mr. Crocket) 4532 ; (Mr. Bruneau) 4552 ; (Mr. Cockshutt) 4580 ; (Mr. Crawford) 4607 ; (Mr. Schaffner) 4622 ; (Mr. Grant) 4703 ; (Mr. Porter) 4726 ; (Mr. Laurence) 4745, 4753 ; (Mr. Armstrong) 4767 ; (Mr. Bole) 4784 ; (Mr. Paquet) 4798 ; (Mr. Henderson) 4811 ; (Mr. Cash) 4833 ; (Mr. Broder) 4846 ; (Mr. Bureau) 4861 ; (Mr. Herron) 4878 ; (Mr. Parmelee) 4886 ; (Mr. Taylor) 4896 ; (Mr. Kemp) 4922 ; (Mr. German) 4944 ; (Mr. Ward) 4951 ; (Mr. A. A. Wright) 4960, 4978 ; (Mr. Campbell) 5037 ; (Mr. Lalor) 5055 ; (Mr. T. Martin) 5083 ; (Mr. Elson) 5100 ; (Mr. Black) 5109 ; (Mr. Adamson) 5114 ; (Mr. Sinclair) 5121 ; (Mr. Bristol) 5140 ; (Mr. Guthrie) 5153 ; (Mr. Boyer) 5189 ; (Mr. McIntyre) 5179 ; (Mr. Derbyshire) 5197 ; (Mr. Forget) 5206 ; (Mr. Brodeur) 5211 ; (Mr. Macdonell) 5240 ; (Mr. Kennedy) 5256 ; (Mr. Bennett) 5262 ; (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 5276 ; (Mr. Worthington) 5290 ; (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5301 ; (Mr. Wilmot) 5309 ; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 5317 ; (Mr. Barker) 5354 ; (Mr. Stockton) 5380 ; (Mr. Leonard) 5393 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) negatived (Y. 59, N. 140) 5400; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5401 ; 2°, 5423 (iii).

Autonomy (Saskatchewan) for N.W.Ters. B. No. 70 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1°*, 1467 (i) ; Res. prop., 2914 (ii); 2° m., 5424 (iii); 2° M. of B., 8698 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8698, Neg. (Y. 37 ; N. 90) 8699 ; in Com. on Res., *re* Financial Subsidy, 8701 ; in Com., 8702, 8718; 3° m., 8866 ; Amt. (Mr. Scott) *re* C.P.R. Taxes, 8873 ; Neg. (Y. 11, N. 126) 8881; Amt. (Mr. Leonard) *re* Schools, 8882 ; Neg. (Y. 6 ; N. 124) 8882 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Schools, 8884 ; Amt. (Mr. Sproule) *re* Schools, 8884; 3° agreed to, on division, 8885 (v) (5 Edward VII, c., 42).

Autonomy B. 69, in Com. (Alberta Boundaries) 5601 (iii).

Autonomy B. 69 (Arbitration *re* Assets) 5946 (iii).

——— (B.N.A. Act, s. 2) 5719, 5750 (iii).

——— (B.N.A. Act, s. 2) 5719, 5750 (iii), 8526 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8526 (v) ; Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8530, 8613 (v).

——— (C.P.R. Taxes) 6049 (iv).

——— (compensation for lands) 5817 (iii).

——— (date of Act) 8634 (v).

——— (distribution of seats) 7724 ; Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to ref. to Judges, 7770 ; Newspaper Rumors, Quotation : Read (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 7744 ; Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7817, 7864, 7917 (iv) ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8004, Neg., 8092 (v).

——— (election of members), 5766, 5809 (iii).

——— (Executive Council), 5781 (iii).

——— (House of Commons representation), 5685 (iii).

——— (Hudson Bay Co. Rights) 5947 (iii), 6049 (iv), 8166 (v).

——— (Joint Stock Companies) Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick), 6083 (iv).

——— (lands vested in Crown), 5918, 5946 (iii), 5986 (iv), 8171 ; Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 8171, 8256-7 (v).

——— (laws, courts, &c.) 5783, 5812 · Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 5927 (iii), 6101 (iv), 8170, 8240 ; Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 8244 (v).

——— (Legislative Assembly) 5815 (iii).

——— (Lt. Gov.'s Powers) 5781 (iii).

——— (readjustment *re* census) Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 5753 (iii).

——— (school clause Amt.) 7103 (iv) ; Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8387 ; Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8269 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8292 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 8341 ; Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8491 (v).

——— (seat of government) 5781 (iii), 8244 (v).

——— (Senate representation) 5674 (iii).

Autonomy B. 69, in Com., on Schedules (Athabaska) 8163 ; (Cardston) 8140 ; (Edmonton city) 8160 ; (Gleichen) 8153, 8166 ; (High River) 8155 ; (Lacombe) 8156 ; (Leduc) 8157; (Lethbridge) 8150 ; (Macleod) 8150 ; (Medicine Hat) 8148 ; (Peace River) 8163 ; (Pincher Creek) 8153 ; (Ponoka) 8156 ; (Red Deer) 8155 ; (St. Albert) 8163 ; (Saskatchewan) 8161 ; (Stony Plain) 8157 ; (Strathcona) 8157 ; (Sturgeon) 8162 ; (Vermilion) 8155 ; (Wetaskiwin) 8157 (v).

Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) on 3°, Amt. (Mr. S. Hughes) B.N.A. Act, sec. 2, Neg. (Y. 37 ; N. 106) 8834 (v).

——— Amt. (Mr. Scott), C.P.R. Land Taxes, 8777.

——— Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Schools, 8804 ; Neg. (Y. 41 ; N. 109) 8817 (v).

——— Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) Distribution of Seats, 8858, Neg. (Y. 42 ; N. 97) 8859 (v).

Autonomy B. 69, on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche). Distribution of Seats, 8860.
——— Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) Dual Language (Neg. Y. 7, N. 140) 8854 (v).
——— Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8839, Neg. (Y. 7, N. 140) 8855 (v).
——— Amt. (Mr. Barker) Rupert's Lands, 8864 (v).
——— Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) Schools (Neg. Y. 7 ; N. 138) 8831 (v).
——— Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) School Fund, 8835, Neg. (Y. 7, N. 132) 8837 (v).
——— Amt. *re* Separate Schools (Mr. Léonard) 8857 (v).
Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) in Com. (annual subsidy), Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 8760 (v).
——— (B.N.A. Act) Amt. (Mr. Monk) 8702 (v).
——— Amt. *re* C. P. R. (Mr. Scott) 8873, Neg. (Y. 11, N. 126) 8881 (v).
——— (Crown lands) 8760 (v).
——— (distribution of seats) : Remarks (Mr. Lake) 8704 (v).
——— (H. of C. Representation), Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 8703 (v).
——— (law courts, &c.) Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 8758 (v).
——— (Rupert's Lands) Amt. (Mr. Barker) 8761 (v).
——— (schools), Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 8759 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8759 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 8759 (v).
——— (Senate representation), Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 8703 (v).
Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) in Com. on Schedules (Grenfell) 8757 ; (Lumsden) 8757 ; (Moosejaw) 8757 (v).
Autonomy (Saskatchewan) B. 70, 3° m., 8866 ; Amt. (Mr. Scott) *re* C.P.R. Exemption, 8873; Neg. (Y. 11; N. 126) 8881 ; Amt. (Mr. Léonard) *re* Schools, Neg. (Y. 6 ; N. 124) 8882 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Schools, 8884 ; Amt. (Mr. Sproule) Schools, 8884 (v).
Autonomy Bills, Amendments : Presented (Mr. Fielding) 2840 (ii).
——— Approval of Cabinet, Resignation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Sup., 2263 (ii).
——— Alberta Boundaries, Letter *re* Naming of Prov.: Read (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5637 (iii).
——— Changes since First Reading, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2046 (ii).
——— Circulars, &c., Denial (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2570 (ii).
——— Circular signed by T. Brown, Sec. of Public Instruction, N.W.T., Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 3009 (ii).
——— Constitutionality of, Changes *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2192 (ii).
——— Cor. referred to by Prime Minister : Inquiry for (Mr. Sproule) 2593 (ii).
Autonomy Bills, Delay in Printing : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1671 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Haggart) 1754 (i).
——— Discussion, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6736, 6836 (iv).
——— Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Minister: on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2493 (ii).
——— Information asked for in Rets.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3091 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2594 (ii).
——— Letter from Hon. G. W. Ross to Min. of Fin. (Mr. Henderson) 6092 (iv).
——— Meridian Divisional Line : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8634 (v).
——— Notice of Amendment, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2761 (ii).
——— Official Record of Division : Remarks (Mr. McIntyre) 5428 (iii).
——— Papers *re* : Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3008 (ii).
——— Par. in 'Le Soleil' : M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjn., 1745 (i).
——— Personal Explanation, Debate and Absence : (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2043 (ii).
——— Personal Explanations (Mr. Bourassa and Mr. A. Lavergne) 8865-6 (v).
——— Personal Explanation *re* Draft Bill of 1902 (Mr. Lake) 4348 (iii).
——— Petitions *re* : Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 2260, 2319 (ii).
——— Pets. *re* : Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Macpherson) 2681 (ii).
——— 'Political Pay,' Charge by Mr. Belcourt *re* Mr. Foster's Speech : Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 3517 ; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 3520 (ii).
——— Population *re* Saskatchewan : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5919 (iii).
——— Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 1788 (i).
——— Printing, &c., for 3° : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 8762 (v).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Circular sent by Jacques Cartier Club, 2569, 2590 (ii).
——— Ry. Subsidies by Dom. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4202 (iii).
——— Ref. to Speech on 'Doukhobors and Englishmen' (Mr. Black) 5901 (iii).
——— Resignation of Hon. C. Sifton : Personal Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1851 (i).
——— Res. *re* : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1594 (i).
——— Schedules *re* Constituencies : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com., 5815 (ii).
——— Schedules, Population and Votes cast : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5575 (iii).
——— Schedules, Preparation of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4375, 4750 (iii).

Autonomy Bills, Schedules *re* Saskatchewan, Preparation of Maps, &c.: Ramarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5475 (iii).

—— School Clause Amt.: Remarks *re* Explanation (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5673 (iii).

—— School Clauses, Attack on Orangeism: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 5873 (iii).

—— School Clause, Explanation *re* Amended clause 16: Read in Com. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 5983 (iv).

—— School Clause Amts., Explanation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com., 5818 (i); Quotations from Regina 'Leader' (read) 5851 (iii).

—— School Clause in Com.: Remarks (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 5817-18 (iii).

—— School Clause: Personal Explanation (Mr. Bourassa) 7175 (iv).

—— School Clause 16: Statement (Mr. Fitzpatrick *re* Drafting, 4829 (iii).

—— Second Reading *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2022 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 2112 (ii).

—— School Pets.: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) in Com. of Sup., 2319 (ii).

—— personal explanation (Mr. Sproule) 2320 (ii).

—— in Com. on Res. (subsidy clause), 5479; Statement *re* Net Rev. of Public Lands: read (Mr. Scott) 5505 (iii).

—— 'Yellow Dog,' Quotation from Halifax Chronicle: Read (Mr. Sproule) in Com., 5879, 5901 (iii).

See 'Mackenzie,' 'Keewatin,' 'Controverted Elections,' 'Northwest Territories,' 'Land Titles Act,' 'Northwest Irrigation,' 'Census and Statistics,' 'N. W. Territories B. 160,' 'Northwest Territories Representation Act. Amt. B. 156,' 'Census and Statistics B. 163' 'Northwest Irrigation B. 161,' 'Manitoba Boundaries'.

Baddeck and East SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 934 (i).

Baddeck Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7396 (iv), 9585 (v).

Badgley Island Timber Cutting, Licenses Granted: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 452 (i).

Bait Freezers Deep Sea Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 9620 (v).

—— Establishment in Canso, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1146 (i).

—— Mar. Canada, Number, Location, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Martin) 2067 (ii).

Ballots, Bank, Method of Issuing, Complains *re* S. Lanark and Ottawa: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 1342 (i).

—— Printing, Procedure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 911 (i).

—— Printing, &c., for Carleton, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 587 (i).

Ballot Box Frauds in Dom. Elections, Demonstration *re* Fraudulent Box: (Mr. Porter) on M. for Sup., 9199 (v).

Ballot Boxes, Payment to Mr. Cayouette: Remarks (Mr. Morin) 1337 (i).

—— Letter read (Mr. Morin) 989 (i).

See 'House of Commons,' 'Voters' Lists,' &c.

Balsam Lake Waterways, Agreeement *re*: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 1524 (i).

Bank Act Amt. B. No. 181 (Mr. Fielding) 1° m., 7642 (iv); 2°*, 8688; in Com., 8688; 3°*, 8689 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 4).

Banking Act Amts., Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6112 (iv).

—— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2441 (ii).

Bank Notes, Supervision *re* Printing and Circulation, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6251 (iv).

See 'Finance, &c.'

Banff Hot Spring Roads and Bridges; in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iv).

Banff, N.W.T. Water Works and Sewage Construction: in Com. of Sup., 9306 (v).

Banff Pamphlets, Printing and Distribution; in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).

Barachois Boat Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 7396 (iv).

Barachois de Malbaie Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).

Barrie (Allandale) Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 9595 (v).

Barrington Passage Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).

Barry's Wharf, Madawaska River: in Com. of Sup., 6873 (iv).

Bass River Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7397 (iv).

Batiscan Channel Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7322 (iv).

Battery Point Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 9552 (v).

Battleford and Lake Lenore Ry. Co.'s B. No. 75 (Mr. Lamont) 1° m., 1671; 2°*, 1758 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 60.)

Battleford Bridge, N.W.T., Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 7587 (iv).

Bayfield Pier, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7546 (iv).

Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.'s B. No. 85 (Mr. Harty) 1°*, 1788; 2°*, 1891 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 81.)

Bay St. Lawrence, Boat Harbour: in Com. of Sup. 7397 (iv).

—— Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv).

Bear Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 7397 (iv).

Beauharnois Canal, Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6307 (iv).
——— Water Power, Utilization : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6307 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1504 (i).
Beaverton Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7546 (iv).
Beaujeu Bank Pier : in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Beckerton Public Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7397 (iv).
Beet Sugar Industry, Encouragement of &c.: M. for Copies of Cor* (Mr. Clements) 3204 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. Bickerdike) to place on Order Paper, 9278 (v).
Belle River Dredging Channel : in Com. of Sup., 7546 (iv).
Belle River Wharf, P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 9585 (v).
Bell, Dr., Director of Geological Survey : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9303 (v).
Belleville Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1547 (i).
Beloeil Guide Piers and Booms : in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).
Benrier, Mr. J. P., Postmaster at St. Claud, Dismissal, &c., Cor. *re* : M. (Mr. Staples) for Cor.*, 1397 (i).
Bersimis to Godbout Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 7608 (iv).
Bic Harbour Wharf at Pointe à Cote : in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).
——— Land purchased from P. Ross : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1850 (i).
Bicquet Lighthouse Keeper, Name, Salary, &c.: Qtes. (Mr. Bergeron) 3202 (ii).
Bills from Senate (M.) to place on Order Paper amongst Private Bils (Mr. R. G. Macpherson) 8001 (v).
——— M. (Mr. A. Johnston) to place on Order Paper, 8096 (v).
——— Amendments *re*, Correction of Clerical Error (Mr. Fielding) 8383 (v).
——— M. (Mr. Bickerdike) to place on Order Paper, 9278 (v).
Bills, Royal Assent.: Mess. from Dep. Governor (Mr. Speaker) 6084 (iv).
——— Com. from Gov. Gen's Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 6991 (iv).
Bills, Royal Assent to in Senate, 9820 (v).

BILLS :

Bill (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)
1°*, pro forma, 5 (i).

Bill (No. 2) To amend the Railway Act, 1903.—(Mr. Lancaster.)
1°*, 9 ; 2° m., 281 ; M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 312 ; agreed to (Y. 85. N. 45) 315 ; in Com., 1780 (i), 3223 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 3) To amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships.—(Mr. Lancaster.)
1°*, 9 ; on Order for 2°, 733 (i).

Bill (No. 4) To amend the Railway Act, 1903.—(Mr. Maclean, York.)
1°*, 9 ; on Order for 2°, 109 (i) ; Remarks, 3246 ; withdn., 3743 (ii).

Bill (No. 5) Respecting the Census and Statistics.—(Mr. Fisher.)
1°*, 52 ; 2°* 625 ; in Com., 625 ; Res. prop., 820 ; in Com. on Res., 989 ; M. for Com. on B., 1013 ; in Com., 1069, 1467 ; 3°*, 1506 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 5.)

Bill (No. 6) To amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.—(Mr. McCarthy, North Simcoe.)
1°*, 58 ; 2° m., 315 ; ref. to Sel. Com., 316 (i).

Bill (No. 7) Respecting the Inspection and Sale of Seeds.—(Mr. Fisher.)
M. for Com. on Res., 52 ; in Com., 54 ; 1°*, 66 ; 2°, 322 ; in Com., 322, 1155, 1788 ; 3° m., 1868 ; 3°*, 1886 (i) ; Sen. Amts., 7583 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 41.)

Bill (No. 8) To amend the Mounted Police Act, 1894.—(Sir Wilfrid Laruier.)
Res. prop., 59 ; in Com., 98 ; 1°*, 109 ; 2°*, 459 ; in Com., 459 ; 3°*, 465 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 24.)

Bill (No. 9) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Guthrie.)
1°, 263 (i).

Bill (No. 10) Respecting Labour Union Labels.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo.)
In Com. on Res., 272 ; 1°*, 279 ; 2°*, 601 ; in Com., 918, 1770 ; 3°, 1780 (i).

Bill (No. 11) Respecting the Columbia and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)
1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 404 ; in Com., and 3°*, 864 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 82.)

Bill (No. 12) Respecting the Ottawa Electric Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)
1° m., 316 ; 2°*, 404 ; in Com., 1283 ; on Order for Com., 1338 ; in Com., 1888; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1890 (i), 2532 ; on Order for House again in Com., 2714 ; in Com., 2950, 3170 ; 3° m., 3393 ; Amt. (Mr. Stewart) Neg. (Y. 56, N. 80) 3398 ; 3°*, 3399 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 40.)

Bill (No. 13) Respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Gauvreau.)
1°, 317 ; 2°*, 404 ; in Com., and 3°*, 864 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 59.)

Bill (No. 14) Respecting the Molsons Bank.—(Mr. Ames.)
1°, 317 ; 2°*, 415 ; in Com., 1755 ; 3°*, 1755 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 124.)

Bill (No. 15) To incorporate the St. Mary's and Western Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre.)
1°* 317 ; 2°*, 415 ; in Com., and 3°*, 864 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 155.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 16) Respecting certain patents of the Canada Car Company, Limited.—(Mr. Bickerdike.)
1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 415 (i).

Bill (No. 17) Respecting certain patents of the Goodwin Car Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike.)
1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 415 (i).

Bill (No. 18) Respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)
1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 415 ; in Com., and 3°*, 864 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 142.)

Bill (No. 19) To incorporate the Calgary, Red Deer and Battleford Railway Company.—(Mr. Scott.)
1°, 318 ; 2°*, 415 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2325 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 67.)

Bill (No. 20) To incorporate the Moosejaw and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. Scott.)
1°*, 318 ; 2°*, 415 (i) ; in Com., 2715, 2762, (iii) ; 3°*, 2763 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 130.)

Bill (No. 21) To amend the Act respecting the Safety of Ships.—(Mr. Sinclair.)
1°, 319 ; 2°*, 601 ; in Com., 731 (i).

Bill (No. 22) Respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°*, 378 ; 2°*, 534 ; in Com., 1100 ; 3°*, 1100 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 66.)

Bill (No. 23) To amend the provisions of the Criminal Code, 1892, with respect to common bawdy houses.—(Mr. Bole.)
1°, 450 ; on Order for 2°, 733 (i).

Bill (No. 24) Respecting the Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Railway Company —(Mr. Galliher.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 115.)

Bill (No. 25) Respecting the Walkerton and Lucknow Railway Company.—(Mr. McKenzie, Bruce.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583, in Com., and 3°*, 1101 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 175.)

Bill (No. 26) To incorporate the Sovereign Fire Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Clarke.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., 1755 ; 3°*, 1757 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 159.)

Bill (No. 27) Respecting certain patents of the Facer Solid Steel Car Wheel Company, of Perth, Limited.—(Mr. Caldwell.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., 1285, 1339 ; 3°*, 1340 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 91.)

Bill (No. 28) To incorporate the North-west Telephone Company.—(Mr. Turriff.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., 1890 (i), 2047, 2323 ; 3° m., 2325 ; on Order for 3°, 2714 (ii) ; 3° m., 6346 ; Sen. Amts., 7683 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 136.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 29) Respecting the Canada Southern Bridge Company.—(Mr. German.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°, 583 ; in Com., 1286 ; 3°*, 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 70.)

Bill (No. 30) Respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. German.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 71.)

Bill (No. 31) Respecting the Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Company. —(Mr. German.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 69.)

Bill (No. 32) To incorporate the London and St. Clair Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 118.)

Bill (No. 33) Respecting certain patents of Jean Effront.—(Mr. Demers, St. John and Iberville.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°, 1755 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 89.)

Bill (No. 34) Respecting the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., 1706 ; 3°*, 1755 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 134.)

Bill (No. 35) To incorporate the Georgian Bay and Seaboard Railway Company.—(Mr. Grant.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1288 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 95.)

Bill (No. 36) To amend the Railway Act 1903.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)
Res. prop., 319 ; M. for Com., 493, 535 ; in Com., 563 ; 1°* of B., 582 ; 2°, 745 ; in Com., 1596 ; 3° m., 1802 ; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) Neg., (Y. 47, N. 93) 1806 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 35.)

Bill (No. 37) To amend the Quebec Harbour Commissioners' Act, 1899.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)
1°, 582 ; 2° m., 1242 ; in Com., 1243 ; 3°*, 1244 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 33.)

Bill (No. 38) To amend the Seamen's Act. —(Mr. Préfontaine.)
1°, 583 (i) ; 2°*, 2114 ; in Com., 2115 (ii) ; wthdn., 4749 (iii).

Bill (No. 39) Respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 132.)

Bill (No. 40) Respecting the Niagara-Welland Power Company.—(Mr. Guthrie.)
1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1710 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 133.)

Bill (No. 41) Respecting the Regina and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Scott.)
1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2325 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 153.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 42) Respecting the Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. Macpherson.)

1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1541 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 173.)

Bill (No. 43) Respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company. —(Mr. Gervais.)

1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2042 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 116.)

Bill (No. 44) To amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships.—(Mr. Lancaster.)

1°, 684 ; on Order for 2°, 918, 1399 (i).

Bill (No. 45) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company.—(Mr. E. M. Macdonald.)

1°, 727 ; 2°*, 909 (i) ; on Order for Com., 2765 ; in Com., 3649, 3879 (ii), 4123, 4202 ; 3° m., 4228 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 75.)

Bill (No. 46) Respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. E. M. Macdonald.)

1*, 728 ; 2°*, 909 (i) ; M. for Com., 4236 ; in Com., 4240 ; 3° m., 4412 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 50.)

Bill (No. 47) Respecting the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion.)

1°*, 728 ; 2°*, 1101 (i).

Bill (No. 48) Respecting the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)

1°, 817 ; 2°*, 909 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1541 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 163.)

Bill (No. 49) Respecting the Century Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Macpherson.)

1°*, 817 ; 2°*, 909 (i) ; in Com., 2765 ; 3°*, 2767 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 80.)

Bill (No. 50) To incorporate the Calgary and Battleford Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff.)

1°*, 817 ; 2°*, 909 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2325 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 65.)

Bill (No. 51) Respecting Contracts for Government Works.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick)

1°, 818 ; 2°*, 1672 ; in Com., 1672 ; 3°*, 1806 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 7.)

Bill (No. 52) To amend the Franchise Act, 1898.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick).

1°, 818 (i) ; 2°*, 2112 ; in Com., 2112 (ii), 9198 ; 3°*, 9199 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 13.)

Bill (No. 53) To amend the Act respecting the Department of Railways and Canals. —(Mr. Emmerson.)

1°*, 817 ; 2°*, 1673 ; in Com., 1673 ; 3°*, 1806 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 37.)

Bill (No. 54) To amend the Public Works Act.—(Mr. Hyman.)

1°, 819 ; 2°*, 1679 ; 3°*, 1806 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 32.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 55) To incorporate the Canada-Middlesex Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)

1°*, 908 ; 2°*, 1101 (i).

Bill (No. 56) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Bole.)

1°*, 985 ; 2°*, 1101 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2042 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c., 73.)

Bill (No. 57) To incorporate the Three Rivers, St. Maurice and Champlain Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. Bureau.)

1°, 986 ; 2°*, 1101 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c., 167.)

Bill (No. 58) Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Lamont.)

1°*, 986 ; 2°*, 1101 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii) ; Sen. Amts., 9078 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 72.)

Bill (No. 59) To amend the Act respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to Railway Debts.—(Mr. Geoffrion.)

1° m., 986 ; 2°*, 1399 ; in Com., 1400 (i), 2105, 3205 (ii).

Bill (No. 60) To incorporate the Algoma Copper Range Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)

1°*, 1241 ; 2°*, 1338 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3598 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c. 54.)

Bill (No. 61) To incorporate the Lebonk and Thunder Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Bole.)

1°, 1241 ; 2°*, 1338 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c., 117.)

Bill (No. 62) Respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Lamont.)

1°*, 1241 ; 2°*, 1339 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII, c., 88.)

Bill (No. 63) To incorporate the Brantford and Woodstock Railway Company.—(Mr. Schell, Oxford.)

1°*, 1241 ; 2°*, 1339 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c., 63.)

Bill (No. 64) Respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. Stewart.)

1°*, 1336 ; 2°*, 1541 (i) ; in Com., 3598 ; 3°*, 3598 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c., 78.)

Bill (No. 65) Respecting the James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Watson.)

1°*, 1336 ; 2°*, 1541 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII, c., 110.)

Bill (No. 66) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, with respect to appeals from certain summary convictions.—(Mr. Porter.)

1°*, 1336 (i) ; 2°, 4260 ; in Com., 4260, 5137 (iii) ; 3°, 9699 (v). (5 Edward VII, c. 10.)

Bill (No. 67) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. Guthrie.)

1°*, 1421 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 68) Respecting a patent of the Paper Goods Company, Limited.—(Mr. Macdonell.)

1°*, 1421 ; 2°*, 1541 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c., 146.)

Bill (No. 69) To establish and provide for the Government of the Province of Alberta.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

1° m., 1421 (i) ; Res. prop., 2913 ; 2° m., 2915, on M. for 2°, 2963, 3010, 3091, 3136, 3252, 3363, 3400, 3450, 3591, 3598, 3672, 3745, 3893, 4078, 4086, 4136, 4273, 4375, 4414, 4480, 4552, 4598, 4703, 4753, 4811, 4846, 4922, 4978, 5037, 5083, 5113, 5140, 5211, 5317, Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Neg. Y. 59 ; N. 140) 5401 ; 2°, 5423 ; in Com., 5423, in Com. on Res. *re* Subsidy, 5434 ; Amt. (Mr. Fielding) *re* Subsidy, 5470 ; 5479 ; Res. ref. to Com. on Bill, 5575 ; in Com. on Bill, 5601, 5719, 5749, 5808, 5927 (iii) ; Explanation (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 5983 ; in Com. on B., 6048, 6086, 7103 ; Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Dual Language, 7583 (iv), 8530 (v); in Com., 7724, 7817, 7864, 7916 (iv), 8004 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Distribution of Seats, 8004 ; in Com., 8148 ; Amt. (Mr. Barker) *re* Preamble, 8173 ; in Com., 8240 ; Amt. (Mr. Lake) 8259 ; in Com., 8268 ; Amt. (Sir W. Laurier) *re* School Clause No. 2, 8269 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Amended School Clause, 8292 ; in Com., 8317 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) *re* School Clause, 8341 ; Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) *re* School Clause, 8387 ; Amt. (Mr. Lamont) *re* School Clause, 8493 ; in Com., 8530 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) to Mr. Monk's Amt., 8593 ; 3° m., 8777 ; Amt. (Mr. Scott) *re* C.P.R. Taxes, 8792; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Schools, 8804, Neg. (Y. 41 ; N. 109) 8816 ; Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) *re* Schools, 8831, Neg. (Y. 7 ; N. 138) 8832 ; Amt. (Mr. Sam. Hughes) *re* Schools, 8833, Neg. (Y. 37 ; N. 106), 8834 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) *re* Schools, 8835, Neg. (Y. 7 ; N. 132) 8837; Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Dual Language, 8839 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) to Amt., 8852, Neg. (Y. 7 ; N. 140) 8854 ; Amt. Neg. (Y. 7 ; N. 140) 8855 ; Amt. (Mr. Leonard) 8857 ; Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) *re* Distribution of Seats, 8858 ; Neg. (Y. 42 ; N. 97) 8859 ; Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) *re* Distribution of Seats, 8860 ; Amt. (Mr. Lake) *re* Lands, &c., 8863 ; Amt. (Mr. Barker) *re* Preamble, 8864 ; 3°, agreed to on division, 8866 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 3.)

Bill (No. 70) To establish and provide for the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

1°*, 1467 (i) ; Res. prop., 2914 (ii) ; 2° m., 5424 (iii), 8698 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8698, Neg. (Y. 37 ; N. 90) 8699; in Com. on Res. *re* Financial Subsidy, 8701 ; in Com., 8702, 8718 ; 3° m., 8866 ; Amt. (Mr. Scott) *re* C.P.R. Taxes, 8873, Neg. (Y. 11, N. 126) 8881 ; Amt. (Mr. Leonard) *re* Schools, 8882, Neg. (Y. 6, N. 124) 8882 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Schools, 8884 ; Amt. (Mr. Sproule) *re* Schools, 8884 ; 3°, agreed to, on division, 8885 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 42.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 71) Respecting the Great Northern Railway of Canada.—(Mr. Schell, Oxford.)

1°*, 1504 ; 2°*, 1710 (i) ; in Com., 4258 ; 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII, c., 99.)

Bill (No. 72) To incorporate the Canadian Canals Corporation.—(Mr. Calvert.)

1°*, 1592 ; 2°, 1757 (i).

Bill (No. 73) To incorporate the Montreal, Quebec and Southern Railway Company. —(Mr. Gervais.)

1°*, 1592 ; 2°, 1757 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 128.)

Bill (No. 74) Respecting the Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Railway Company. (Mr. Talbot, Strathcona.)

1°*, 1671 ; 2°, 1758 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 122.)

Bill (No. 75) Respecting the Battleford and Lake Lenore Railway Company.—(Mr. Lamont.)

1°*, 1671; 2°*, 1758 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 60.)

Bill (No. 76) Respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 1671 ; 2°, 1757 (i) ; in Com., 2325 ; 3°*, 2325 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 152.)

Bill (No. 77) Respecting the Canadian Agency.—(Mr. Bickerdike.)

1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i) ; on Order for Com., 9049 ; in Com., 9077 (v).

Bill (No. 78) Respecting the Macleod, Cardston and Montana Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff.)

1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 119.)

Bill (No. 79) Respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. Zimmerman.)

1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i) ; in Com., 4259 ; 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 165.)

Bill (No. 80) To incorporate the Woodstock and Lake Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex.)

1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i).

Bill (No. 81) Respecting the Ottawa River Railway Company, and to change its name to the 'Central Trunk Railway Company.'—(Mr. Piché.)

1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 79.)

Bill (No. 82) To incorporate the Dominion Annuity Company.—(Mr. Bole.)

1°*, 1745 ; 2°*, 1891 (i) ; in Com., 2767 ; 3° m., 2768 ; 3°*, 2950 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 55.)

Bill (No. 83) Respecting the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company.—(Mr. Turriff.)

1°*, 1788 ; 2°*, 1891 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5132 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 52.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 84) Respecting the Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)

1°*, 1788 ; 2°*, 1891 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 105.)

Bill (No. 85) Respecting the Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—(Mr. Harty).

1°*, 1788 ; 2°*, 1891 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 81.)

Bill (No. 86) Respecting the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company, Limited.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 1933 (i) ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 2715, 2763, 3134 ; 3°*, 3135 (iii) ; Sen. Amts., 9817 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 139.)

Bill (No. 87) To incorporate the International Terminal and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Johnston, Lambton.)

1°*, 1933 (i) ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 3135 ; 3°, 3135 (ii) ; Sen. Amts., 9695 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 108.)

Bill (No. 88) To incorporate the Athabaska Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff.)

1°*, 193 (i); 2°*, 2060 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 57.)

Bill (No. 89) Respecting Monterey Electric and Gas Company, Limited, and to change its name to 'Monterey Railway, Light and Power Company.'—(Mr. Macdonell.)

1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c., 126.)

Bill (No. 90) Respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company. — (Mr. Smith.)

1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2297 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 90.)

Bill (No. 91) Respecting the Timagami Railway Company.—(Mr. McCool.)

1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 3135 ; 3°, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 161.)

Bill (No. 92) Respecting the Ottawa and New York Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 (ii) ; in Com., 4965, 5736 (iii), 5963 ; 3°*, 5973 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 141.)

Bill (No. 93) Respecting the Grand Council of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association of Canada.—(Mr. Hughes, Kings.)

1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 2769 ; 3°*, 2770 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 77.)

Bill (No. 94) Respecting the Brockville, Westport and North-western Railway.—(Mr. Derbyshire.)

1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 64.)

Bill (No. 95) Respecting Gillies Brothers, Limited.—(Mr. Wright, Renfrew.)

1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 2763 ; 3°*, 2765 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 96.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 96) Respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion.)

1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 129.)

Bill (No. 97) Respecting the Kingston and Dominion Central Railway, and to change its name to 'The Montreal, Ottawa Kingston and Georgian Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Harty.)

1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2325 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5113 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 86.)

Bill (No. 98) To incorporate the Imperial Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

1°*, 2043 ; 2°*, 2297 ; in Com., 2770 ; 3°*, 2772 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 107.)

Bill (No. 99) To incorporate the Title Guarantee and Trust Company.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 2108 ; 2°*, 2297 ; in Com., 3651 (ii), 4680 ; 3° m., 4964 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 162.)

Bill (No. 100) Respecting the Guelph and Georgian Bay Railway Company.— (Mr. Guthrie.)

1°*, 2108 ; 2°*, 2297 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 101.)

Bill (No. 101) To incorporate the Winding Ledges Power and Boom Company.—(Mr. Costigan.)

1°*, 2108 ; 2°*, 2297 (ii).

Bill (No. 102) Respecting a certain patent of the Gold Medal Furniture Manufacturing Company, Limited.— (Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2297 ; in Com., 3399 ; 3°*, 3400 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 97.)

Bill (No. 103) Respecting the Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Tobin.)

1°*, 2184 ; on Order for 2°, 2296 ; 2°*, 2297 ; in Com., 3669 ; 3°*, 3669 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 154.)

Bill (No. 104) Respecting the Northern Bank.—(Mr. Bole.)

1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 135.)

Bill (No. 105) To incorporate the Ontario Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Boyce.)

1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 ; in Com., 2772 ; 3°*, 2950 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 137.)

Bill (No. 106) Respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Black.)

1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., 4971, 5113 ; 3°*, 5113 (iii) ; Sen. Amts., 7625 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 85.)

Bill (No. 107) Respecting a certain patent of Celeste Joly.—(Mr. Smith.)

1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 112.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 108) To incorporate the Western Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Adamson.)
1°*, 2184 ; 2°* 2298 (ii) ; in Com., 4684 ; 3°*, 4700 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 74.)

Bill (No. 109) Respecting the Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 104.)

Bill (No. 110) Respecting the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 164.)

Bill (No. 111) To incorporate the Saskatchewan Bridge Company.—(Mr. Scott).
1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2773 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 157.)

Bill (No. 112) Respecting the Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Railway Company.—(Mr. Guthrie.)
1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4700 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 102.)

Bill (No. 113) Respecting the Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)
1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5132 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 138.)

Bill (No. 114) Respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)
1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 2773 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 6610 ; Sen. Amts., 7625 (iv). (5 Edward VII,. c. 120.)

Bill (No. 115) Respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy.)
1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 3400 (ii) ; on Order for Com., 7621, 7625; in Com., 7622, 7677; 3°, 7853 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 98.)

Bill (No. 116) Respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)
1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 3400 ; in Com., and 3°*, 6610 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 53.)

Bill (No. 117) To incorporate the Athabaska Railway and Oil Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°*, 2185 ; 2°* 2298 ; in Com., 3135 ; 3°*, 3135 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 58.)

Bill (No. 118) Respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 2298 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 51.)

Bill (No. 119) To incorporate D. R. Fraser and Company, Limited.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 2773 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 7625 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 87.)

Bill (No. 120) Respecting False Representations to Induce Immigration.—(Mr. Logan.)
1°*, 2323 (ii) ; 2°*, 9699 ; in Com., 9699 ; 3°*, 9700 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 16.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 121) To amend the Act respecting the Packing and Sale of Staple Commodities.—(Mr. Fisher.)
M. for Com. on Res., 676 ; in Com. on Res., 681, 736 (i), 2413 ; 1°* of B., 2441; 2°, and in Com., 2841 ; 3°*, 2850 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 44.)

Bill (No. 122) To incorporate the Grand River and Western Power Company.—(Mr. Zimmerman.)
1°*, 2681 ; 2°*, 3136 (ii).

Bill (No. 123) Respecting the Board of the Presbyterian College, Halifax.—(Mr. Sinclair.)
1°*, 2681 ; 2°*, 3136 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 149.)

Bill (No. 124) Respecting the Farmers' Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Martin, Wellington.)
1°*, 2681 ; 2°*, 3136 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4700 (ii); Sen. Amts., 6609 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 92.)

Bill (No. 125) To incorporate the Crown Casualty Company of Canada.—(Mr. Gervais.)
M. to receive Pet., 2203, 2322, 2593 ; 1°*, 2593 ; 2°*, 3136 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3669 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 83.)

Bill (No. 126, from the Senate) For the relief of Edward Albert Murphy.—(Mr. Galliher.)
1°*, 3091 ; 2°*, 3400 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 121.)

Bill (No. 127, from the Senate) For the relief of James Arthur Pryor.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 3091 ; 2°*, 3400 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 150.)

Bill (No. 128) To amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. Gervais.)
1°, 3359 (ii).

Bill (No. 129, from the Senate) Respecting certain patents of William A. Damen.—(Mr. Campbell.)
1°*, 3834 (ii) ; 2°*, 4700 (iii) ; ref. back to Sel. Com., 6379 ; in Com., and 3°*, 7624 (iv) ; M. *re* Amts., 8383 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 84.)

Bill (No. 130, from the Senate) For the relief of Jane Marie Fitz-Simons.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 4081 ; 2°*, 4414 (iii) ; in Com., 6377 ; 3° m., 6378 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 94.)

Bill (No. 131) Respecting the Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Railway Company.—(Mr. Macpherson.)
1°*, 4081 ; 2°*, 4414 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 171.)

Bill (No. 132) To amend the Government Railways Act.—(Mr. Emmerson.)
1° m., 4186 (iii) ; 2°*, and in Com., 6139, 7583 ; 3°, 7584 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 36.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 133, from the Senate) Respecting the Citizens' Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Barr.)

1°*, 4271 ; 2°*, 4700 (iii) ; in Com., 5973 ; 3°*, 5973 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 81.)

Bill (No. 134) To incorporate the Provident Savings Association, Limited. — (Mr. Gervais.)

1°*, 4370 ; 2°*, 4598 (iii) ; in Com., 5974 ; 3°*, 5976 (iv) ; Sen. Amts., 9078 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 151.)

Bill (No. 135, from the Senate) Respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company. —(Mr. Galliher.)

1°*, 4550 ; 2°*, 4700 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 176.)

Bill (No. 136, from the Senate) To incorporate the Anthracite Coal Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)

M. to receive Pet., 4550 ; Pet. ref. back to Sel. Com., 4644 ; 1°*, 4807 ; 2°*, 4978 (iii) ; in Com., 5976 ; 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 56.)

Bill (No. 137, from the Senate) Respecting the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)

1°*, 4550 ; 2°*, 4978 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 6383 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 114.)

Bill (No. 138, from the Senate) Respecting the Montreal Bridge Company, and to change its name to the Montreal Bridge and Terminal Company.—(Mr. Piché.)

1°*, 4550 ; 2°, 4703 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 6275 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 127.)

Bill (No. 139) Respecting the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Duncan Ross.)

M. to receive Pet., 3743 ; 1°*, 4550 ; 2° m., 4700 ; 2°*, 4977 (iii) ; in Com., 8315, 8637 ; 3° m., 8818, 9040 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 172.)

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

1°*, 4550 ; 2°*, 4977 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 100.)

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

M. to receive Pet., 3744 (ii), 4375 ; 1°*, 4550 ; 2°*, 4977 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 113.)

Bill (No. 142) For the relief of Edward Norman Lewis, a Member of the House of Commons.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°*, 4550 ; 2°*, 5136 ; in Com., 5136 ; 3°*, 5137 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 19.)

Bill (No. 143, from the Senate) To incorporate the Owen Sound and Meaford Railway Company.—(Mr. Telford.)

1°*, 4644 ; 2°*, 4978 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 144.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 144, from the Senate) To incorporate the Fessenden Wireless Telegraph Company of Canada.—(Mr. Telford.)

1°*, 4644 ; 2°*, 4978 (iii) ; in Com., 6380, 6607 ; 3°*, 6609 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 93.)

Bill (No. 145 from the Senate) Respecting a Patent, No. 69772, of the Underwood Typewriter Company.—(Mr. Grant.)

1°*, 4644 ; 2°*, 4977 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 6383 (iv). (5 Edward VII, c., 168.)

Bill (No. 146 from the Senate) Respecting certain Patents of the Underwood Typewriter Company (Mr. Grant.)

1°*, 4644 ; 2°*, 4977 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 6383 (iv). (5 Edward VII, c., 169.)

Bill (No. 147) To amend the Seamen's Act.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

1°*, 4750 (iii) ; 2°*, 7424 ; in Com., 7424 (iv), 9029 ; 3°*, 9031 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 40.)

Bill (No. 148) Respecting the incorporation of Live Stock Record Associations.—(Mr. Fisher.)

1° m., 5076 ; Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5577 ; 2°*, 5922 ; in Com., 5922 ; 3°*, 5927 (iii). (5 Edward VII, c., 21.)

Bill (No. 149) Respecting the South Shore Railway Company and the Quebec Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Brown.)

1°*, 5783 (iii) ; 2°*, 6868 (iv) ; M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 9072 ; M. to place on Orders for Com., 9278 ; in Com., 9340, 9586 ; 3°*, 9587 ; Sen. Amts., 9815 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 158.)

Bill (No. 150 from the Senate) Respecting the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Devlin.)

1°*, 5783 (iii) ; 2°*, 6868 ; in Com., and 3°*, 7060 (iv). (5 Edward VII, c., 109.)

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

M. to present Pet., 2490 ; M. to rec. Pet., 2491 (ii) ; 1°*, 5783 (iii) ; 2°*, 5976 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8146 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 170.)

Bill (No. 152 from the Senate) For the relief of Clara Bidwell McDermot.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 5919 (iii) ; 2°*, 5976 ; in Com., 6275, 6347 ; 3° m., 6376 ; Agreed to (Y. 38 ; N. 13) 6377 (iv). (5 Edward VII, c., 121.)

Bill (No. 153, from the Senate) For the Relief of George Pearson.—(Mr. Calvert.)

1°*, 5919 (iii) ; 2°*, 6868 ; in Com., 7623 ; 3°, 7624 (iv). (5 Edward VII, c., 147.)

Bill (No. 154, from the Senate) For the relief of George Dance Harper.—(Mr. Johnston, Lambton.)

1°*, 5919 (iii) ; 2°*, 5976 ; in Com., 6377 ; 3°*, 6377 (iv). (5 Edward VII, c., 103.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 155, from the Senate) Respecting the Administration of an Act respecting the Packing and Sale of Certain Staple Commodities.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

1°*, 5960 (iii) ; 2°*, 5979 ; in Com., 5979 ; 3°*, 5983 (iv). (5 Edward VII, c., 45.)

Bill (No. 156) To amend the North-west Territories Representation Act.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°, 6046 (iv) ; 2°*, 8769 ; in Com., 8769 ; 3°*, 8885 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 28.)

Bill (No. 157) Respecting the District of Mackenzie.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°, 6103 (iv) ; Order dschgd., 8176 (v).

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

1°, 6103-4 (iv) ; Order dschgd., 8176 (v).

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

1°, 6103-4 (iv) ; 2°*, and in Com., 8769 ; 3°*, 8885 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 8.)

Bill (No. 160) With respect to the North-west Territories.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°, 6104 (iv) ; 2°, 8763 ; in Com., 8764 ; 3°*, 9408 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 27.)

Bill (No. 161) To amend the North-west Irrigation Act, 1898.—(Mr. Oliver.)

1°, 6104 (iv) ; 2°*, 8775 ; in Com., 8775 ; 3°*, 8885 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 28.)

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

1°*, 6104 (iv) ; 2°*, 9082 ; in Com., 9082 ; 3°*, 9085 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 18.)

Bill (No. 163) To amend the Census and Statistics Act.—(Mr. Fisher.)

1°, 6105 (iv) ; 2° 8774 ; in Com., 8775 ; 3°*, 8885 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 6.)

Bill (No. 164, from the Senate) To incorporate the Monarch Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Gordon.)

1°*, 6232 ; 2°*, 6868 (iv) ; in Com., and 3°*, 8655 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 125.)

Bill (No. 165) Respecting the Canadian Yukon Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 6232 ; 2°*, 7218 (iv) ; in Com., and 3°*, 8655 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 76.)

Bill (No. 166, from the Senate) Respecting certain Patents of the Ideal Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 6232 ; 2°*, 6868 ; in Com., and 3°*, 7625 (iv) ; M. *re* Amts., 8383 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 106.)

Bill (No. 167, from the Senate) For the relief of Arthur Howe Hersey.—(Mr. Johnston, Lambton.)

1°*, 6232 ; 2°*, 6868 ; M. for Com., 7624 ; On Order for Com., 7682 ; M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 7682 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 168) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the Financial Years ending respectively the 30th June, 1905, and the 30th June, 1906 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

Res. prop., 6966 ; 1°* ; 2°* ; in Com., and 3°*, 6966 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 1.)

Bill (No. 169) To amend the Act respecting the Royal Military College.—(Sir Frederick Borden.)

Res. prop., 6904 ; in Com. on Res., 6966 ; 1°* of B., 6984 ; 2°*, 7262 ; in Com., 7262; 3°*, 7262 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 39.)

Bill (No. 170) To amend the Militia Act.—(Sir Frederick Borden.)

Res. prop., 6905 ; in Com. on Res., 6984 ; 1°* of B., 6991 ; On Order for 2°, 7263; 2° m., 9179 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9198 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 22.)

Bill (No. 171) Respecting the Fort and Pilotage District of Quebec.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

1°, 7018 ; 2°*, 7440 ; in Com., 7440 ; 3°*, 7444 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 34.)

Bill (No. 172, from the Senate) For the relief of Philip Vibert.—(Mr.Zimmerman.)

1°*, 7095 ; On Order for 2°, 7218 ; 2°, 7261; in Com., and 3°*, 7624 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 174.)

Bill (No. 173) Respecting the St. Maurice Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Bureau.)

Pet. presented, 6826 ; M. to receive Pet., 7017 ; 1°*, 7175 ; 2°*, 7261 (iv) ; in Com., and 3°*, 8655 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 156.)

Bill (No. 174, from the Senate) To amend the Grain Inspection Act as regards the Selection of Commercial Grades and Samples.—(Mr. Fisher.)

1°*, 7420 (iv) ; 2°*, 9395 ; in Com., 9395 ; 3°*, 9408 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 14.)

Bill (No. 175) Respecting the Pacific Bank.—(Mr. Galliher.)

1°, 7420 ; 2°, 7625 (iv) ; in Com., and 3°*, 8146 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 145.)

Bill (No. 176) To amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. Brodeur.)

1°, 7421 (iv) ; 2°*, 8676 ; in Com., 8676 ; 3°*, 8685 ; Sen. Amts., 9411 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 17.)

Bill (No. 177, from the Senate) Respecting certain Patents of David Thomas Owen. —(Mr. Stewart.)

1°*, 7642 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146 ; in Com., 8652 ; 3°*, 9049 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 143.)

Bill (No. 178, from the Senate) Respecting the Canada Central Railway Company. —(Mr. Dyment.)

1°*, 7642 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9049 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 68.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 179, from the Senate) Respecting the Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff.)

1°*, 7642 (iv) : M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146; in Com., 8652; M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 8655 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9049 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 62.)

Bill (No. 180, from the Senate) Further to amend the Act of 1899 respecting the City of Ottawa.—(Mr. Fielding.)

1°*, 7642 (iv) ; 2°*, 8686 ; in Com., 8686 ; 3°*, 8688 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 29.)

Bill (No. 181) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Fielding.)

1°, 7642 (iv) ; 2°*, 8688 ; in Com., 8688 ; 3°*, 8689 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 4.)

Bill (No. 182, from the Senate) Respecting the Sterling Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 7810 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°*, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146 ; in Com. and 3°*, 8655 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 160.)

Bill (No. 183, from the Senate) Respecting a certain patent of the Metal Volatilization Company.—(Mr. McCool.)

1°*, 7810 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096; 2°*, 8146; in Coc., and 3°*, 9049 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 123.)

Bill (No. 184, from the Senate) To amend the Acts respecting Naturalization and Aliens.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°*, 7906 (iv) ; 2°*, 8685 ; in Com., 8685, 8689 ; 3°*, 8690 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 25.)

Bill (No. 185, from the Senate) For the relief of Isaac Pitblado.—(Mr. Bole.)

1°*, 7906 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9049 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 148.)

Bill (No. 186) For the regulation of Wireless Telegraphy in Canada.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

1° m., 8177 ; 2°*, 9031 ; in Com., 9031; 3°*, 9032 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 49.)

Bill (No. 187. from the Senate) To amend the Companies Act.

(This Bill was not read the first time in the House of Commons.)

Bill (No. 188) Respecting the Inspection of Water Meters.—(Mr. Brodeur.)

Res. prop., 8385 ; in Com. on Res., 8674 ; 1°* of B., 8676 ; 2°*, 9409 ; in Com., 9409 ; 3°*, 9524 ; Sen. Amts., 9816 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 48.)

Bill (No. 189) Further to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—(Mr. Borden, Carleton.)

1° m., 8775 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 190) To amend the Customs Tariff, 1897.—(Mr. Fielding.)

M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 8888 ; in Com., 8983; 1°*, of B., 8997; 2°*, 9760 ; in Com., 9760 ; 3°*, 9769 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 11.)

Bill (No. 191) Respecting the Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. O. E. Talbot.)

1°*, 9072 ; 2°*, 9179 ; M. to place on Orders for Com., 9278 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9340 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 111.)

Bill (No. 192) Respecting the Powers of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

1°, 9028 ; 2°*, 9288 ; in Com., 9288 ; 3°*, 9288 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 23.)

Bill (No. 193) To amend the Revised Statute respecting the salaries of certain public functionaries and other annual charges on the Consolidated Revenue.—(Mr. Fielding.)

Res. prop., 8693 ; in Com. on Res., 9033 ; 1°*, 2°*, 9033 ; in Com., 9033 ; 3°*, 9033 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 20.)

Bill (No. 194) To amend the Revised Statute respecting the House of Commons, and the Dominion Elections Act, 1900. —(Mr. Borden, Carleton.)

1° m., 9073 (v).

Bill (No. 195) Respecting Roads and Road Allowances in the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 9075 ; 2°, 9525 ; in Com., 9526 ; 3°*, 9529 ; Sen. Amts., 9819 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 38.)

Bill (No. 196) In amendment of the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°, 9075 ; 2°*, 9411 ; in Com., 9411 ; 3°, 9524 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 9.)

Bill (No. 197) To amend the Adulteration Act.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

1°*, 9179 (v).

Bill (No. 198, from the Senate) For the relief of Agnes Hedewig Helga Salusbury Trelawney.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 9278 ; 2°*, 9587 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9760 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 166.)

Bill (No. 199) To amend an Act respecting an Arbitration between His Majesty and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°, 9279 ; 2°*, 9280 ; in Com., 9529 ; 3°*, 9529 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 15.)

Bill (No. 200) Respecting the Inspector of Insurance and the Director General of Public Health.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°, 9688 ; 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 9690 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 46.)

Bill (No. 201) Respecting the Salary of the First Minister.—(Mr. Fielding.)

Res. prop., 9700 ; in Com. on Res., 9725 ; 1°* of B., 9726 ; 2°*, 9790 ; in Com., 9790 ; 3°, 9790 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 12.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 202) To amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

Res. prop., 9701 ; in Com. on Res., 9726 ; 1°* of B., 9733 ; 2°*, 9791 ; in Com., 9791 ; 3°*, 9792 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 43.)

Bill (No. 203) Respecting Annuities for certain Privy Councillors.—(Mr. Fielding.)

Res. prop., 9702 ; in Com. on Res., 9733 ; 1°* of B., 9739 ; 2°*, 9792 ; in Com., 9792, 9796 ; 3°*, 9797 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 30.)

Bill (No. 204) To amend the Act respecting Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

Res. prop., 9702 ; in Com. on Res., 9740, 9797 ; 1°* of B., 9760 ; 2°*, 9792 ; in Com., 9792, 9798 ; 3°*, 9798 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 31.)

Bill (No. 205) To amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

Res. prop., 9705; in Com. on Res., 9760; 1°* of B., 9760 ; 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 9796 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 47.)

Bill (No. 206) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1905, and the 30th June, 1906.—(Mr. Fielding.)

M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9798 ; in Com., 9800 ; 1°*; 2°*, 9801 ; in Com., 9801 ; 3°*, 9801 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 2.)

Binder Twine Bounties, &c. : Statement Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. of Sup., 7221 (iv).

Binder Twine, Home Consumption Manufactured in Can., Quantity, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1739 (i).

Binder Twine Industry, Kingston, Output, Distribution, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 482 (i).

Binder Twine, Raw Material imported from Mexico : Remarks (Sir William Mulock) in Com. of Sup., 897 (i).
See ' Cordage.'

Bissonnette vs. Crown, Illegal Stamping of Letters in Montreal, P. O., Cor. read : in Com. of Sup., 194 (i).
See ' Post Office,' &c.

Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Conspiracy, Cor., Tels., &c. : Read (Mr. Bennett) 541-6 (i).

——— Denials of Ministers, Ques. of Order : Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 546 (i).

——— Irrelevancy of Debate : Ques. of Order (Mr. Henderson) 558 (i).

——— Letter *re* Resignation : M. for Copy* (Mr. Monk) 601 (i).

——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. Foster) 697 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Maclean, York) 55 ; on M. for Com. on B. 36, 511 (i).

Blanche River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7547 (iv).

Blind River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6870 (iv).

Boisdale Wharf, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9585 (v).

Boissevain Postmaster, Mr. A. McKnight, Dismissal, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2327 (ii).
See ' Post Office,' &c.

Bonusing SS. Cos. for Cold Storage, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 1101-4 (i).

Book-keeping Methods I.C.R., &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1928 (i).

Boots and Shoes, Imports and Exports, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 7216 (iv).

Books purchased for Library, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 75 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L., Notification of Election (Mr. Speaker) 583 (i).

——— Introduced, 624 (i).

Boundary Line Fence : *See* ' Wire Fencing.'

Bourgeois Inlet Wharf, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).

Bout de L'Isle Ferry Service Inspection, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 9696 (v).

Bowmanville Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1549 (i).

Boyd, Geo. A., Emplymt. at Sault Ste. Marie, Harbour Improvements : Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 6881 (iv).

Bracebridge Dry Dock, Local Supt., Remuneration, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 6654 (iv).

Bracebridge Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7547 (iv).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 179 (Mr. Turriff) 1°*, 7642 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146 ; in Com., 8652 ; M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 8655 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9049 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 62.)

Brantford and Woodstock Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 63 (Mr. M. S. Schell) 1°*, 1241; 2°*, 1339 (i); in Com., and 3°, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 63.)

Brandon Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1550, 1633 (i).

Brantford Letter Carriers : Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) in Com. of Sup., 217 (i).

Brantford Parade Grounds : Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) in Com of Sup. 860, 1553 (i).

Bredt, Mr. P. M., Emplymt. by Govt.: (Mr. Lake) 189, 265 (i).

Breton Cove Boat Landing : in Com. of Sup., 7397 (iv).

Bridgeburg Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1550 (i).

Bridges, Dr., Resignation as Medical Officer of No. 8 District : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 417 (i).

Bridges, Strengthening of I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1912 (i), 9384 (v).
Bridgewater Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
British American Fish Co., Contract *re* Fishing Rights in Western Lakes : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).
B. C. Canning Industries : *See* 'Salmon Canning.'
B. C. Customs Collector, Victoria, Appnmt. of : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 270 (i).
B. C. Dom. Lands, Sale to Mr. T. W. Patterson, Prices paid, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4371 (iii).
B. C. Indian Inductrial Schools : in Com. of Sup., 6556 (iv).
——— Travelling Expenses *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6557 (iv).
See 'Indians.'
B. C. Judgeship, Appnmt. of W. W. B. McInnes: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 382 (i).
B. C. Legislation *re* Immigration, Disallowance of : Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 189 (i), 6474 (iv).
Britton, Judge, Rep. *re* Alien Investigation : Inquiry for (Mr. Sproule) 1152 (i).
Broad Cove Harbour Works : in Com. of Sup., 7403 (iv).
Broad Cove Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Brockville, Westport and North-western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 94 (Mr. Derbyshire) 1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 64).
Bronte Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7548 (iv).
Bronte Pier Lighthouse : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., (2868 ii).
——— Statement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 9176 (v).
Brothers' Light, Salary of Keeper : Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 2702 (ii).
Bruce County Armouries : Remarks (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 1658 (i).
Brunet, Mr., G.T.P. Ry. Commissioner, Resignation, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5036 (iii).
Bryce, Dr., Payments to *re* Indians : in Com. of Sup., 6558 (iv).
Bryson Bridge Reconstruction : in Com. of Sup., 7585 (iv).
Budget, The, Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 8888 ; Res. moved, 8914 (v).
Debate :
(Mr. Foster) 8915 ; (Mr. Cockshutt) 8936 ; (Mr. Clements) 8957 ; (Mr. Paterson) 8934 ; (Mr. Campbell) 8938 ; (Mr. A. A. Wright) 8949 ; (Mr. Caldwell) 8965 ; (Mr. Galliher) 8971 ; (Mr. Daniel) 8978 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2685 (ii).
——— Date of Delivery : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4920 (iii).
Budget, The, Statement *re* Delivery (Mr. Fielding) 8763 (v).
——— Inquiry *re* (Mr. Foster) 2006, 2441, 2762 (ii) ; 7100 (iv).
Buffaloes, Specimens for Exhibitions : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup, 6272 (iv).
Buildings, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 1641 (i), 6735 (iv).
——— Renewals, Repairs, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1641 (i).
Buildings, Govt. : in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
Buildings, Govt., Inspection by Architects, Clerks, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1642 (i).
——— Manitoba : in Com. of Sup., 1633 (i) ; 9549.
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i), 7284 (iv).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 1637 (i), 9550 (v).
——— N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 846, 1015 (i).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 1547 (i), 9547 (v).
——— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 1101 (i).
See 'Public Works,' &c.
Buoys, Construction and Maintenance : in Com. of Sup., 2729 (ii).
——— Tenders, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2742 (ii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Burford Armoury : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com., 1649 (i).
Burritt's Rapids Locks, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Reid) 8384 (v).
Business of the House, Cold Storage Discussion : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8181 (v).
——— Procedure *re* Supply Motions : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1241 (i).
See 'Govt. Business,' &c.
Butter and Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Grievance *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Walsh) 8886 (v).
Butter in Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 881 (i).
See 'Agriculture.'
By-Elections, Resignations, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7423 (iv).
Cabinet Changes from 1904 : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1336 (i).
Cabinet Ministers-ex, Annuities B. No. 203 (Mr. Fielding) Res. prop., 9702 ; in Com., on Res., 9733 ; 1°* of B., 9739 ; 2°*, 9792 ; in Com., 9792, 9796 ; 3°*, 9797 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 30.)
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers : Remarks (Mr. Borden) on Orders of the Day, 3555 (ii).
——— Interior Dept., Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3362 (ii), 4085 (iii).

Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3450 (ii).

—— Representation *re* : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 3252 (ii).

—— Minister of Public Works : M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjn., 5471 (iii).

Cables of the Empire, Cor. with Govt.: M. (Mr. Logan) for Cor.*, 1397 (i).

Cacouna Wharf, Expenditure *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7096 (iv).

Cadet Corps, Ammunition supplied : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) 7815 (iv).
See 'Militia.'

Cairns, A. W., Salary as P. O. Inspector : in Com. of Sup., 6629 (iv).

Calgary and Battleford Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 50 (Mr. Turriff) 1°*, 817 ; 2°*, 909 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2325 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 65.)

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. No. 22 (Mr. Oliver) 1°*, 378 ; 2°*, 534 ; in Com., 1100 ; 3°*, 1100 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 66.)

Calgary, Land Titles Office : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).

—— Post Office Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).

Calgary, Red Deer and Battleford Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 19 (Mr. Scott) 1° m., 318 ; 2°*, 415 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2325 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 67.)

Campaign Literature and Franking Privileges: Remarks (Mr. White) 1809 (i).
See 'Franking.'

Campbellton and Gaspé Basin Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 9616 (v).

Campbellton, Public Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1048 (i).

—— I.C.R. Station Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1968 (i).

—— Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 1744 (i).

Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. No. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) 1° m., 728 ; 2°*, 909 (i) ; M. for Com., 4236 ; in Com., 4240 ; 3° m., 4412 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 50.)

Canada Atlantic Ry., Purchase : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Haggart) 2685 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. Haggart) 69 (i).

—— Running Rights : *See* 'I.C.R. and C.A.R.', 'Govt. Rys. B. 132,' 'Transportation.'

Canada Car Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 16 (Mr. Bickerdike) 1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 415 (i).

Canada Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 178 (Mr. Dyment) 1°*, 7642 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9049 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 68.)

'Canada-Cape Breton' Accident, 'Statement of Case' : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 2067 (ii).

—— Capt. Salmon's Resignation, Cor., &c. : M. for Copies (Mr. Ames) 384 (i).

'Canada-Cape Breton' Accident, Report *re* Investigation, Instructions, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2625 (ii).
See 'Marine.'

Canada Eastern Ry., Improvements of Road-bed : Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 1978 (i).

—— Cor., Names of Officials, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 734 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 4811 (iii).

—— Purchase, Expenditure *re* Litigation : Remarks (Mr. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 1523 (i).

—— Total Expenditure *re* : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1922 (i).
See 'I.C.R.', &c.

Canada and France SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7094 (iv).

'Canada Gazette' Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 6723 (iv).

Canada and G. B. Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 864 (i).
See 'Post Office,' 'Trade and Commerce,' &c.

Canada Life Assurance Co., Ref. to in Com. on B. 108, 4684 (iii).

Canada and Mexico Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 895 (i), 9622, 9680 (v) ; conc., 6909 (iv).

Canada and Mexico SS. Communication : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 66 (i).

Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s B. No. 31 (Mr. German) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 69.)

Canada-Middlesex Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 55 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 908 ; 2°*, 1101 (i).

Canada and New Zealand SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 7094 (iv).

Canada and S. Africa SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 971 (i).

Canada Southern Bridge Co.'s B. No. 29 (Mr. German) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., 1286 ; 3°*, 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 70.)

Canada Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 30 (Mr. German) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 71.)

'Canada' Str., Expenditure *re* Equipment, Names of Employees, Payments to, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 1399 (i).
See 'Marine,' &c.

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. No. 128 (Mr. Gervais) 1° m., 3359 (ii).

Can. Temperance Act, Expenditure *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6957 (iv).

Canadian Agency B. No. 77 (Mr. Bickerdike) 1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i) ; on Order for Com., 9049 ; in Com., 9077 (v).

Canadians arrested by U.S.: *See* 'Walton, R. M.'

Canadian Bank of Commerce, Yukon, Compensation *re* : in Com. of Sup., 9615 (v).

Canadian Canals Corporation incorp. B. No. 72 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 1592 ; 2° m., 1757 (i).

Canadian Cattle, Embargo in G.B.: on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Agr. Com., 8998 (iv).

——— Par. in Montreal 'Star': Read (Mr. Lennox) 454 (i).

'Canadian Citizenship,' Political Speech by Min. of Rys.: Remarks (Mr. Crockett) 2214 (ii).

Canadians detained at U. S. Borders: Letter read (Mr. Barker) 5920 (iii).

Canadians, Distressed, Relief to: in Com. of Sup., 7247 (iv).

Canadian Exhibit, Imperial Institute: in Com. of Sup., 1836 (i).

Canadian Fast Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) 9773 (v).

——— Tel. read (Mr. Emmerson) 9279 (v).

See 'Trade and Commerce.'

Canadian Hard Wheat, Drawbacks by U. S., &c.: M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 746 (i).

Canadians in S. Africa, Claims *re* Mining Rights: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Macdonnell) 9530 (v).

Canadian Mining Institute: in Com. of Sup., 7247 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 58 (Mr. Lamont) 1°*, 986 ; 2°*, 1101 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii) ; Sen. Amts., 9078 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 72).

Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 56 (Mr. Bole) 1°*, 985 ; 2°, 1101 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2042 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 73).

C.P.R. Land Tax Exemption, Interpretation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 730 (i).

——— Taxation, *re* Municipalities, Judgment of Sup. Court: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup.. 2022 (ii).

C.P.R. Lands Taxation *re* Autonomy B. 69: 6049 (iv).

See 'Autonomy,' &c.

Canadian Products sent to Mexico, &c.: Remarks (William Mulock) in Com. of Sup., 897 (i).

Canadian Shippers, and Atlantic SS. Contracts with Armours, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 4235 (iii).

Canadian Yukon Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 165 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 6232 ; 2°*, 7218 (iv) ; in Com., and 3°*, 8655 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 76).

CANALS :

Arbitrations and Awards *re* Canals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1508 (i).

Atwater Bridge over Lachine Canal, Contract *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7261 (iv).

——— Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7422 (iv).

CANALS—*Con.*

Beauharnois Canal Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 6307 (iv).

——— Water Power, Utilization: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6307 (iv).

——— Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1504 (i).

Burrit's Rapids Locks, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Reid) 8384 (v).

Canal Tools, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 1546.

Cardinal Canal, Claims for Damages *re* Contractors: in Com. of Sup., 1220 (i).

——— Swing Bridge and Wharf: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 1418 (i).

Carillon and Grenville Canals, Guide Piers: in Com. of Sup., 6305 (iv).

Chambly Canal, Macadamizing Road: in Com. of Sup., 9378 (v).

——— Ste. Therese Island Culvert: in Com. of Sup., 6301 (iv).

Cornwall Canal, Concreting Apparatus: in Com. of Sup., 6298 (iv).

——— Dredging, Contract *re* Advertising, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 588, 686 (i).

——— Employees for Oct. and Nov., 1904: Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 107 (i).

——— Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 1219 (i).

——— Lock Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 1494 (i).

——— Stone Facing between Locks: in Com. of Sup., 9381 (v).

Cote. St. Paul, Bridge, Lachine Canal: in Com. of Sup., 6294 (iv).

——— Water Power, Lease to J. Frothingham: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3360 (ii).

Culbute Canal, Litigation *re* Flooding, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 1522 (i).

Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1219 (i) ; 9061 (v).

Dep. Minister. Appnmt. of Mr. Butler and Superannuation of Mr. Schreiber, Duties assigned to, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9678 (v).

Farran's Point Gas Plant: in Com. of Sup., 6308 (iv).

Galops Channel, Completion: in Com. of Sup., 1230 (i).

——— Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 1220 (i).

——— Removing Shoals: in Com. of Sup., 9354 (v).

——— Repairs *re* Leakage: in Com. of Sup., 1492 (i).

Gamebridge Mason Inspector, Dismissal, Imperfect Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4750, 5600 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 8004 (v).

See 'Ritchie.'

CANALS—*Con.*

Grenville Canal, Appnmt. of Inspector : Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1509 (i).

——— Guide Piers : in Com. of Sup., 1499 (i).

Hanault, L. O., Payments *re* Lachine Canal : in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).

Holland River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9359 (v).

Inspection and Surveys : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1509 (i).

Lachine Canal, Cote St. Paul, Water-power used for Manufacturers : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 1515 (i).

——— Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 6294 (iv).

——— Installation of Electrical Appliances : in Com. of Sup., 9354 (v).

——— Lock Gates, Suspension : in Com. of Sup., 6300 (iv).

——— Machinery for Shops : in Com. of Sup., 1240 (i).

——— Mill Street Paving : in Com. of Sup., 6301 (iv).

——— Power House Flumes : in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).

——— Rebuilding Wall Basin, Lock No. 2 : in Com. of Sup., 1421 (i).

——— Rebuilding Wharf below Dock : in Com. of Sup., 1421 (i).

——— Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6306 (iv).

——— St. Gabriel's Basin Walls : in Com. of Sup., 9378 (v).

——— Tail Race Widening : in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).

——— Wall Underpinning : in Com. of Sup., 6298 (iv).

——— Water Privilege, Lease to Wm. Parkyn, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5132 (iii).

See 'Atwater,' 'Cote St. Paul,' 'Hanault.'

Magann & Finn, Payments to *re* Port Colborne Contract : in Com. of Sup., 1232 (i).

Matthews, Geo. Co., Claims *re* Damages by Flooding : in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).

Murray Canal, Inspector : Remarks (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. of Sup., 1512 (i).

——— Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 1495 (i).

Payne, J. L., Salary Increase : in Com. of Sup., 9062 (v).

Port Colborne, Breakwater, Elevator, &c., Cor., Papers, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 2067 (ii).

——— Deepening Summit Level : in Com. of Sup., 1232 (i).

——— Eastern Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 815 (i).

——— Elevator : in Com. of Sup., 1263, 1266, 1288 (i).

——— Entrance Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1230 (i).

See 'Welland.

CANALS—*Con.*

Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Emmerson) 908 (i).

——— Delay in bringing down : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 601 (i).

Rideau Canal Extension : in Com. of Sup., 1333 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1523 (i).

Ritchie, James, Inspection of Masonry *re* Trent Canal, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Foster) 2777 (ii).

See 'Gamebridge.'

St. Lawrence Canals, Deepening Shoals : in Com. of Sup., 6289 (iv).

St. Peters Canal, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).

——— Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6308 (iv).

St. Ours Canal, Booms and Piers : in Com. of Sup., 1499 (i).

——— Landing Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6302 (iv).

Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Contracts *re* Construction : in Com. of Sup., 1406 (i).

——— Construction : in Com. of Sup., 1334 (i).

——— Dredging, U.S. and Canadian Contractors, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 589 (i).

Soulanges Canal Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 6290 (iv).

Sunday Work : in Com. of Sup., 1547 (i), 9383 (v).

Tay Canal, Ref. to in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Haggart) 1301 (i).

Tools, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1546 (i).

Trent Canal, Claims for Damages, Mr. Jas. Clark, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Ward) for copy, 1395, (i).

——— Dismissal of J. Ritchie, &c.: M. for copy* (Mr. Foster) 2777 (ii).

——— incomplete return : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4750 (iii).

See 'Gamebridge.'

——— Geo. Matthews Co., Claim *re* Damages by Flood : in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).

——— Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1499 (i).

——— Lowering Floor of Lock : in Com. of Sup.. 6302 (iv).

——— McLaren's Creek Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 9379 (v).

——— Peterborough Dam : in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).

——— Staff on Dams, taken by Dom. Govt.: in Com. of Sup., 9383 (v).

——— Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 1471, 1476 (i), 6291 (iv), 9354 (v).

——— letter from Sir Wilfrid Laurier to Mr. Aylesworth : Read (Mr. Ward) 1476 (i).

——— Surveys of Dams taken by Dom.: in Com. of Sup., 9376 (v).

CANALS—*Con.*
Trent Canal, Surveys, Rice Lake, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ward) 153 (i).
See 'Holland.'
Vanderburg, Stephen, Claims *re* Injuries on Welland Canal : in Com. of Sup., 6305 (iv).
Welland Canal, Deepening, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 588 (i).
——— Deepening Long Level : in Com. of Sup., 6290 (iv).
——— Deepening Summit Level at Port Colborne, 1263 (i).
——— Electric Plant : in Com. of Sup., 1231 (i), 9377 (v).
——— Employees during Oct., Nov.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 453 (i).
——— Emplymt. of Labour, Political Influence : Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 6855 (iv).
——— Lowering Head of Lock No. 1 : in Com. of Sup., 6309 (iv).
——— Port Colborne Elevator : in Com. of Sup., 1263, 1266, 1288 (i).
——— Removal of Obstructions : in Com. of Sup., 1231 (i).
——— Removal of Piers and Bridge Building : in Com. of Sup., 1234 (i).
——— Stone Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 1496 (i).
——— Survey : in Com. of Sup., 1234 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1520 (i).
——— Water Power Leases, Names, Quantity, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. German) 2097 (ii).
See 'Magann,' 'Port Colborne.'
Williamsburg Canal, Steam Hoist : in Com. of Sup., 1494 (i).
Williamsburg and Cornwall Canals, Water Power Leases, Dates, Rentals, Claims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 4809 (ii).
Yamaska Lock : in Com. of Sup., 6868 (iv).
Canning Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Canso Herring Industry, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1146 (i).
Canso Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1023 (i).
Canton Fabre Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7288 (iv).
Cape Road Crossing, I.C.R., Elimination of : in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).
Cape Tormentine Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7497 (iv).
Capital Account, I.C.R., Total Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Chisholm) 2064 (ii).
See 'I.C.R.', &c.
Caplin and Paspebiac Ry., Payments *re* Subsidy : M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 3203 (ii)
Carbide for Acetylene Gas Purposes, Quantity purchased : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 914 (i).
Carbide purchased, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ganong) in Com. of Sup., 1055 (i).
Carbide purchased for Lighthouses : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2710, 2743 (ii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Cardigan and Montague Bridge Branch, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 2171 (ii).
See 'I.C.R.-P.E.I.' &c.
Cardinal Canal, Claims for Damages *re* Contractors : in Com. of Sup., 1220 (i).
——— Swing Bridge and Wharf : Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 1418 (i).
Carillon Canal, Fishway, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2064 (ii).
——— remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 2910 (ii).
——— Guide Piers : in Com. of Sup., 6305 (iv).
——— Works, Emplymt. of Labourers, Affidavit read *re* Political Influence : Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 6856 (iv).
Carleton Co., Electoral District, Certificate *re* Election : Notification (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 583 (i).
——— Vacancy : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 98 (i).
See 'Borden, R. L.'
Carlos Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Carpets purchased by Govt. for House of Parlt., Quantity, Value, Duty paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Osler) 8266 (v).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa,' &c.
Carter, C. J., Gratuity to : in Com. of Sup., 2183 (ii).
Cascumpec Sandhills Channel, P.E.I., Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2773 (ii).
Cast-Iron, Quantity furnished to Marine Dept. at Sorel : Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 2328 (ii).
Castonguay, Dismissal and Emplymt. by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 5688 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. O. E. Talbot) 6653 (iv).
Catholic Mutual Benefit Association of Canada B. No. 93 (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 2769 ; 3°*, 2770 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 77.)
Cattle, Canadian Embargo, 6th Rep. of Agriculture Com.: Presented (Mr. McIntyre) 8097 (v).
Cattle Quarantine : in Com. of Sup., 2309 (ii), 6690, 6911 (iv).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.
Caughnawaga Indians, Medical Attendance : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Bergeron) 225 (i).
Celeste Joly Patent Relief B. No. 107 (Mr. Smith) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii), in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 112.)
Cement : in Com. on Ways and Means, 8985 (v).
——— Tariff Changes *re* : in Com. on Customs Bill, 9765 (v).

Cement, Testing Laboratory, Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7613 (iv).
Census and Statistics B. No. 5 (Mr. Fisher) 1°*, 52 ; 2°*, 625 ; in Com., 625; Res. prop., 820; in Com. on Res., 989 ; M. for Com. on B., 1013 ; in Com., 1069, 1467 ; 3°*, 1506 (i). (5 Edward VII, c., 5).
——— Order, Ques. of (Mr. Monk) *re* Resolution, 629 (i).
——— Ruling Reserved (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 632 (i).
Census and Statistics Act Amt. B. No. 163 (Mr. Fisher) 1° m., 6105 (iv) ; 2° m., 8774 ; in Com., 8775; 3°*, 8885 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 6).
Census in Eastern Townships, Incorrect Rets.: Remarks (Mr. Walsh) 675 (i).
Census Enumerators, Appnmt. of : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. on B. 5, 1073 (i).
——— (1901) Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 50 (i).
——— Quinquennial, *re* Alberta, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9608 (v).
——— Total Expenditure for Completion, Dismissal of Staff, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 588 (i).
——— *re* Urban and Rural Population : Remarks (Mr. W. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 6274 (iv).
Central Counties Ry. Co.'s B. No. 64 (Mr. Stewart) 1°*, 1336 ; 2°*, 1541 (i) ; in Com., 3598 ; 3°*, 3598 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 78.)
Central Trunk Ry. Co.; *See* 'Ottawa River Ry.', &c.
Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. No. 49 (Mr. Macpherson) 1°*, 817 ; 2°*, 909 (i) ; in Com., 2765 ; 3°*, 2767 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c., 80.)
Certificates of Masters and Mates B. No. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) 1°*, 9 (i).
See 'Masters and Mates,' 'Seamen's Act,' &c.
Chambly Canal, Macadamizing Road : in Com. of Sup., 9378 (v).
——— Ste. Therese Island Culvert : in Com. of Sup., 6301 (iv).
Chambord Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7289 (iv).
Champlain's Monument, Erection, Grant to : in Com. of Sup., 9340 (v).
Champlain' Str., Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 149 (i).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Champlain Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7290 (iv).
Chance Harbour Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7497 (iv).
Chance Harbour Breakwater : Remarks (Mr. Stockton) in Com. of Sup., 9588 (v).
Chapman, F. B., Emplymt. by Govt. on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1342 (i).
Charges of Management : in Com. of Sup., 69 (i), 6249 (iv), 8691, 9052 (v).
Charlottetown Station Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 2025 (ii).
——— Cor. and Reps. *re* Construction : M. for copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 194 (i).
——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. A. Martin) 4810 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Martin) 60 (i).
——— Track Extension, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 6433 (iv).
Chatham Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1551 (i).
——— Contract, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 587 (i).
Chateauguay River Dredging and Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 6847, 7322 (iv).
See 'St. Louis,' &c.
Chateau Richer, Expenditure by Govt. for Public Works : M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Morin) 109 (i).
Chateau Richer, Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7290 (iv).
——— Montmorency Wharf, Expenditure by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 1015 (i).
——— Public Works, Dates of Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3202 (ii).
——— Removal of Obstruction : Remarks (Mr. Morin) 1154 (i).
Chesley Postmaster, Vacancy, Appnmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 9081 (v).
Chezzetcook (east) Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Chicoutimi, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7377 (iv).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1106 (i).
Child Immigration to Can., Assistance by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1341 (i).
——— Par. in 'Citizen' *re* Mrs. Close's Scheme (remarks) 1936 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) on M. for Sup., 2125 (ii).
See 'Immigration.'
Chilliwack Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Chinese Immigration Act, Administration of : in Com. of Sup., 7204 (iv).
——— Salaries to Customs Officers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 981 (i).
Choquette, Judge, Date of Resignation and Appnmt. to Senate : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1344 (i).
See 'Political Crisis.'
Circulars, Addressed to and distributed by Orange Lodges *re* Separate Schools : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 2405 (ii).
——— Issued by Jacques Cartier Club : Remarks (Mr. Monk) 2408, 2410 (ii).
Circulars issued by Political Associations *re* Census, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. on B. 5, 1097 (i).
Citizen's Bank of Canada B. No. 133 (Mr. Barr) 1°*, 4271 ; 2°*, 4700 (iii) ; in Com., 5973 ; 3°*, 5973 (iv). (5 Edward VII, c., 81.)

Civil Govt., Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 70, 120 (i), 6240, 6721 (iv), 9034 (v).
Civil Service Appointments since 1896, Inside Services, Names, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 2333 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 585 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 5808 (iii), 6232 (iv), 8002 (v).
Civil Service Examiners : in Com. of Sup., 6249 (iv).
——— Report : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5428 (iii).
Civil Servants' Guarantees *re* P. O. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Chisholm) 1758 (i).
Civil Service Insurance Act, Statement : Presented (Mr. Paterson) 54 (i).
Civil Service List : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 51 (i).
Clarke, Mr. E. F., Late M.P., Decease of : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2042 (ii), 2108 (ii).
——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2108 (ii).
Clark's Harbour, Removal of Rocks from Channel : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Clifton Breakwater Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7497 (iv).
Clinton Post Office Buildings : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 852 (i).
Clerks of Works, Salaries, &c., Dom. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1642 (i).
See 'Pub. Works,' &c.
Coal, Anthracite, Quantity used by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. A. McLean) 192 (i).
See 'Pub. Works,' &c.
Coal carried Free on I.C.R. to Ottawa, 1902-3 ; Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 2065, 2192 (ii).
Coal Contracts and Supplies for Penitentiaries : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 478 (i).
Coal for Govt. Railways, Quantity accepted from N.S. Mines : Ques. (Mr. Barker) 2191 (ii).
——— Quantity : Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 910 (i).
Coal Supply for Govt. Steamers, Handling, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2613 (ii).
Coatsworth Customs Collector, Salary, Revenue, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 263 (i).
Cobourg Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1554 (i).
Cobourg Piers, Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7548 (iv).
Colborne Armoury : Remarks (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. of Sup., 1655 (i).
Cold Storage *re* Atlantic Steamers, and Thermograph Records : M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup.. 8183 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2774 (ii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 868 (i).
See 'Thermograph,' &c.
Cold Storage, Bait Freezers, Mar. Canada, Number, Location, &c. : M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Ret., 1769 (i).
Cold Storage Plant for Bait, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 1505 (i).
Coldwater and Lovering Mail Contracts, &c., Remuneration : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1848 (i), 2594 (ii).
Collingwood Customs Collector Watson, Superannuation, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 408 (i).
Collingwood Dock, Conroy Bros., Cheque : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) on M. for Sup., 6572 (iv).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Payments by Govt., *re* Bounty, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6653 (iv).
——— Mr. Conroy's Cheque, Retention by Govt.: Statement (Mr. Fielding) 6654 (iv).
See 'Port Arthur,' &c.
Collingwood Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 6849, 7549 (iv).
Colonial Conference and Tariff Revision : Par. in Montreal 'Star' : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7098 (iv).
Colonial Stock Act, and Investment of Funds in G. B. : M. for Copies of Cor.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9698 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Sup., 9540 (v).
Colonization Roads, Man. and N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 7594 (iv).
Colson, Mr. F., Duties and Salary : Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 8146 (v).
Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 11 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 404 ; in Com., and 3°*, 864 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 82.)
Columbia River, General Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Commercial Agencies in Can. Location, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Martin) 403 (i).
Commercial Agencies : in Com. of Sup., 7208 (iv), 9037 (v).
——— Letter *re* Mr. Jackson's Ability (read) in Com. of Sup., 7210 (iv).
Commercial and Manufacturing Industries, Statistics *re* : Remarks (Mr. Macdonnell) in Com. on B. 5, 1085 (i).
Commercial Travellers' Tax in Quebec : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 9811 (v).
Committees, Sel. Standing : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7 (i).
——— Lists : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 60 (i).
——— Addition of Mr. Bristol's Name : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5210 (iii).
——— Change of Names : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 227 (i).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add Names, 110, 624 (i), 3090 (ii), 5576 (iii).
Commodities, Packing, &c. : *See* 'Apples.'
Companies Act Amt. B. No. 187 (from the Senate) this Bill was not read the first time in the House of Commons.
Congdon, F. T., Appnmt. as Legal Adviser to Yukon, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 7020 (iv).

Congdon, F. T., Appnmt. as Legal Adviser to Yukon, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7717 (iv).
Conmee & Bowman : *See* 'Port Arthur,' &c.
Conroy Bros. Cheque : *See* 'Collingwood Dock.'
Consolidation of Statutes : in Com. of Sup., 7244 (iv).
Contagious Diseases, Prevention in Man. : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 1843 (i).
Contracts for Govt. Works : *See* 'Govt. Contracts.'
Controverted Elections, Lisgar, Judges' Certificate : Presented (Mr. Speaker) 9 (i).
See 'Dom. Election Bills,' &c.
Conventions between United Kingdom and U.S. *re* Personal Property : Remarks *re* Cor. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1068 (i).
Copyright Act *re* Photographs, Legislation *re* Amt. : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1849 (i).
Cordage at Kingston Penitentiary, Sale of 58 Tons, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Clare) 6827 (iv).
——— Plant established at Kingston : Ques. (Mr. Clare) 2329 (ii).
See 'Binder Twine.'
Cornwall Armoury : Remarks (Mr. Pringle) in Com. of Sup., 1552, 1659 (i).
Cornwall Canal, Basin Dredging Contract, Amount, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 588 (i).
——— Concreting Apparatus : in Com. of Sup., 6298 (iv).
——— Dredging, Contract *re*, Advertising, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 686 (i).
——— Employees for Oct. and Nov., 1904 : Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 107 (i).
——— Employees, Payment to *re* Election Campaign : Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 1224 (i).
——— Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 1219 (i).
——— Lock Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 1494 (i).
——— Stone Facing between Locks : in Com. of Sup., 9381 (v).
Corporation, Trusts, &c. : Remarks in Deb. on Address (Mr. Maclean) 42 (i).
Corry Block, Rental, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6818 (iv).
Cote St. Paul, Bridge, Lachine Canal : in Com. of Sup., 6294 (iv).
——— Water Power, Lease to J. Frothingham : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3360 (ii).
See 'Canals.'
County Harbour, Removal of Obstructions : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Country Postmasters, Increases in Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 143 (i).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Court Houses, &c., N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
Court Room, Prince Albert : in Com. of Sup., 124 (i).
Cow Bay, Port Morien Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7399 (iv).
Cow Bay Run Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7401 (iv).
Cowie, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. *re* Herring Experiments : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5425 (iii).
Creameries : in Com. of Sup., 7014 (iv).
Creameries, Butter and Cheese, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6938 (iv).
Creosoted Timber for Piers and Breakwaters, P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 1737 (i).
Criminal Code (bawdy houses) Amt. B. No. 23 (Mr. Bole) 1°, 450 ; on Order for 2°, 733 (i).
——— (summary appeals) B. No. 66 (Mr. Porter) 1°*, 1336 (i) ; 2° m., 4260 ; in Com., 4260, 5137 (iii) ; 3° m., 9699 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 10.)
——— B. No. 67 (Mr. Guthrie) 1°*, 1421 (i).
——— (trading stamps) Amt. B. No. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 9075 ; 2°*, 9411 ; in Com., 9411 ; 3° m., 9524 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 9.)
Criminal Statistics, Compilation of : in Com. of Sup., 1473 (i).
Crowe's Landing Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9600 (v).
Crown Casualty Co.'s incorp. B. No. 125 (Mr. Gervais) M. to receive Pet., 2203, 2322, 2593; 1°*, 2593 ; 2°*, 3136 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3669 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 83).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Co., Passenger Rates, Ref. to Ry. Commission : Remarks (Mr. Herron) 6836 (iv).
Culbute Canal, Litigation *re* Flooding, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 1522 (i).
Culling Timber, Inspectors, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7236 (iv).
See 'Inland Revenue,' &c.
Culloden Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7401 (iv).
Cunningham Point Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Cu[illegible]nd Sorel Bridge Scandals, Ref. to in Debate : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 8142 (v).
Customs Tariff (1897) Act Amt. B. No. 190 (Mr. Fielding) M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 8888 ; in Com., 8983 ; 1°* of B., 8997 ; 2°, 9760 ; in Com., 9760 ; 3°*. 9769 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 11.)
CUSTOMS :
Agricultural Exports and Imports, Duties paid, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Clements) 3203 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Clements) 909 (i).
Anthracite Coal (Scotch) imported, Commercial Value &c : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonald) 9697 (v).
Boots and Shoes, Imports and Exports, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 7216 (iv).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

B. C. Customs Collector, Victoria, Appnmt. of : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 270 (i).

Chinese Immigration, Salaries to Customs Officers, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 981 (i).

Coatsworth Customs Collector, Salary, Revenue, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 261 (i).

Collector at Victoria, B.C., Appnmt. of : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 270 (i).

Collectors' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 407 (i).

Collections on Sundays : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 413 (i).

Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 256 (i).

Deptl. Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 78 (i), 9069 (v).

Dredging Plant, &c., imported into Canada, Valuation, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5425 (iii).

——— Remarks *re* Answer to Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5591 (iii).

Dumping Clause, Customs Instructions *re*, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Kemp) 695 (i).

Duties, Remission *re* Army and Navy Articles: in Com. of Sup., 6724, 6812 (iv).

Gratuities : in Com. of Sup., 6434 (iv).

Harvey, N. B., Customs Collector, Appnmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 9696 (v).

Hay exported from Quebec to Boston, Number of Tons : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 689 (i).

Hay Imports from U.S., Quantity, Duties collected, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1064 (i).

Imports and Exports, Agriculture Products, Duties paid, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Clements) 3203 (ii).

Imports and Exports for Home Consumption, Total Amount : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 380 (i).

Imports from United Kingdom, Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 267 (i).

Imports under Preferential Tariff, Amounts paid, Value, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 152 (i).

Inspectors of Customs, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 405 (i).

Martin, Eli, Emplymt. in Customs Dept. : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7097 (iv).

Montreal Customs, Dep. Collector, Appnmt. of : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 256 (i).

Montreal Free Port, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 7317 (iv).

Morrison, Hector D., Customs Officer at Pinette, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2330 (ii).

——— Officers' Uniforms : in Com. of Sup., 413 (i).

——— Ports, Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 256, 405 (i).

Preferential Tariff, Value of Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 152 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

Remission of Customs Duties on Army and Navy Articles : Explanation (Mr. Paterson) in Com. of Sup., 6724, 6812 (iv).

Revenue collected in N.W. Ters., Customs and Inland Rev.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 600 (i).

Revenue Cruisers for Customs : in Com. of Sup., 409 (i).

Rouse, Mr. David, Appnmt. as Customs Collector, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 452 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie Bonded Warehouse *re* Soft Coal, Establishment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5688 (iii).

Sawlogs, Export Duty, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Sup., 752 (i).

Thompson, Capt. Thos., Preventive Officer at Port Bruce, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 1763 (i).

Tobacco and Cigars imported from U.S., Duties paid, &c.: (Mr. Clements) 5687 (iii).

U.S. Tariff Drawbacks on Raw Materials, &c.: M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 746 (i).

Vegetables, Canned, Preserved, &c., Value of Imports: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Monk) 279 (i).

Yukon Customs, Living Allowance : in Com. of Sup., 411 (i).

Dairying, Live Stock, and Fruit Industries : in Com. of Sup., 6932 (iv).

Dairy Products, Classification for Export, &c: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 7810 (iv).

Damen, Wm. A., Patent Relief B. No. 129 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 3834 (ii) ; 2°*, 4700 (iii) ; ref. back to Sel. Com., 6379 ; in Com., and 3*°, 7624 (iv) ; M. *re* Amts., 8383 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 84.)

Dams across River, Govt. Policy *re* : Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 6839 (iv).

David Thomas Owens Patent Relief B. No. 177 (Mr. Stewart) 1°*, 7642 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146 ; in Com., 8652 ; 3°*, 9049. (5 Edward VII, c., 143.)

Davie. Geo. T., Co., Wrecking Plant *re* Ship Channel : Remarks (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. of Sup., 2479 (ii).

See 'Trade and Commerce,' &c.

Debates, Official, Sel. Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 111 (i).

——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add Name, 3090 (ii).

——— 1st. Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 493 (i).

——— M. to conc. (Mr. Gervais) 683 (i).

——— 2nd Rep. of Com.: (presented) 4457.

——— M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 4550 (iii).

——— 3rd Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 4549 (iii).

——— M. to conc. (Mr. Gervais) 4551 (iii).

Debates Committee, 4th Rep. of Com. : Presented (Mr. Gervais) 4983 (iii).

——— M. to conc., 5034 (iii).

——— 5th Rep.: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 7096 (iv).

——— 6th Rep.: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 9392 (v).

——— 7th Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 9773 (v).

——— M. (Mr. Ethier) to conc., 9801 (v).

Debates, Delay in French Edition : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 239 (i).

Debates, Official : in Com. of Sup., 239 (i), 6592 (iv).

Deep Water Ways Commission: in Com. of Sup., 6894 (iv).

See 'International Water,' &c.

'De Levis,' Str., for Hydrographic Survey, Total Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 914 (i).

Demers, Mr. L. J., Late M.P., Decease of : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5139 (iii).

Dental Institute Circulars : *See* 'Franking Privilege.'

Depot Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7552 (iv).

Descente des Femmes, Tel. Lines : in Com. of Sup. 9604 (v).

——— Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7307 (iv).

Desjardins Wharf, Allumette Island : in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).

Desks in House of Commons, Improvement in : Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) in Com. of Sup., 1566 (i).

See 'House of Commons,' &c.

Detective Service P. O. Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 209 (i).

Devil's Island Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv), 9551 (v).

Digby Pier Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).

Dipper Harbour Breakwater, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7498 (iv), 9588 (v).

——— Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 912 (i).

Director of Operations *re* Militia Council : Remarks (Mr Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 418 (i).

See 'Militia,' &c.

Disallowance of B. C. Legislation : Ques. (Mr. Smith, B.C.) 189 (i).

Discrimination in Freight Rates *re* Atlantic Steamers : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 888 (i).

See 'Trade and Commerce.'

Dismissals from Public Office : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).

Disraeli Wharf, Que. : in Com. of Sup., 9593 (v).

——— Expenditure *re* : Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 1729 (i).

Divorce Bill : Personal Explanation (Mr. Bergeron) *re* Vote, 6405, 6571 (iv).

See 'Fitz-Simmons, Jean Marie,' 'Harper Geo. Dance,' 'Hersey, Arthur Howe,' 'McDermot, Clara Bidwell,' 'Murphy, E. A.,' 'Pearson,' 'Pitblado, Isaac,' Pryor, J. A.,' 'Vibert, Philip.'

Dobie, W. J. B., Dismissal as Postmaster at Thessalon : M. for Com. (Mr. Boyce) 3202 (ii).

See 'Thessalon Postmaster.'

Dodd, Judge, N.S., Salary : in Com. of Sup., 124 (i).

Dog-Fish Experimental Works, Construction of: in Com. of Sup., 9173 (v).

Dominion Annuity Co.'s incorp. B. No. 82 (Mr. Bole) 1°*, 1745 ; 2°*, 1891 (i) ; in Com., 2767; 3° m., 2768 ; 3°*, 2950 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c., 55.)

Dominion Arsenal : in Com. of Sup., 9170 (v).

——— Ammunition, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7012 (iv).

——— Col. Gaudet's Salary : in Com. of Sup., 6513 (iv).

——— Establishment of : in Com. of Sup., 445 (i).

Dominion Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. No. 106 (Mr. Black) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., 4971, 5113 ; 3°*, 5113 (iii) ; Sen. Amts., 7625 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 85.)

Dom. Buildings, Engineers, Firemen, Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6822 (iv).

——— Fuel, &c : in Com. of Sup., 6822 (iv).

——— Furniture, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6817 (iv).

——— Heating, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1670 (i).

——— Rentals, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1663 (i), 6818 (iv).

——— Que., Renewals, Repairs, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1107 (i).

See 'Pub. Works,' &c.

Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. No. 159 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 6103-4 (iv); 2°*, and in Com., 8769 ; 3°*, 8885 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 8.)

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. No. 9 (Mr. Guthrie) 1° m., 263 (i).

——— B. No. 189 (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1° m., 8775 (v).

——— B. No. 194 (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1° m., 9073 (v).

Dom. Election Law, Amt. Bills : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9812 (v).

Dom. Lands, Homestead Inspectors' Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6407 (iv).

——— Inspectors' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iv).

——— Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9251, 9289 (v).

Dom. Lands, in N.W.T., Open to Applicants for Sale, &c. : Ques (Mr. Lake) 1935 (i).

Dom. Lands, N.W.T. Sales, &c. : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2006 (ii).
——— Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 8671 (v).
——— Surveys, Maps, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6406, 6424 (iv).
See 'Interior,' &c.
Dom. Lighthouse Depot, Kingston, Establishment of : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 914.
——— Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 915 (i).
Dom. Notes, Printing in English and French : Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 6826 (iv).
Dom. Police, Commissioner's Report : Presented (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 54 (i).
Dom. Police, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 138 (i).
Dom. and Provincial Accounts : in Com. of Sup., 6959, 7241 (iv).
Dom. and Provincial Legislation, Compilation of Reps., &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9685 (v).
Dom. Steamers, Maintenance, Purchase of Supplies, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6464 (iv).
Dom. Traffic Bridges, Generally : in Com. of Sup., 7592 (iv).
Doncaster Indian Reserve, Abolition of : Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 7812 (iv).
Dorchester Co., Returning Officers, Appnmt. of, Cor., &c. : M. (Mr. Morin) for Copies*, 916 (i).
Dorchester Penitentiary : in Com. of Sup., 480 (i).
Double Tracking I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1933 (i), 2027 (ii), 9390 (v).
Doucet's Landing Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6849, 7298 (iv).
Doughty, Mr. A. G., Dom. Archivist, Salary : in Com. of Sup., 9053 (v).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.
Douglastown Isolated Block : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Doukhobors Homestead Entries *re* Village Lots: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6414 (iv).
Doutre, Mr., Dismissal as Postmaster from Beauharnois : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 142 (i), 6247 (iv).
Dredging Contracts, Govt. Policy *re* : Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 1419 (i).
Dredging Contract, Conmee & Bowman : *See* 'Port Arthur.'
Dredges employed at Port Arthur, Expenditure, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 790 (i).
Dredges, Govt., Built at Toronto : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 2456 (ii).
Dredging Plant, &c., Imported into Canada, Valuation, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5425 (iii).
——— Remarks *re* Answer to Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5591 (iii).
Dredging, B.C., New Plant : in Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv).
——— Generally : in Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv), 9604 (v).
Dredging, Man., New Plant : in Com. of Sup., 7577 (iv).
Dredging in Mar. Provinces, Number of Vessels, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6890, 7578 (iv).
Dredging, Ont. and Que., New Plant : in Com. of Sup., 7577 (iv).
——— Working Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 7579 (iv).
Dredging, P.E.I., New Plant : in Com. of Sup., 6891, 7576 (iv).
Dredging, System of Hiring Dredges : Remarks (Mr. Barr) in Com. of Sup., 6842 iv).
Dredges used in Govt. Works, Expenditure *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 795 (i).
Dredging Vessels, Dom., Repairs, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6890, 7576 (iv).
See 'Pub. Works.'
Dress Regulation for Military Officers : in Com. of Sup., 438 (i).
D. R. Fraser and Company, Limited, Co.'s incorp. B. No. 119 (Mr. Oliver) 1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 2773 (ii), in Com., and 3°*, 7625 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 87.)
Drill Hall, Fredericton, Tenders *re* Construction : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 729 (i).
'Druid' Str., Expenditure *re* Maintenance : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 2703 (ii).
Drummond County Ry., Expenditure on Capital Account, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 2334 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 1941 (i).
Drummondville Improvements *re* I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1960 (i).
See 'I.C.R.' &c.
Dukis Indian Reserve, Sale of Timber : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3202 (ii).
Dumping Clause. Amts. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. on Customs Bill, 9767 (v).
——— Customs Instructions *re*, &c. : M. for Copies (Mr. Kemp) 695 (i).
——— Ref. to in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Paterson) 81 (i).
Dundas, Ry. Mail Clerk, Reinstatement : in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).
Dundonald, Earl of, Cor., O.C.'s, &c., *re* Dismissal : M. for Copies* (Mr. Belcourt) 3205 (ii).
Dundonald Park and Ottawa Improvement Commission : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. on B. 180, 8686 (v).
Durham Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7498 (iv).
Earnings per Train Mile, I.C.R., Stmnt. : Read in Com. of Sup., 9503 (v).
Easter Adjournment : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4750 (iii)
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4375 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4458 (iii).

Eastern Channel, St. Maurice River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7326 (iv).
East Templeton Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7300 (iv).
Echo Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9598 (v).
Economy Pile Wharf Extension : in Com. of Sup., 9579 (v).
Educational Clauses : *See* 'Autonomy Bill.'
Edmonton, Dom. Lands Office : in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).
Edmonton Election, and Toronto Election, Tests *re* Feeling of Country : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com., 5886 (iii).
——— date of nomination of Min. of Int.: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com., 5890 (iii).
——— Certificate of Election ; Notification (Mr. Speaker) 5131 (iii).
——— Printing of Voters Lists, Refusal to Conservatives, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. on B. 69, 5852 ; Names of Voters (read) 5855 (iii).
——— Vacancy : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 4200 (iii).
Edmonton Jail : in Com. of Sup., 481, 1638 (i).
——— Extension of Building : in Com. of Sup. 9684 (v).
Edmonton Public Building : in Com. of Sup , 9550 (v).
Edmonton and Qu'Appelle Tel. Lines : in Com of Sup., 7633 (iv).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 62 (Mr. Lamont) 1°*, 1241 ; 2°*, 1339 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII, c., 88.)
Eel Cove Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Effront : *See* 'Jean.'
Election General, 10th Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8001 (v).
See 'Dom. Election Bills,' &c.
Electoral Atlas, Distribution to Members : Remarks (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup., 6897 (iv).
——— New Edition : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).
Electoral Lists in N.W.T., Names of Qualified Electors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7422 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 7684 (iv).
Electric Lighting, Geological Museum, Contract *re* : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 760 (i).
Electric Light Inspectors : in Com. of Sup., 1696 (i).
Elevator at Port Colborne : in Com. of Sup., 1263, 1266, 1288 (i).
Elevators in Ottawa Buildings, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 6816 (iv).
See 'Pub. Works,' &c.
Embargo on Canadian Cattle : *See* 'Canadian Cattle.'
'Emigration of State Children,' Cor. with Mr. C. Kinloch Cooke : Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 5478 (iii).
See 'Immigration,' &c.
Employees, I.C.R., Messrs. Weldon, McDougall, &c., Political Partisans : Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 1146 (i).
——— Pensions, Legislation *re* : Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) 9029, 9288 (v).
Engine House, Rivière du Loup : in Com. of Sup., 9389 (v).
See 'I.C.R.,' &c.
Engineers, Draughtsmen, &c., Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 9382 (v).
——— Public Works : in Com. of Sup., 6895 (iv).
——— Railway Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 1521 (i).
English River, Removal of Obstructions : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
Entennier, Mr. Henry, Entries for Homestead Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 190 (i).
Escoumain Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7303 (iv).
Esquimalt and Halifax Garrisons, Situation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9128 (v).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s B. No. 90 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) 1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2297 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII, c., 90.)
Esquimalt Defences : in Com. of Sup., 9170 (v).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Abandonment by Imp. Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 188 (i).
See 'Halifax,' 'Militia,' &c.
Estimates, Delay in Suppl., Criticism *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) on M. for Sup., 9085 (v).
Estimates, (1905-6) : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 58 (i).
——— (1905) Suppl.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6165 (iv).
——— (1906) Suppl.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 8718, 9392 (v).
Exchequer Court (railway debts.) Act Amt. B. No. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) 1° m., 986 ; 2°*, 1399; in Com., 1400 (i), 2105, 3205 (ii).
Exchequer Court, Admiralty Jurisdiction, Number of Actions, &c.: M. (Mr. A. H. Clark) for Ret.*, 1770 (i).
Exchequer Court Judgeship in Ont., Appnmt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5209 (iii).
Exchequer Court Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 125 (i).
Excise, Additional Remuneration for Extra Works : in Com. of Sup., 1688 (i).
——— Allowance to Customs Collectors : in Com. of Sup., 1689 (i).
——— Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 6724 (iv).
——— Inspectors' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 1679 (i).
——— Inspectors, Travelling Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 1689 (i).
——— Officers, B.C., Provisional Allowance : in Com. of Sup., 1690 (i).

Exhibitions, (Dom.) at New Wesminster, B.C., Grant : in Com. of Sup., 9339, 9608 (v).
——— Generally : in Com. of Sup., 6269 (iv).
——— Liege, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1832 (i).
Expenditure *re* Capital, I.C.R., &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1940 (i).
See 'I.C.R.,' &c.
Experimental Farms : in Com. of Sup., 6165 (iv), 9608 (v).
——— Distribution of Reps.: in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iv).
——— Establishment of in Alberta : Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) in Com. of Sup., 6170 (iv).
Experimental Station in Niagara District, Cor., &c.: Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 7677 (iv).
Exports and Imports, Returns, Issue of Monthly Rep., and Indexing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 7214 (iv).
See 'Customs,' &c.
Express Cos.: *See* 'Ry. Bill 36.'
Extradiction Cases by U.S., before Commissioners at Montreal : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3937 (ii).
Facer Solid Steel Car Wheel Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 27 (Mr. Caldwell) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., 1285, 1339 ; 3°*, 1340 (i). (5 Edward VII, c., 91.)
Facilities, I.C.R., Increased : in Com. of Sup., 9482 (v).
See 'I.C.R.,' &c.
Fairford River Bed Outlet : in Com. of Sup., 7569 (iv).
Farmers' Bank of Canada B. No. 124 (Mr. T. Martin) 1°*, 2681 ; 2°*, 3136 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4700 (iii) ; Sen. Amts., 6609 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 92.)
Farmington and Wilmot Mail Contractor, Guarantee, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 2330 (ii).
Farran's Point Gas Plant : in Com. of Sup., 6308 (iv).
Fencing Wire, Inspection by Govt., &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 585 (i).
See 'N.W.T., Boundary,' &c.
Fenian Raid Pensions : in Com. of Sup., 6956 ; conc., 6961 (iv).
Fernie, B.C., Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1641 (i).
Fertilizers, Inspection of : Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 1726 (i).
Fessenden Wireless Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. No. 144 (Mr. Telford) 1°*, 4644 ; 2°*, 4978 (iii) ; in Com., 6380, 6607 ; 3°*, 6609 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 93.)
FINANCE :
American Currency, Circulated in Canada, Prevention *re* : Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 3010 (ii).
See 'Foreign,' 'Silver.'
FINANCE—*Con.*
Assistant Receiver General's Office : in Com. of Sup., 9052 (v).
Audit Act and Treasury Board, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1935 (i).
See 'Auditor General,' &c.
Banking Act Amts., Legislation *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6112 (iv).
Bank Notes, Supervision *re* Printing and Circulation, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6251 (iv).
See 'Dom. Notes.'
Binder Twine Bounties, &c. : Statement read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. of Sup., 7221 (iv).
Canadian Bank of Commerce-Yukon, Compensation *re* : in Com. of Sup., 9615 (v).
Charges of Management : in Com. of Sup., 69 (i), 6249 (iv), 8691, 9052 (v).
Dom. and Provincial Accounts : in Com. of Sup., 6959, 7241 (iv).
Dom. Notes, Printing in English and French : Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 6826 (iv).
Estimates, (1905-6) : Presented Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 58 (i).
——— (1905) Suppl. : Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6165 (iv).
——— (1906) Suppl. : Presented (Mr. Fielding) 8718, 9392 (v).
Finance Dept., Private Sec. Allowance : in Com. of Sup., 6268 (iv).
——— Deptl. Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 78, 118 (i). 9060 (v).
Foreign Coin Circulation, Prevention *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 8776 (v).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Payments *re* : in Com. of Sup., 7216 (iv).
Lead Bounties, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 7222 (iv).
Life Insurance Companies Funds, Total Amount, Par Value, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 3204 (ii).
Loans by Govt., Temporary or Permanent, Total Amount, Rate of Interest, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 4921 (iii).
Manitoba School Fund, Amt. paid to Man. Govt. : Ques. (Mr. Bole) 379 (i).
Mint, Royal, Establishment of in Can., Cor. with Imp. Govt. : M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies*, 916 (i).
——— inquiry for cor. (Mr. Monk) 2595 (ii), 7424 (iv), 8387 (v).
——— Estimated Cost of Equipment, Capacity, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2185 , 2326 (ii).
See 'Pub. Works—Ottawa,' &c.
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness, Collections, &c. : M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 402 (i).
Ontario Subsidies, Letter from G. W. Ross to Fin. Min. : Read (Mr. Henderson) 6092 (iv).

FINANCE—*Con.*

Penny Banks, Charters, Stmnt. *re* Business, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 687 (i).

Petroleum Bounties, Payments, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).

P.E.I. Subsidy, Additional Grant, Cor., &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 3205 (ii).

See 'Marine,' &c.

Provincial Subsidies, Readjustment *re* Memoranda, &c. : M. for Copies (Mr. Carvell) 2100 (ii).

Receiver General's Office : in Com. of Sup., 6249 (iv).

Silver Coins, Worn, &c., Redemption of: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 688 (i).

Yarmouth Bank of N.S., Investigation, Punishment of Offenders : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9690 (v).

First Minister (Increase of Salary) B. No. 201 (Mr. Fielding) Res. prop., 9700 ; in Com., on Res., 9725 ; 1°* of B., 9726 ; 2°*, 9790; in Com., 9790 ; 3° m., 9790 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 12.)

Fiscal Year, Change in Ending of, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Sup., 9096 (v).

Fisher, Mr. P. G., Retirement, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lake) 264 (i).

FISHERIES :

American Fishermen on N. S. Coasts, Protection *re* by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 7907 (iv).

Atlantic Fisheries Investigation, Rep. *re* : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 270 (i).

Bait Freezers, Deep Sea Fisheries : in Com. of Sup., 9620 (v).

——— Establishment in Canso, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1146 (i).

——— Mar. Canada, Number, Location, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Martin) 2067 (ii).

British American Fish Co., Contract *re* Fishing Rights in Western Lakes : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).

B. C. Canning Industries : *See* 'Salmon Canning.'

Canso Herring Industry, &c. : Ques (Mr. Lefurgey) 1146 (i).

Carillon Canal Fishway, Construction, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2064 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 2910 (ii).

Cowie, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. *re* Herring Experiments : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5425 (iii).

Dog-fish Experimental Works, Construction of : in Com. of Sup., 9173 (v).

Fish-breeding Establishments, Maintenance, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6635 (iv).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

Fishing Bounty Distribution, Expenditure *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6636 (iv).

——— Fraud *re* Payment, Rep. of Mr. Matheson : M. (Mr. Ganong) for Copy*, 1770 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2911 (ii).

Fish-Curing Establishments : in Com. of Sup., 9173 (v).

Fish exported into New York State, Prohibition of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. L. P. Demers) on M. for Sup., 6177 (iv).

Fish Hatcheries, Distribution of : in Com. of Sup., 2904 (ii).

Fish Hatcheries in Lake Winnipeg: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 6635 (iv).

Fishing Regulations, Conflict between Dom. and Provinces, &c. Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 4751 (iii).

Fishing Rights in Estuaries, Jurisdiction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1346 (i).

Fisheries Industry, Commission of Investigation, Recommendation, &c.: M. (Mr. Ganong) to adjn., 6312 (iv).

——— Expenses *re* : in Com. of Sup., 9172 (v).

See 'Herring,' &c.

Fishermen Immigrants from England and Scotland for Cod Fisheries, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 586 (i).

Fish Transportation from Boston to Montreal via G. T. Ry., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. of Sup., 1930 (i).

Georgian Bay and Lake Huron Fisheries, Requests for Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5479 (iii).

Halibut Fisheries, B.C., American Encroachments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 585 (i).

Halifax Fishery Award, Amount received by Can. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Piché) 8886 (v).

Halifax Fishery Award and Claims of P.E.I., Memorials, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. A. McLean) for Copies, 1386 (i).

——— Distribution *re* Provinces, Basis *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1593 (i).

——— Payment to Provs., Ref. *re* : Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2065 (ii).

Hatcheries, N.B., Salmon Pond, N.B., Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 590 (i).

Herring and Fishing Industry, Rep. of Commission, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4552 (iii).

Herring Industry and Bait Freezers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1146 (i).

Herring Industry, Experiments at Canso, N.S., Emplymt. of Mr. Cowie : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5425 (iii).

Hurley, J.M., Inspector, Rep., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 2895 (ii).

Inspection, N.S., Violation of Regulations, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9687 (v).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

Inspectors' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 2878, 2890 (ii), 6630 (iv).

James Bay Lobsters, Investigation *re* by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6475 (iv).

Lake Manitoba, Closing *re* Fishing, Protests, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2901 (ii), 6630 (iv).

Lake Winnipeg Fish Hatcheries : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2905 (ii).

Lobster Canneries, Licenses, Applications, &c., N.B. District No. 1 : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 584 (i).

——— Number issued by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 910 (i).

Lobster and Herring Industry, Rep. of Commissioners : Ques. (Mr. McLennan) 4371 (iii).
See 'Fisheries Industry,' &c.

Lobster Fishing, Open Season in 1903-4-5 : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 1504 (i).

Lobster Fisheries, Res. of Board of Trade, Moncton : Read (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 2909 (ii).

Lobsters, Legal Length in Bay of Fundy, Changes *re* : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 583 (i).

Manitoba Lake Fishing, Closing of, Cor., Pets., &c.; M. for Copies* (Mr. Crawford) 9698 (v).

Markey, F. H., Lease to *re* Fishing Rights in N. Western Lakes : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).

Moose Lake Fishing Licenses, Grants to by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).

Nelson River, &c., Fishing Rights : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).

Overseers, Complaints against : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 6632 (iv).

Overseers in Colchester Co., N.S., Number and Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Laurence) 5978 (iv).

Oyster Culture, Protection *re* : in Com. of Sup., 2912 (ii).

Pound Net Licenses issued by Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 2892 (ii).

——— Little Current, Cor. between A. E. Dyment and Govt. *re* : M. for Copies* (Mr. Crocket) 1399 (i).

P. E. I. Fisheries, Supervision, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1762 (i).

Protection Service : in Com. of Sup., 2907 (ii), 6630 (iv).

Protection Service, Strs., Monthly Pay-roll, &c., Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1350 (i).

Protection Steamers, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 1347 (i).
See 'Marine,' &c.

Salmon Canning Fisheries, B.C., Suspension, &c., Representations *re* : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 269 (i).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

Salmon Hatcheries and Provincial Fishing Licenses : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2905 (ii).

Fitz-Simons, Jean Marie, Relief B. No. 130 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 4081 ; 2°*, 4414 (iii) ; in Com., 6377 ; 3° m., 6378 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 94.)

Fog Horns, Toronto Harbour, Testing, &c., Complaints *re* : Cor., &c., Read (Mr. Kemp) 9281 (v).
See 'Marine,' &c.

Fog Signals, Submarine : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 891 (i).

Foote, J., Gratuity to : in Com. of Sup., 6434 (iv).

Foreign Coin Circulation, Prevention *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 8776 (v).
See 'Finance,' &c.

Forest Protection in Man.: in Com. of Sup., 9298 (v).

Fort Lawrence Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 6838 (iv).

——— Name of Contractor, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5034 (iii).

Fort Macleod Court House, Inspection *re* : Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 1644 (i).

Fort William and Port Arthur Harbours, Number of Tenders, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 6729 (iv).

Fort William and Port Arthur Open Navigation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6645 (iv).

Fort William Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 784 (i), 6900 (iv).
See 'Pt. Arthur,' &c.

Ft. William, G. T. P. Ry. Station Plans, filed in Ry. Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 2009 (ii).
See 'G. T. P. Ry.', &c.

Franchise Act (1898) Amt. B. No. 52 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 818 (i) ; 2°*, 2112 ; in Com., 2112 (ii), 9198 ; 3°* 9199 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 13.)

Franking Privilege Abuse *re* Circulars of Dental Institute : Remarks (Mr. Ames) 1807 (i).

——— Circular issued by Jacques Cartier Club, &c. : Remarks (Mr. O. E. Talbot) on M. for Ways and Means, 9798 (v).

——— Regulations after Prorogation : Remarks (Mr. Clements) 9395 (v).

——— Use of Stamp *re* Documents : Remarks (Mr. Barr) 5134, 5963 (iii).
See 'Campaign,' &c.

Frank, Relief to Settlers *re* Land Slide : Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 9603 (v).

Frechette, L. A., Translation *re* Excise Branch: in Com. of Sup., 1690 (i).

Fraser River Ship Channel Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7574 (iv).

Fraserville Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7323 (iv).
Fredericton, Military Buildings, Tender *re* Construction : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 728 (i).
——— Post Office, Equipment, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Crocket) 170 (i).
——— Station Agent, Dismissal of Mr. O. White : M. for Cor. (Mr. Crocket) 192 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 107 (i).
——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. Crocket) 698 (i).
See 'I.C.R.,' &c.
Free Mail Delivery, Total Cost, &c. : Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 729 (i).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Freeport Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Freetown Agent's Dwelling House, P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 2180 (ii).
Free Transportation of Hay, &c., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 59 (i).
See 'Hay', 'Passes,' &c.
Freight Diversion I.C.R. and Traffic Arrangements : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2219 (ii).
——— Letter from C. W. Stewart : Read (Mr. Daniel) 2227 (ii).
Freight Rates, Advancement of Rebate : Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 1545 (i).
——— Discrimination, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 890 (i).
——— Increases of, &c.: Statement (Mr. Emmerson) in Reply to Mr. Taylor, 6112 (iv) ; Cor. read, 6115 (iv).
——— Ref. to Gananoque and Fredericton : Reply (Mr. Taylor) to Min. of Rys., 6585 (iv).
See 'Agriculture-Holstein,' 'Trade and Commerce,' &c.
Frude's Point Wharf Enlargement, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).
Fruit Growers Association, P.E.I., Res. *re* Maintenance of Industry : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 381 (i).
Fruit Inspectors, Number, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 588 (i).
Fruit Marks Act, Convictions under : Ques. (Mr. Gunn) 3010 (ii).
Fruit Marks Act, Inspectors appointed, Names, Salaries, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 736 (i).
Fuel Inspector, I.C.R., Duties, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 451 (i).
Fumigating Stations : in Com. of Sup., 1831 (i).
Furness, Withy & Co., Contract *re* S. African Trade : in Com. of Sup., 971 (i).
See 'Trade and Commerce.'
Gabarus Harbour Improvements : in Com of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Galena Oil Co., Oil purchased for I.C.R. : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 2254 (ii).
Galician Vote *re* Edmonton Election : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 4201 (iii).
Galops Canal, Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 1220 (i).
——— Channel Completion : in Com. of Sup., 1230 (i).
——— Removing Shoals : in Com. of Sup., 9354 (v).
——— Repairs *re* Leakage : in Com. of Sup., 1492 (i).
Gamebridge Masonry Inspector, Dismissal, Imperfect Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5600 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 8004 (v).
See 'Canals,' &c.
Gananoque Armoury : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1656 (i).
Gas and Electric Light Inspection at Three Rivers, Total Cost, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1760 (i).
Gas and Electric Light Inspection, Rep. *re* : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1692 (i).
Gas Plant, Parry Sound, Purchase of Property : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2725 (ii).
See 'Acetylene,' &c.
Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 934 (i).
Gatineau Point Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7303 (iv).
Gatineau River Slides and Booms : in Com. of Sup., 7630 (iv).
Gaynor-Greene Extradition, Charges against Mr. Lafontaine, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3937 (ii).
General Statistics : in Com. of Sup., 6274 (iv).
Geographical Board of Canada, Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 625 (i).
Geological Museum, Ottawa : in Com. of Sup., 754 (i).
Geological Survey, Appnmts. and Absences, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 382 (i).
——— Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 122(i). 6248 (iv).
——— Director, Name, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9303 (v).
——— Explorations, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8669, 9685 (v).
——— Maps, Printing and Distribution, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8670 (v).
——— Mr. F. Nicolas' Salary : in Com. of Sup., 9249 (v).
Georgetown, Increased Accommodation, P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 2179 (ii).
Georgeville Wharf Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal Surveys, Engineers, Reps., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brabazon) 192 (i).
——— Instructions *re*, Inquiry for Copies (Mr. White) 822 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 7637 (iv).
——— Survey via French River, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9547 (iv).
Georgian Bay Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6886 (iv).
Georgian Bay Indian Surveys : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 236 (i).
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale, Jurisdiction, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. Wright) 6477 (iv).
——— Sale to Mr. F. W. Grant : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 6479 (iv).
——— Sale of : Personal Explanation (Mr. Grant) 6736 (iv).
Georgian Bay and Lake Huron Fisheries, Requests for Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5479 (iii).
Georgian Bay and Seaboard Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 35 (Mr. Grant) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1288 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 95.)
Gillies Brothers Limited B. No. 95 (Mr. A. A. Wright) 1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 2763 ; 3°*, 2765 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 96.)
Gillis, N. J., Emplymt. by Govt. at St. Louis Exhibition : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3361 (ii).
Gimli Wharf, Lake Winnipeg : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9577 (v).
——— Public Building, Purchase of Site : Ques. (Mr. Blain) 9697 (v).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1034 (i).
Glanders, Spread among Horses, Prevention of by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6690 (iv).
Glenn Ross P.O., Abolition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1149 (i).
Godbout, Mr. J., Lighthouse-keeper, Political Partisanship *re* Dom. Elections : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1343 (i).
Goderich Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7553 (iv).
Goderich Mail Contract, Tender *re* : Ques. (Mr. Gunn) 2493 (ii).
Gold Medal Furniture Manufacturing Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 102 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2297 ; in Com., 3399 ; 3°*, 3400 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 97.)
Gold of the Yukon purchased by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Thompson) in Com. of Sup., 6264 (iv).
Goodwin Car Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 17 (Mr. Bickerdike) 1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 415 (i).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3361 (ii).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Wednesdays and Thursdays: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 820 (i).
See 'Business.'
Government Legislation : Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 820 (i).
Govt.Railways Act Amt. B. No. 132 (Mr. Emmerson) 1° m., 4186 (iii) ; 2°*, and in Com., 6139, 7583 ; 3° m., 7584 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 36.)
Government Railways, Disposal of Old Rails, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2066 (ii).
See 'I. C. R.', 'Old Rails,' &c.
Govt. Steamers, Expenditure *re* Repairs : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1349 (i).
——— Maintenance, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2595 (ii).
——— statement of expenditure : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2597 (ii).
——— Purchase of Supplies : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2617 (ii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Govt. Works Contract B. No. 51 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 818 ; 2°*, 1672 ; in Com., 1672 ; 3°*, 1806 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 7.)
Gov. Gen.'s Instructions, Changes in : Remarks (Mr. Maclean, York) 227 (i).
Gov. Gen. Secretary's Office, Clerical Assistance: in Com. of Sup., 6248 (iv).
——— Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 70 (i), 9053 (v).
Grades and Curves, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1987 (i).
Graeme Hunter, Charges *re* Immigration Society : Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2188 (ii).
See 'Immigration.'
Grain carried and exported through Govt. Elevators, Arrangements *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 1917 (i).
See 'I.C.R.'
Grain Inspection Act (commercial grades) Amt. B. No. 174 (Mr. Fisher) 1°*, 7420 (iv) ; 2°*, 9395 ; in Com., 9395 ; 3°*, 9408 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 14.)
Grain Inspection : in Com. of Sup., 6901 (iv).
Grain Inspectors, List of, &c.: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. of Sup., 7224 (iv).
Grain Standards *re* Inspection : Stmnt. (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup., 9681 (v).
Grain Survey Boards, Appnmt. for Montreal and Toronto : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 910 (i).
——— Pets., Memorials, &c., *re* : M. (Mr. Ames) for Copies, 1763 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 7230 (iv).
Grain Warehouses, Montreal, Preparation of Plans : Ques. (Mr. Piché) 1345 (i).
Grand Bend Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7553 (iv).
Grand Bend Pier, Delay in Building, &c.: (Mr. Armstrong) 1344 (i).
Grand Manan and Mainland : SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 922 (i).

Grand Manan, N.B., Life-saving Crew, Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 4921 (iii).
Grand Mechins Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7303 (iv).
Grand Piles Dam, St. Maurice River : in Com. of Sup., 7326 (iv).
Grand River and Western Power Co.'s incorp. B. No. 122 (Mr. Zimmerman) 1°*, 2681 ; 2°*, 3136 (ii).
Grand River, Ont., Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6873 (iv).
Grande Rivière de Beaupré Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 3400 (ii) ; on Order for Com., 7621, 7622 ; in Com., 7622, 7625 ; 3° m., 7853 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 98.)
G. T. P. Ry., Agreement with National Transcontinental Ry. Act: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 2776 (ii).
——— Commissioners, Appnmts., Total Amount expended : M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret.*, 916 (i).
——— Commission, Appnmt. of Hon. S. N. Parent : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 699 (i).
——— Commission, Staff and Salaries : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 688 (i).
——— Commission, Surveys, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2277 (ii).
——— Commission, Surveys, &c., Number of Employees : M. (Mr. Gervais) for Ret.*, 1770 (i).
——— Contracts, Awarding of, &c.: Answer to Question (Mr. Emmerson) 9782 (v).
——— Construction, Location from Winnipeg, &c., Rumours *re* : Remarks (Mr. Lamont) 9814 (v).
See ' Route.'
——— Contracts, Winnipeg Terminals : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9541, 9812 (v).
——— Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9498 (v).
——— Estimates : Remarks (Mr. Foster) *re* Discussion, 2182 (ii).
——— Interim Rep.: Presented (Mr. Emmerson) 6310 (iv).
——— Plans *re* Terminal Points, deposited with Ry. Dept.: M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 917 (i), 2816 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1150 (i).
——— Plans of Terminal at Port Arthur, Approval of Location : Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 6138 (iv).
——— Questions answered by Ministers : Remarks (Mr. Monk) 1595 (i).
——— Route proposed, West of Winnipeg, Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 729 (i).
See ' Construction.'
——— Surveys and Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 2282, 2298 (i)), 7498 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry., Surveys in B.C., Information *re* : Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 3009 (ii).
——— Surveys, Information given out by Mr. Hays in Address: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2007 (ii).
——— Surveys, Number and Names of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gervais) 686 (i).
——— Surveys, O.C. *re* Commission : Remarks (Mr. Maclean, York) 229 (i).
——— Surveys, Plans, Field Notes, &c., Repayment for, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9490 (v).
——— Surveys, Quebec and Moncton Route, Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 228 (i).
——— Survey of Route, Moncton to Winnipeg, Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6134 (iv).
——— Surveys through Madawaska, N.B., Suggested Route : Ques. (Mr. Costigan) 5688 (iii).
——— Terminals, Right of Way, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9498 (v).
——— Canadian Northern, Joint Terminals : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 9499 (v).
——— Terminals at Winnipeg, Cor. *re* : Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 9541, 9812 (v).
G.T.Ry., Appeal in *re*, 4 Edward VII., c. 31 : Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 9080 (v).
G.T.Ry. Arbitration Act Amt. B. No. 199 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 9279 ; 2°*, 9280 ; in Com. 9529 ; 3°*, 9529 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 15.)
G.T.R. and I.C.R. Arbitration, Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 68, 165 (i).
——— Arbitration *re* Traffic Arrangements, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1929 (i).
See ' I.C.R.'
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. No. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) 1° m., 727 ; 2°*, 909 (i) ; on Order for Com., 2765 ; in Com., 3649, 3879 (ii) ; 4123, 4202 ; 3° m., 4228 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 75.)
Grand Trunk Ry. B. No. 45, Statement *re* Amalgamation with C. A. R. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 4222 (iii).
——— Statement *re* Mileage (Mr. Ingram) 4223, 4231 (iii).
——— 3° m., Ques. of Order (Mr. Ingram) 4228 (iii).
Grand View Station, Murray Harbour Branch P.E.I. Ry., Location, &c., Cor. : M. (Mr. Martin) for Copies*, 1770 (i).
Grasshopper Scourge, Claims for Relief to Man. Farmers : Ques. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 909 (i).
Grass Seed Exports, Quantity and Quality : Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 913 (i).
Gratuities to Ry. Employees : in Com. of Sup., 2183 (ii).
See ' Employees,' &c.

Grazing Leases, &c. : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 8529 (v).
See 'Interior.'
G. B. and Canada Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 864 (i).
See 'Trade and Commerce,' 'Atlantic,' &c.
G. B. and Her Colonies, Inter-Imperial Parliament : Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2334 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 2401 ; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2401.
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Ingram) 2402 ; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2402 (ii).
Great Northern Ry. Co. of Canada B. No. 71 (Mr. M. S. Schell) 1°*, 1504 ; 2°*, 1710 (i) ; in Com., 4258 ; 3°* 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 99.)
Great Salmon River Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7498 (iv).
Great West Ry. Co. : *See* 'Northwest Coal,' &c.
Gregory, Col., Retirement of : Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 418 (i).
Greece's Point Wharf, Total Cost, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2063 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 7301 (iv).
Green, Samuel H., Postmaster at Kaslo, B.C., Dismissal, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 2331 (ii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Grenville Canal, Appnmt. of Inspector : Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1509 (i).
——— Guide Piers : in Com. of Sup., 1499 (i).
See 'Canals,' &c.
Grimsby. Establishment of Experimental Farm: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6165 (iv).
Grondine's Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Grosse Isle Hospital Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9608 (v).
Grosse Isle Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7305 (iv).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Station Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1108 (i), 6734 (iv).
——— Steamer : in Com. of Sup., 1838 (i).
——— Telegraph System : in Com. of Sup., 9604 (v).
Guelph and Georgian Bay Ry Co.'s B. No. 100 (Mr. Guthrie) 1°*, 2108 ; 2°*, 2297 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 101.)
Guelph Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1555 (i).
Haggard, Rider, Rep. to Imp. Govt., &c. : Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 9523 (v).
Haileybury, Lake Temiscaming Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6887, 7556 (iv).
Haldimand Armoury : Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 1656 (i).
Half-Breed Scrip issued to United States Citizens : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6311 (iv).
——— Memo. from Mr. Cote : Read (Mr. Oliver) 6403 (iv).
Half-Breed Scrip to non-residents, Cancellation of O.C.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6489, 6560 (iv).
Half-Breeds Patents, Issue of, Claims, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on M. for Sup., 6907 (iv).
——— Inquiry for : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7020, 7099 (iv).
Half-Breed Scrip, Charges *re* Mr. McDonald, Cor., &c. : Read (Mr. Foster) 7647 (iv).
——— Charges, &c. : Personal Explanation (Mr. Bole) 7812 (iv).
——— Charges *re* Mr. Chaffee's Claims : Personal Explanation (Mr. Foster) 7916 (iv).
——— Instructions to Judge Myers *re* Investigation : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7723 (iv).
——— O. C., *re* Judge Myers : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8003 (v).
——— patents issued, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8003 (v).
——— scope of instruction to Judge Myers : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8170 (v).
——— Mr. Chaffey's letter : Read (Mr. Foster) 8183 (v).
——— Investigation, Apppmt. of Counsel : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8528, 8697 (v).
——— Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8777 (v).
——— statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8777 (v).
——— Investigation *re* Progress, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9725 (v).
——— inquiry for papers (Mr. Foster) 7422 (iv), 9028 (v).
——— further papers laid on Table (Mr. Oliver) 9075, 9179 (v).
Half-Breed Scrip, Unsettled Claims in N. W. Ter., Complaints from Old Settlers : Remarks (Mr. Herron) 9813 (v).
——— Application by Norman Oulette and Others, Purchase of, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Staples) 9078 (v).
See 'Immigration,' 'Indians,' 'Interior,' &c.
Half Island Cove Breakwater, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9584 (v).
Halibut Fisheries, B.C., American Encroachments, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 585 (i).
Halifax and Canso SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 937 (i).
Halifax and Esquimalt Defences, Cor., O. C.'s, &c., with Dom. Govt. : M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 2334 (ii).
——— Abandonment of by G. B. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6510 (iv), 9677 (v).
——— Par. in Ottawa 'Journal' *re* Govt. Control : Read (Mr. S. Hughes) 1402 (i).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Halifax and Newfoundland SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 906 (i).
Halifax and W. Indies SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 7087 (iv).

Halifax, Deep Water Dredging *re* I.C.R. Terminals : in Com. of Sup., 2026 (ii).
——— Detention Hospital : in Com. of Sup., 1037 (i).
——— Dom. Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1036 (i).
See 'Public Works,' &c.
——— Fishery Award, Amount received by Can. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Piché) 8886 (v).
——— Claims of P.E.I., Memorials, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. A. McLean) for Copies, 1386 (i).
——— Distribution *re* Provinces, Basis *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1593 (i).
——— Payment to Provs. Ref. *re* : Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2065 (ii).
Halifax Immigrant Building : in Com. of Sup., 1036 (i).
Halifax, I.C.R., Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 2032 (ii), 9391 (v).
Halifax Lightship, Maintenance, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2708 (ii).
Halifax Military Equipment : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6511 (iv).
Halifax, St. John's Nfld. and Liverpool Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 902 (i).
Hamilton and Kilbride Mail Contractor, Distance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 9080 (v).
Hamilton Cove P.O. Mail Service and Revenue: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7421 (iv).
Hamilton Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1559 (i).
Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Ry. Co.'s B. No. 112 (Mr. Guthrie) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4700 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 102.)
Hamilton Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iv).
Hamelin and Gosselin, Imprisonment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1849 (i).
Hanault, L. O., Payments *re* Lachine Canal : in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).
'Hansard' Index, Change of : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1570 (i).
See 'Debates,' &c.
Harbours and Boards of Commissioners, Names, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1063 (i).
Harbour Buoys, Maintaining, Placing, &c., Contracts *re* : M. (Mr. Ames) for Ret.*, 917 (i).
Harbour Commissioners, Control by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6725 (iv).
Harbours, Docks and Slides, Working Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges Generally : in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
——— B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
——— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 7569 (iv).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1744 (i), 7497 (iv), 9588 (v).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, N.W.T., General Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
——— N.W.T. Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv), 9602 (v).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1727 (i), 6837, 7237, 7395 (iv), 9551 (v).
——— N.S., Govt. Policy *re* Breakwaters, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9553 (v).
——— Ont. : in Com. of Sup., 6729, 6869, 7546 (iv), 9595 (v).
——— Ont., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7555 (iv).
——— P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 1734 (i), 9585 (v).
——— Quebec : in Com. of Sup., 770 (i), 2448 (ii), 6436, 6839, 7285 (iv), 9590 (v).
See 'Public Works,' 'Marine,' &c.
Harper, Geo. Dance, Relief B. No. 154 (Mr. T. G. Johnston) 1°*, 5919 (iii) ; 2°*, 5976 ; in Com., 6377 ; 3°*, 6377 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c., 103.)
Harrigan Cove Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7403 (iv).
Harrison, Capt., Allowance *re* Services : in Com. of Sup., 6466 (iv).
Harvey, N.B., Customs Collector, Appnmt. of : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 9696 (v).
Haultain, Mr., Letter *re* Autonomy Bill : Remarks (Mr. Borden) on M. for Sup., 2493 2548 (ii).
See 'Autonomy.' &c.
Hawkesbury Public Building : in Com of Sup., 1560 (i).
Hay exported from Quebec to Boston, Number of Tons : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 689 (i).
Hay, Free Transport over I.C.R., Cor. between Govt., &c. : M. for copies (Mr. Foster) 164
——— O.C., Circulars, &c. : M. for copies* (Mr. Foster) 280 (i).
——— Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 919 (i), 2005, 2595, 3450 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 59 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 1929 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 108 (i).
Hay Imports from U.S., Quantity, Duties collected, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1064 (i).
Hay Lake Channel, Lowering of Water : Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 701, 1420 (i).
Herring and Fishing Industry, Rep. of Commission, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4552 (iii).
Herring Industry and Bait Freezers, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1146 (i).
Herring Industry Experiments at Canso, N.S., Emplymt. of Mr. Cowie : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5425 (iii).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.

Hersey, Arthur Howe Relief B. No. 167 (Mr. T. G. Johnston) 1°*, 6232; 2°*, 6868; M. for Com., 7624; On Order for Com., 7682; M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 7682 (iv).

Hersey, Arthur Relief B. No. 167: M. (Mr. L. P. Demers) to employ Stenographers, 8527 (v).

Higgin's Shore Pier, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1734 (i).

High Commissioner's Office: in Com. of Sup., 120 (i).

High Court Judgeship, Exchequer Court Division, Vacancy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5209 (iii).

Highland Cadet Corps, Montreal, Letter *re*: Read (Mr. Monk) 7813 (iv).
See 'Militia,' &c.

Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 2038, 2127 (ii).
See 'Murray Harbour.' &c.

Hodgins, Jonathan,, Resignation from Montreal Harbour Commission: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 151 (i).

Hog Cholera in Essex and Kent Cos.: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 6711 (iv).
See 'Agriculture.'

Holland River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 9359 (v).
See 'Trent,' &c.

Holliday Bros., Contract *re* North Shore Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).

Holstein Breeders, Complaints *re* Freight on Rys., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6680 (iv).

Homesteads for Residents, N.W.T., Second Applications, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 2067 (ii).

Homesteads Inspectors as Active Politicians: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6407 (iv).
See 'Interior,' &c.

Honora Wharf, Freight Shed: in Com. of Sup., 9597 (v).

——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6887 (iv).

Hope Island Timber Cutting: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Bennett) 2759 (ii).

Hospital Dues for Sick Mariners Fund, Surplus, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2687 (ii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS:

Ballots, Blank, Printing, Custom *re* Procedure; Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 911 (i).

Ballot Box Frauds in Dom. Elections, Demonstration *re* Fraudulent Box: (Mr. Porter) on M. for Sup., 9199 (v).

Ballots, Blank, Method of Issuing, Complaints *re* S. Lanark and Ottawa: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 1342 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

Ballot Boxes, Payment to Mr. Cayouette: Letter read (Mr. Morin) 989 (i).

Bills, Royal Assent: Mess. from Dep. Governor (Mr. Speaker) 6084 (iv).

——— Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 6991 (iv).
See 'Bills.'

Books purchased for Library, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 75 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L., Notification of Election (Mr. Speaker) 583 (i).

——— Introduced, 624 (i).

Carleton Co., Electoral District, Certificate *re* Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 583 (i).

——— Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 98 (i).

——— Committee Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 6594 (iv).

Controverted Elections, Lisgar, Judges' Certificate: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 9 (i).

Desks, in House of Commons, Improvement in: Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) in Com. of Sup., 1566 (i).
See 'Locked.'

Doorkeepers Inattention: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6600 (iv).

Dorchester Co., Returning Officers, Appnmt. of, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Morin) for Copies*, 916 (i).

Edmonton Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 5131 (iii).

Electoral Lists in N.W.T., Names of Qualified Electors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7422 (iv).

——— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 7684 (iv).

——— Employees: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 5209 (iii).

Internal Economy Commission: Mess. from His Ex.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 8 (i).

——— Res. *re* Purchasing Furniture: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 6612; Res. read (Mr. Speaker) 6614 (iv).

——— Reps. presented to the House: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9076 (v).

Legislation, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6268 (iv).

Levis Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 7175 (iv).

——— Vacancy, Issue of Writ: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 6474 (iv).

Library, Books and Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 75 (i), 6944 (iv).

——— Enlargement of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6944 (iv).

——— Joint Rep.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 8 (i).

Locked Desks for Members' Papers: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).
See 'Desks.'

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

London and N. Oxford By-Election, Issue of Writ : Notification (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6311 (iv).

——— Issue of Writ : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 6473 (iv).

——— Resignation of Mr. W. F. Maclean : Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6384 (iv).

See 'Oxford.'

Man. Elections : Duties of Ret. Officers, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1506 (i).

Manitoba Election Returns : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1672 (i).

——— Voters' Lists returned to Clerk of Crown : Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1405 (i).

Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Greenway) on M. for Sup., 6738 (iv).

Marquette Voters' Lists, Original Copy : M. for Copy* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 97 (i).

Meetings after six o'clock, Recess : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 450 (i).

Members, New, 111, 624, 1846 (i), 7420 (iv).

Messengers, House of Commons : in Com. of Sup., 240 (i), 6612 (iv).

Ministers, Absence from House : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1285 (i).

Morning Sittings : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9081 (v).

Nicolet, Controverted Election, Certificate from Judges : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 9081 (v).

N.W. Ter., Voters' Lists : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2594 (ii).

Oxford and London Elections, Resignation of Mr. D. D. McKenzie : Remarks (Mr. Porter) in Com. on B. 69, 8474 (v).

Oxford N., Electoral Vacancy : Notification to Mr. Speaker (Mr. Sproule) 5961 (iv).

——— Issue of Writ : Notification (Mr. (Mr. Speaker) 6046 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6135 (iv).

——— Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 8177 (v).

Petitions, Presenting, Endorsement of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 2490 (ii).

P.O., Complaints *re* Delivery of Mails : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com of Sup., 199 (i).

See 'Post Office,' &c.

Purchases, Auditing of : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6617 (iv).

Quebec Centre Electoral District, Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 110 (i).

Questions answered by Ministers : Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 1067 (i).

Ret. Officers, Dep., Delay in Payments to, Letter from Mr. Walker : Read (Mr. W. J. Roche) 6560 (iv).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

Ret. Officers, Forms and Instructions *re* Dom. Elections : M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 697 (i).

——— Instructions *re* Form of Oath at London and Oxford Elections : M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7331 (iv).

——— for Mackenzie and Dauphin, Man. Special Reps. Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1336 (i).

Rooms for Members, Allotment : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 238, 250 (i).

Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 6268 (iv).

Selkirk Ret. Officers, Occupation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 1761 (i).

Senate and House of Commons Conferences, Mess. from the Senate : Read (Mr. Fielding) 9028 (v).

———M. (Mr. Fielding) to conc., 9280 (v).

Sergeant-at-Arms, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 240 (i), 6610 (iv).

Sessional Clerks : in Com. of Sup., 239 (i), 6595 (iv).

Sessional Messengers : in Com. of Sup., 240 (i), 6612 (iv).

Sessional Pages : in Com. of Sup., 6613 (iv).

Sessions of Parliament, Delays in bringing down Estimates, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9085 (v).

Speaker, Election of : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2 (i).

Speaker, Dep.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to appoint, 50 (i).

Stationery : in Com. of Sup., 238 (i), 6594 (iv).

Steward for Speaker's Rooms, Appnmt. of : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 240 (i).

Toronto Centre, Electoral District, Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 4370 (iii).

——— Issue of Writ, Registration, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3251 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Foster 2777 (ii).

——— Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2841 (ii).

——— Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3362

Ventilation in the House of Commons : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).

See 'Public Works,' &c.

Voters' Lists, Algoma, East and West, Revision, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 594 (i).

——— Edmonton Election, Preparation of : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).

——— Electoral Atlas : in Com. of Sup., 6722 (iv).

——— Macdonald, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Staples) 697 (i).

——— N. W. Ters., Use in Dom. Elections, 1905 : M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 601 (i).

See 'N.W.T.'

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
Voters' Lists, Man., Printing, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 60 (i).
See 'Man.' &c.
——— Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6897, 6954 (iv).
——— Unorganized Ters., Cor. *re*, Instruction, &.: M. (Mr. Boyce) for Copies*, 1397 (i).
Wright Electoral District : Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1846 (i).
——— Vacancy : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 98 (i).
Yukon Election, and Returning Officer, Cor. : Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1254 (i).
Yukon Elections for Dom., Delay in opening Ballot Boxes : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 987 (i).
——— Ret. of Member Elect, Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 453 (i).
——— Returning Officer, Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1152 (i).
——— Return of Member Elect : Telegrams Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1066 (i).
Yukon Territorial District, Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2322 (ii).
Howard's Cove, P.E.I., Surveys *re* Wharf : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4703 (iii).
Hudson's Bay and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 109 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 104.)
Hudson's Bay Servants, Claims *re* Lord Selkirk's Estate, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lamont) 9698 (v).
Hudson's Bay, Sovereignty over : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. on B. 69, 5608-9 ; Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5609 (iii).
See 'Autonomy,' &c.
Hull Wharf, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2064 (ii).
Huot, Mr. J., Payments to *re* L'Ange Gardien Beach : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1343 (i).
Hurley, J. M., Fishery Inspector, Rep., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 2895 (ii).
Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Co.'s B. No. 84 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 1788 ; 2°*, 1891 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 105.)
Hydrographic Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 2679 (ii), 6623 (iv), 9172 (v).
Ice-Boats, Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9177 (v).
Ice-Breakers, Govt. Steamers, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9034 (v).
——— 'Montcalm,' Accident to, Information : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4752 (iii).
——— statement (Mr. Préfontaine) 4752 (iii).
——— *re* St. Lawrence Channel : in Com. of Sup., 6464 (iv), 9617 (v).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Ice Jam in St. Lawrence River, Govtl. Action *re* : Remarks (Mr. Broder) 699 (i).
Ice Jam on Thames River : Remarks (Mr. Clements) on M. for Sup., 1013 (i).
Ideal Manufacturing Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 166 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 6232 ; 2°*, 6868 ; in Com., and 3°* 7625 ; M. *re* Amts., 8383 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 106.)
Immigration, Fraudulent Representation B. No. 120 (Mr. Logan) 1° m., 2323 (ii) ; 2°*, 9699 ; in Com., 9699 ; 3°*, 9700 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 16.)
IMMIGRATION :
Agents, in Canada and G. B., &c., Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 9308 (v).
——— Memo. from Toronto Trade and Labour Council : Read (Mr. Osler) 9309 (v).
Agents, G. B., &c., Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6384, 7685 (iv), 9226 (v).
——— on Conc.: M. (Mr. Foster) to reduce Mr. Nixon's Salary, 9770 ; Neg. (Y. 30, N. 66) 9770 (v).
Associated British Canadian Society, Charges against Graeme Hunter : Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2188 (ii).
Association in Prince Edward County : Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) in Com. of Sup., 7706 (iv).
Austrians stranded in Ottawa, Provision for, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 4845 (iii).
Bonus to Transportation and Booking Agents : Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 7811 (iv).
See 'North Atlantic.'
Children from English Workhouses, Proposal of Mr. Neill : Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 6188 (iv).
——— Govt. Assistance: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1341 (i).
——— Par. in 'Citizen' *re* Mrs. Close's Scheme (remarks) 1933 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) on M. for Sup., 2125 (ii).
——— Cor. with Mr. C. Kinloch Cooke : Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 5478 (iii).
——— Reply to Ques.: Read (Mr. Oliver) 5576 (iii).
Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 7709 (iv).
Detention Hospital, B.C., Proclamation *re* : Read (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 9331 (v).
——— Authority, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9927 (v).
False Representations to, &c. : Remarks *re* Bills (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8177 (v).
Farmer, Bonus paid by Govt., &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7811 (iv).
Graeme Hunter, Charges *re* Immigration Society : Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2188 (ii).
Haggard, H. Rider, Rep. to Imp. Govt., &c. : Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 9523 (v).
See 'Salvation,' &c.

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Immigrants deported in 1904-1905, Nationalities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1592, 1847 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv).
——— Examination *re* Qualifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 2187 (ii).
Immigration Property, Montreal, Leases by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 913 (i).
——— Interpreters, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7701 (iv).
——— Literature, Distribution of Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7710 (iv).
——— Medical Inspection, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9226 (v).
——— Office, G. B., Number of Employees, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 592 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Ten Year Contract *re* Immigrants, &c.: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 7906 (iv), 8387 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7705 (iv).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. U. Wilson) 8145 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8182 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9318 (v).
——— Notice of M. (Mr. Osler) 9329 (v).
——— Prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) on M. for Sup., 9437; Neg. (Y. 40, N. 76) 9480 (v).
——— Protests *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 8887 (v).
See 'SS. Subsidies,' &c.
Number of Immigrants arriving in 1904, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 1148 (i).
Peterborough Immigrant Homes, Inspection *re*: Remarks (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. of Sup., 7694 (iv).
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Immigration Agent, Salary, &c., Reps., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 452 (i).
Salvation Army and Immigration, Cor., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7684 (iv).
Salvation Army Colonies, Rider Haggard's Rep.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 6188 (iv).
See 'Haggard.'
Skilled Labour, Allegations from Toronto Labour Council: Notice of Motion (Mr. Foster) 7424 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 7504 (iv).
——— SS. Steamship Bonuses to by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9318 (v).
——— Subsidies to SS. Companies, Contract *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7699, 7705 (iv).
See 'North Atlantic.'
Imperial Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. No. 98 (Mr. Belcourt) 1°*, 2043; 2°*, 2297; in Com., 2770; 3°*, 2772 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 107.)
Imperial Institute, Can. Exhibit: in Com. of Sup., 1838 (i).
Imports and Exports, Agricultural Products, Duties paid, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Clements) 3203 (ii).
Imports and Exports for Home Consumption, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 380 (i).
Imports from United Kingdom, Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 267 (i).
Imports under Preferential Tariff, Amounts paid, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 152 (i).
Indemnity of Members, &c.: *See* 'Senate and House of Commons,' &c.
Indian Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7403 (iv).
——— Pet. *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8178 (v).
INDIANS:
Agents acting as Magistrates: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 6545 (iv).
Blankets, Clothing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 225 (i).
B. C. Indians, Miscellaneous Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 9339 (v).
——— Industrial Schools: in Com. of Sup., 6556 (iv), 9339 (v).
——— Travelling Expenses *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6557 (iv).
Bryce, Dr., Payments to: in Com. of Sup., 6558 (iv).
Caughnawaga Indians, Medical Attendance: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Bergeron) 225 (i).
Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 111 (i).
Deptl. Salaries, Indian Affairs: in Com. of Sup., 116 (i).
Doncaster Reserve, Abolition of: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 7812 (iv).
Dukis Reserve, Sale of Timber: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3202 (ii).
Georgian Bay Indian Surveys: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 236 (i).
Grants to Agricultural Societies: in Com. of Sup., 237 (i).
Half-Breed Scrip, Applications by Norman, Oulette, and Others, Purchase of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 9078 (v).
Half-Breed Scrip, Further Papers laid on Table: (Mr. Oliver) 9197 (v).
See 'Interior,' &c.
Inspectors, Man. and N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6548 (iv).
Jamieson, Dr., Payment to by Govt. *re* Indian Attendance: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 6552 (iv).

INDIANS—*Con.*
Lands Management Fund : in Com. of Sup., 236 (i).
Legal Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 237 (i).
Legal Expenses *re* Test Case at Oka : in Com. of Sup., 9335 (v).
Live Stock, purchased for Indians, Man. and N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
——— Statement : Read (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 6543 (iv).
McDonald, Mr. J. L., Dismissal as Indian School Teacher, N.S. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 6514 (iv).
Indians, Man. and N.W.T., Annuities : in Com. of Sup., 6538 (iv).
——— Implements : in Com. of Sup., 9336 (v).
——— Provisions, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9338 (v).
Medical Inspection, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 6555 (iv).
——— N.B. : in Com. of Sup., 6516 (iv).
——— Ont., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 223 (i).
——— P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 6537 (iv).
Medical Inspection, Payments *re* : Remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6553 (iv).
Moose Mountain Indian Agency, Letter from Rev. E. Mackenzie : Read (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 9337 (v).
N.B., Indians, Supt.'s Salary : in Com. of Sup., 9336 (v).
Indians, N.S., General Vote : in Com. of Sup., 6514 (iv).
Oka Indians, Settlement of Claims, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 235 (i).
Ont. and Quebec, Indians, Medical Attendance : in Com. of Sup., 223 (i).
Pemberton Band of Indians, B.C., Purchase of Land : in Com. of Sup., 9339 (v).
Printing for Indians, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6558 (iv).
Promotions, Indian Dept., &c.: Conc., 6909 (iv).
——— Promotion of Mr. Bray : Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6920 (iv).
Purchase of Provisions : in Com. of Sup., 6550 (iv).
Reserves, Sale of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 6552 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes), on M. for Sup., 6563 (iv).
Salaries, Indians, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6516 (iv).
Seed Grain, Indians, Man. and N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
——— N.B. : in Com. of Sup., 6516 (iv).
Schools, Indian : in Com. of Sup., 225 (i).
——— Establishment of : Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) in Com. of Sup., 230 (i).
——— Mar. Provs. : in Com. of Sup., 225 (i).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 230 (i).
INDIANS—*Con.*
Stoney Indians, Depleting Game, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 6548 (iv).
Surveys, Man. and N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6552 (iv).
———Que. and Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 236 (i).
Timber on Indian Lands, Procedure *re* Sale of : Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 9280 (v).
Treaty No. 9, Payments *re* Indians : in Com. of Sup., 9336 (v).
Unforeseen Expenses, Indians : in Com. of Sup., 6517 (iv).
Yoho Park Reserve, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 7719 (iv).
Industrial Schools, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 9339 (v).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. No. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) 1° m., 7421 (iv) ; 2°, 8676 ; in Com., 8676; 3°*, 8685 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 17.)
INLAND REVENUE :
Adulteration of Food, Centralization of Samples : Remarks (Mr. Black) in Com. of Sup., 1717 (i).
——— Violations of Act, Prosecutions, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1699, 1710 (i).
Cement Testing Laboratory, Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7613 (iv).
Culling Timber, Inspectors, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7236 (iv).
Deptl. Rep. : Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 51 (i), 4085 (iii).
Deptl. Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 89 (i), 9069 (v).
Electric Light Inspectors : in Com. of Sup., 1696 (i).
Excise, Additional Remuneration for extra work : in Com. of Sup., 1688 (i).
——— Allowance to Customs Collectors : in Com. of Sup., 1689 (i).
——— Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 6724 (iv).
——— Inspectors' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 1679 (i).
——— Inspectors' Travelling Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 1689 (i).
——— Officers, B.C., Provisional Allowance : in Com. of Sup., 1690 (i).
Fertilizers, Inspection of : Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 1726 (i).
Fréchette, L. A., Translation *re* Excise Branch : in Com. of Sup., 1690 (i).
Gas and Electric Light Inspection at Three Rivers, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1760 (i).
Gas and Electric Light Inspection, Rep. *re* : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1692 (i).
Inspectors of Weights and Measures, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1692 (i).

INLAND REVENUE—*Con.*

Jams, Preserves, Adulteration of, Prosecutions *re* : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 1710 (i).

Maple Products, Adulteration of, Prevention by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. Béland) 1340 (i).

Methylated Spirits, Purchased by Exercise Dept. : in Com. of Sup., 1691 (i).

Metric System, Adoption of : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1694 (i).

Preventive Service *re* Excise : in Com. of Sup., 1688 (i).

Spirits in Bond, Age Limit, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. on B. 176, 8679 (v).

Tobacco Industry, Inspection *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1681 (i).

Weights and Measures Inspectors : in Com. of Sup., 1692 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 1695 (i).

Weights and Measures Standards : in Com. of Sup., 1695 (i).

Inspection of Staples, Grain, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6901, 7224 (iv).

Inspector General of Militia : in Com. of Sup., 437 (i).

Inspectors of Customs, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 405 (i).

See 'Customs,' &c.

Inspector of Insurance and Director General of Public Health B. No. 200 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 9688 ; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 9690 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 46.)

Inspectors of Weights and Measures, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1692 (i).

See 'Inland Revenue,' &c.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY :

Additional Sidings, Spur Lines, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1970 (i), 6431 (iv).

Advertising Car, Expenditure *re* : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 2257 (ii).

Advertising in Newspapers, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2236 (ii).

Agents, Dwelling Houses, Policy of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).

Amherst Station Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 1983 (i).

Annual Statement, on M. for Sup. (Mr. Emmerson) 1888, 1891 (i).

Antigonish Station Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 1967 (i).

Arbitration, I.C.R. and G. T. R., Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 68, 165 (i).

Arbitration, I.C.R. and G.T.R., *re* Traffic Arrangements, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1929 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Book-keeping Methods, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1928 (i).

Bridge Strengthening : in Com. of Sup., 1912 (i), 9384 (v).

Campbellton Station Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1968 (i).

Cape Road Crossing, Elimination of : in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).

Capital Account, Total Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Chisholm) 2064 (ii).

Chapman, F. B., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1342 (i).

Coal carried to Ottawa Free : Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 2065, 2192 (ii).

Coal purchased, 1904, Quantity : Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 910 (i).

Coal for Govt. Railways, Quantity accepted from N.S. Mines : Ques. (Mr. Barker) 2191 (ii).

Double Tracking : in Com. of Sup., 1933 (i), 2027 (ii), 9390 (v).

Drummond County Ry., Expenditure on Capital Account, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 2334 (ii).

Drummondville Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1960 (i).

Earnings per Train Mile, Stmnt.: Read in Com. of Sup., 9503 (v).

Employees, Messrs. Weldon, McDougall, Political Partisans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 1146 (i).

Employees, Pensions, Legislation *re* : Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) 9029, 9288 (v).

See 'Pensions.'

Engine Houses, Riviere du Loup : in Com. of Sup., 9389 (v).

Expenditure *re* Capital, &c: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1940 (i).

Facilities, Increased : in Com. of Sup., 9482 (v).

Financial Statement : (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. of Sup., 1888, 1891 (i), 7448 ; Reply (Mr. Haggart) 7447, 7457 (iv).

Fredericton Station Agent, Dismissal of Mr. O. White : M. for Cor. (Mr. Crocket) 192 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 698 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 107 (i).

See 'White.'

Freight Diversion and Traffic Arrangements : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2219 (ii).

——— Letter from C. W. Stewart : Read (Mr. Daniel) 2227 (ii).

Freight Rates, Increase in, &c.: Statement (Mr. Emmerson) in Reply to (Mr. Taylor) 6112 (iv) ; Cor. read, 6115 (iv).

——— Ref. to Gananoque and Fredericton : Reply (Mr. Taylor) to Min. of Rys., 6585 (iv).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Fuel Inspector, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 451 (i).
Galena Oil Co., Oil purchased : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 2254 (ii).
See 'Oil.'
Government Railways, Disposal of Old Rails, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2066 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4751 (iii).
Grades and Curves : in Com. of Sup., 1987 (i).
Halifax, Deep Water Terminals, Dredging *re* I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2026 (ii).
Halifax, Terminals : in Com. of Sup., 2032 (ii).
Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 9391 (v).
Hay transported free over I.C.R., Cor. between Govt., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Foster) 164 (i).
——— O.C., Circulars, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 280 (i).
——— Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 919 (i), 2005, 2595, 3450 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 59 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 108 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 1929 (i).
Increased Expenditure : Remarks (Mr. White) in Com. of Sup., 2215 (ii).
Indiantown and Blackville Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 9482 (v).
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Claims for Damages, Amounts paid, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Kemp) 383 (i).
Locomotives, Purchase of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1964 (i).
Levis Property for I.C.R. Purposes, Charges *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) on M. for Sup., 6668 (iv).
Locomotive Machinery for Shops : in Com. of Sup., 6428 (iv).
'Maritime Express,' Running Time : Remarks (Mr. Lavergne) 6831 (iv).
M. C. B. Coupler for Rolling Stock, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 2178 (ii).
Memramcook Ry. Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 1977 (i).
Mitchell Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 1940 (i).
Mitchell, Diversion of Line : in Com. of Sup. 1940 (i).
Moncton, Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 1967 (i)., 9391 (v).
——— Shops, Capacity of : Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 1965 (i).
Newcastle Station Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1967 (i).
Oil and Supplies, Purchases *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2246 (ii).
See 'Galena.'
Original Construction : in Com. of Sup., 1912 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Parlour, and Dining Cars, Profits, &c., *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2254 (ii).
Passenger Stations and Freight Sheds : in Com. of Sup., 1977 (i).
Passes over I.C.R. for Legislators of Quebec Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. of Sup., 1922, 1925 ; Reply (Mr. Emmerson) 1925 (i).
Passes issued, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 2257 (ii).
Pension Scheme for Old Age : Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 2492 (ii).
See 'Employees.'
Pictou Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 9390 (v).
P.E.I. Railway : in Com. of Sup., 2025, 2127 (ii), 8692 (v).
———Agents' Houses ; in Com. of Sup., 2180 (ii).
——— Bloomfield Agent's House : in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).
——— Branch Lines, Survey and Construction, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies*, 916 (i).
——— Cardigan to Montague Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 2171 (ii), 9482 (v).
——— Charlottetown, P.E.I. Ry., Station, Cor. and Reps. *re* Construction : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 194 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. Martin) 4810 (iii).
——— Charlottetown Railway Station, Site &c.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 60 (i).
——— Charlottetown Station Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 2025 (ii), 6433 (iv).
——— Freetown Agent, Dwelling House : in Com. of Sup., 2180 (ii).
——— Georgetown Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 2179 (ii), 9486 (v).
——— Grand View Station, Murray Harbour Branch, Location, &c., Cor.: M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies*, 1770 (i).
——— Kitchen, Mr., Contractor for Hillsborough Bridge, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 2138 (ii).
——— Kensington Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 2178 (ii).
——— Land Expropriations, Papers laid on Table (Mr. Emmerson) 8528 (v).
——— M. C. B. Coupler : in Com. of Sup., 2178 (ii).
——— Morrell River Bridge Swing Span : in Com. of Sup., 2177 (ii).
——— Morrell River Ry. Bridge, Complaints *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5035 (iii).
——— Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 2038, 2127 (ii), 7494 (iv), 8692, 9482, 9488 (v).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
P.E.I. Ry., Murray Harbour Branch, Amount due Contractors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2064 (ii).
——— Murray Harbour Branch, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 189 (i).
——— delegation *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. Mc- 265 (i).
——— and Murray Harbour Branch Expenditure to Jan. 1st, 1905: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 106 (i).
——— Standard Gauge, Cost of Construction: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2181 (ii).
——— Stanley Bridge, &c., Surveys *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 266 (i).
——— Stanley Bridge, Total Cost, Claim for Damages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 587 (i).
——— Summerside Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2176 (ii).
——— Train Service: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 697 (i).
——— Vernon River Bridge Branch Line: in Com. of Sup., 2177 (ii).
——— Water Service Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2170 (ii).
——— West Cape Branch Surveys: Ques (Mr. Lefurgey) 589 (i).
——— Westinghouse Brakes: in Com. of Sup., 2178 (ii).
——— Working Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 6901, 6908 (iv).
Private Cars, Number, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2258 (ii).
Receipts and Expenditures, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 688 (i).
Revenue Collections: in Com. of Sup., 2204 (ii).
Rivière Ouelle Spur Line, Extension, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Barker) in Com. of Sup., 1981 (i).
Rolling Stock: in Com. of Sup., 1986 (i), 2037 (ii), 6428 (iv).
——— Number added 1900-4: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 736 (i).
——— Stmnt. of Estimated Cost: Read in Com. of Sup., 9501 (v).
Running Rights over C. A. Ry.: *See* 'Govt. Rys. B. 132.'
Running Time, Connections at Montreal: Remarks (Mr. Morin) 6831 (iv).
St. Cyrille, Diversion of Ry. Line: in Com. of Sup., 1969 (i).
St. Fabien Subway: in Com. of Sup., 1980 (i).
Ste. Flavie Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 9390 (v).
St. John Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 9389 (v).
St. Lambert and Beloeil Double Tracking: in Com. of Sup., 2183 (ii).
St. Moise Station Improvements: in Com. of Sup.. 1976 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Sackville Railway Station, Tenders *re* Erection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 5133 (iii).
Semaphores: in Com. of Sup., 1986 (i).
Snow Blockades, Delay in Service, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2028 (ii).
Station Accommodation along Line: in Com. of Sup., 6429 (iv).
Steel Rails and Fastenings: in Com. of Sup., 1988 (i), 2038 (ii).
See 'Govt. Rys.', &c.
Superannuation Scheme: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 2241 (ii).
Sydney, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 1912 (i).
——— Collections for Freight, &c.: M. Mr. A. Martin) for Ret., 1767 (i).
Sydney Mines, Extension of Line: in Com. of Sup., 1987 (i).
Ties, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6429 (iv).
Time Table, Changes and Delays: on M. for Sup., 6827-9 (iv).
Time Tables, Printing in English and French: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 6827 (iv).
Traffic and Freight Arrangements, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2228 (ii).
Traffic Arrangements with Foreign and Can. Rys., Amounts received: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4703 (iii).
Traffic Arrangements with other Rys.: Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 1915 (i).
Train Service, Stalled by Snowstorms, Tel.: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 695 (i).
——— Explanation (Mr. Emmerson) 726 (i).
Transportation Facilities *re* Fish Trade with Mar. Provs.: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) 1930 (i).
Truro, Dining Room: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 2255 (ii).
——— Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 9391 (v).
White, Odbur, Dismissal as Station Agent: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 107 (i).
——— M. for Cor. *re* (Mr. Crocket) 193 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 2295; Cor. (read) 2206 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 2235 (ii).
Woodill, Seymour, Emplymt.: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 2191 (ii).
Working Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 6907 (iv), 9384 (v).
Inter-Imperial Parliament between G. B. and Her Colonies: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2334 (ii).
INTERIOR:
Acreage in Provisional District Alberta, Sas., &c., Disposal of, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 601 (i).
Acres of undisposed Lands, N. W. Ters.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 601 (i).

INTERIOR—*Con.*
Alaska Boundaries, Demarcation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7719 (iv).
Alberta, Provisional District, Acreage disposed of: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 601 (i).
Assay Apparatus for Geological Survey: in Com. of Sup., 8671 (v).
Badgley Island Timber Cutting, Licenses granted: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 452 (i).
Banff Hot Spring Roads and Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iv).
Banff Pamphlets, Printing and Distribution: in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Cabinet Vacancy, Interior Dept., Information *re* (Mr. Foster) 3450 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4085 (iii).
See 'Interior,' &c.
Colonization Roads, Man. and N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7594 (iv).
Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 453 (i).
Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 114 (i), 6264 (iv), 9070 (v).
Dep. Minister of, Resignation, Appnmt, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4370 (iii).
Dom. Lands, Homestead Inspectors' Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6407 (iv).
——— Inspectors' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iv).
——— Maps, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6406, 6424 (iv).
——— N.W.T., Open to Applicants for Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1935 (i).
——— N.W.T. Sales, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2006 (ii).
——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9251, 9289 (v).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 8671 (v).
Doukhobors Homestead Entries *re* Village Lots: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6414 (iv).
Edmonton, Dom. Lands Office: in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).
Entennier, Mr. Henry, Entries for Homestead Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 190 (i).
Forest Protection in Man.: in Com. of Sup., 9298 (v).
Geological Survey, Appnmts. and Absences, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 382 (i).
——— Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 6248 (iv).
——— Director, Appnmt., &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9303 (v).
——— Explorations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8669; on conc., 9685 (v).
——— Maps, Printing and Distribution, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8670 (v).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 122 (i).
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale, Jurisdiction, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. Wright) 6477 (iv).

INTERIOR—*Con.*
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale to Mr. F. W. Grant: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 6479 (iv).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. Grant) 6736 (iv).
Govt. Lands, N.W.T., Sale of in 1903-4, Rates, &c.: M. for O. C.* (Mr. Foster) 164 (i).
Grazing Leases, N.W.T., Number issued, Names of Lessees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5478 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 8529 (v).
Half-Breed Patents, Claims, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on M. for Sup., 6907 (iv).
Half-Breed Scrip, Charges *re* Mr. Chaffee's Claims: Personal Explanation (Mr. Foster) 7916 (iv).
Half-Breed Scrip, Charges *re* Mr. McDonald, Cor, &c.: Read (Mr. Foster) 7647 (iv).
——— Charges, &c.: Personal Explanation (Mr. Bole) 7812 (iv).
Half-Breed Scrip, issued to United States Citizens: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6311 (iv).
——— Memo. from Mr. Cote: Read (Mr. Oliver) 6403 (iv).
——— to non-residents, Cancellation of O. C.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6489, 6560 (iv).
——— O. C.'s, Forms, &c.: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 7099 (iv).
——— Instructions to Judge Myers *re* Investigation: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7723 (iv), 8170 (v).
——— Mr. Chaffey's letter: Read (Mr. Foster) 8183 (v).
Half-Breed Scrip, O. C. *re* Judge Myers: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8003 (v).
——— Patents issued, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8003 (v).
Half-Breed Scrip Investigation, Appnmt. of Counsel: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8528, 8697 (v).
——— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8777 (v).
——— Progress, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster 9725 (v).
——— Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8777 (v).
Half-Breed Scrip, Further Papers laid on Table (Mr. Oliver) 9075 (v).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 7422 (iv), 9029 (v).
——— Issue of Patent, Inquiry for: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7020 (iv).
——— Unsettled Claims in N. W. Ter., Complaints from Old Settlers: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 9813 (v).
Homesteads for Residents, N.W.T., Second Applications, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 2067 (ii).
Immigration Property, Montreal, Leases by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 913 (i).

INTERIOR—*Cno.*

Interior Dept. Appnmt. of Minister : Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4200 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1152 (i).

See 'Cabinet.'

——— Dep. Minister, Resignation, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4370 (iii).

——— Vacancy in Cabinet : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3362 (ii).

Leach, Mr. R. E. A., Emplymt. by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1151 (i).

Litigation Expenses, Interior Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 7720 (iv).

Logberg Printing Co., Winnipeg, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4373, 4457 (iii).

——— Remarks *re* Question (Mr. Taylor) 4374 (iii).

Maps for Dom. and N.W.T. Engraving, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7721 (iv), 9307 (v).

National Boundary Fence : in Com. of Sup., 8672 (v).

See 'Wire Fence,' &c.

Nicolas, Mr., Emplymt. by Geological Survey Dept.: on Conc., 9685 (v).

Nixon, Jos., Appnmt. as Lands Agent at Macleod, N.W.T.: Explanation (Mr. Oliver) 6110 (iv).

——— Charges *re* Irregularities : M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8098 (v).

——— Delays in Answers to Questions : Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 9075 (v).

——— Investigation : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8697 (v).

——— Second Investigation, Letter *re* Payment of Money : Read (Mr. Foster) 9787 (v).

N.W.T. Boundary, Erection of Wire Fencing, Contract *re* : Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5478 (iii).

N.W. Ters., Land Sales : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 1154 (i).

N.W. Land Titles Office, Registrars' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 9249 (v).

Patterson, T. W., Sale of Dom. Lands, B.C., Price paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4371 (iii).

Preston, Mr., Immigration Office G.B., Number of Employees, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 592 (i).

Preston, W. T. R., Visit to Canada : Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 451 (i).

Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Change in Boundaries, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9298 (v).

St. Lawrence Islands, Govt. Control *re* Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Walsh) 6477 (iv).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Issue of Patents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8267, 8655 (v).

School Lands sold by Auction, in N.W.T., Number of Acres : Ques. (Mr. Lake) 730 (i).

Schukin, Ivan, Homestead Patent cancelled : Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 6408

INTERIOR—*Cno.*

Seed Grain, Advance to Settlers, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 9307 (v).

Settlers Effects, Duty *re* : in Com. on Ways and Means, 8996 (v).

Seymour, Mr. D. G., Complaint *re* Homestead Location : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9033, 9294 (v).

Smart, Jas. A., Dep. Min. of Interior, Resignation, &c: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4370 (iii).

Surveys, Dom. Lands : in Com. of Sup., 9306 (v).

Timber Limits, Sale in N.W.T. and Man., Advertisements *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7097 (iv).

Tree Culture and Forest Protection, Man., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9297 (v).

Wood, Major Z. T., Additional Living Allowance *re* Yukon : in Com. of Sup., 9250 (v).

Young, Thos. and G. C. McNab, Dom. Officials and Political Organizers : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9254 (v).

Internal Economy Commission : Mess. from His Ex.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 8 (i).

——— Res. *re* purchasing Furniture : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 6612 ; Res. read (Mr. Speaker) 6614 (iv).

——— Reps. presented to the House : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9076 (v).

International Boundary Fence : *See* 'N.W.T. Boundary Line,' 'Wire Fencing,' &c.

International Congress of Americanistes, Cebration at Quebec, Grant to : in Com. of Sup., 9622 (v).

International Postal Supply Co., Rent of Stamping Machines : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).

International Terminal and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 87 (Mr. T. G. Johnston) 1°*, 1933 (i) ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 3135 ; 3° m., 3135 (ii) ; Sen. Amts., 9695 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 108.)

International Water Ways Commission, Appnmt. of : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 701 (i).

See 'Deep Waterways,' &c.

Interprovincial and James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 150 (Mr. Devlin) 1°*, 5783 (iii) ; 2°*, 6868 ; in Com., and 3°*, 7060 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 109.)

Inverness Mines, Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).

Inverness, N.S., Postmaster, Personal Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 8885 (v).

Inverness, Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1040 (i).

Irish Cove Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).

Iron and Steel Bounties, Payments *re* : in Com. of Sup., 7216 (iv).

Isle Bizard Wharf Butments, Expenditure *re* : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 2067 (ii).

Jacques Cartier Surveys, Costs, Reports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 593 (i).
James Bay Lobsters, Investigation *re* by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6475 (iv).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 65 (Mr. Watson) 1°*, 1336 ; 2°*, 1541 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 110.)
James Bay Ry., Deviation of Line, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Grant) 9697 (v).
——— Maps or Plans *re* Location, Filing of : Ques. (Mr. Grant) 2190 (ii).
'James W.', Schooner, Rescue of Crew by SS. 'Durango': Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4198 (iii).
Jamieson, Dr., Payment to by Govt. *re* Indian Attendance : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 6552 (iv).
Jams, Reserves, Adulteration of, Prosecutions *re* : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 1710 (i).
Janvrin's Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7406 (iv).
Japan Exhibition, Trade Increase : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6273 (iv).
——— Discrimination *re* Canadian Goods, Quotations *re* in 'Industrial Canada': Read (Mr. Barker) 6654 (iv).
——— Relations with Canada, Treaty, &c.: Statement (Mr. Fisher) 7908 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8385 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7816 (iv).
Jean Effront, Patent Relief B. No. 33 (Mr. Demers, Iberville) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1755 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 89.)
'J. I. Tarte' Dredge, Defective Boilers, Accident, &c. Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2466 (ii).
Johnston, Mr. T. G., late M.P., Decease of : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8694 (v).
Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Ry. Co.'s B. No. 191 (Mr. O. E. Talbot) 1°*, 9072; 2°*, 9179 ; M. to place on Orders for Com., 9278 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9340 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 111.)
Joliette County Ry. Surveys, Total Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1346 (i).
Judge Advocate General, Appnmt. of : Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act (salaries) Amt. B. No. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) Res. prop., 9702 ; in Com. on Res., 9740, 9797 ; 1°* of B., 2°*, 9792 ; in Com., 9792, 9798 ; 3°*, 9798 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 31.)
Judicial Vacancies, Length of Vacancies, Appnmts., &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7423 (iv).
——— Promotions and Appnmt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8002 (v).
——— Statement (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 8002 (v).
JUSTICE :
Admiralty Court Registrars, Fees, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 125 (i).
JUSTICE—*Con.*
Atlin, B.C., Living Allowance to Judge : in Com. of Sup., 9683 (v).
B. C. Judgeship, Appnmt. of W. W. B. McInnes : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 382 (i).
Castonguay, Dismissal and Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 5688 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. O. E. Talbot) 6653 (iv).
Consolidation of Statutes : in Com. of Sup., 7244 (iv).
Court Room, Prince Albert : in Com. of Sup., 124 (i).
Dodd, Judge, Salary: in Com. of Sup., 124 (i).
Dominion Police Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 138 (i).
Dorchester Penitentiary : in Com. of Sup., 480 (i).
Edmonton Jail : in Com. of Sup., 481, 1638 (i).
——— Extension of Building : in Com. of Sup., 9684 (v).
Exchequer Court, Admiralty Jurisdiction, Number of Actions, &c. M. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) for Ret.*, 1770 (i).
——— Judgeship in Ont., Appnmt. *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5209 (iii).
——— Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 125 (i).
Extradition Cases by U.S., before Commissioners at Montreal : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3937 (ii).
Gaynor-Greene Extradition, Charges against Mr. Lafontaine, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3937 (ii).
Hamelin and Gosselin, Imprisonment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1849 (i).
High Court Judgeship, Exchequer Court Division, Vacancy *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5209 (iii).
Judges, Man. and N.W.T., Travelling Allowances : in Com. of Sup., 122 (i).
Judges Salaries in Yukon : Remarks (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).
Judicial Vacancies, Length of Vacancies, Appnmts., &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7423 (iv).
——— Promotions and Appnmt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8002 (v).
——— Statement (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 8002 (v).
Justice, Administration of, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 101 (i), 6721 (iv).
——— Prisoners' Maintenance : in Com. of Sup., 122 (i).
Justice, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup.,72 (i).
——— Penitentiaries : in Com. of Sup., 465 (i).
Keewatin Ter., Maintenance of Lunatics : in Com. of Sup., 7720 (iv).
Kingston Penitentiary : in Com. of Sup., 477 (i).
Manitoba, Stony Mountain Penitentiary : in Com. of Sup., 481 (i).
New Westminister, B.C., Penitentiary, Payment to W. A. Duncan : in Com. of Sup., 9684 (v).

JUSTICE—*Con.*
N. W. T. Supreme Court Judges, Additional : in Com. of Sup., 9683 (i).
Parole Officer, W. T. Archibald, Salary : in Com. of Sup., 6721 (iv).
Parole System for Convicts : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 465 (i).
Penitentiaries, General Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 465 (i).
——— Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 271 (i).
Prince Albert Court Room : in Com. of Sup., 124 (i).
Prince Albert Jail : in Com. of Sup., 481 (i).
Regina Jail : in Com. of Sup., 481 (i).
St. Regis Lockup : in Com. of Sup., 237 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary : in Com. of Sup., 480 (i).
Secret Service, Expenditure *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6958 (iv).
Sheriffs of Yukon, Allowances : in Com. of Sup., 132 (i).
Statutes Revision Commission : in Com. of Sup., 8672 (v).
——— Completion of : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 745 (i).
——— Indexing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 8673 (v).
Stony Mountain Penitentiary, School Fees : in Com. of Sup., 9684 (v).
Sunday Observance Legislation, Payment for Legal Services : in Com. of Sup., 6722 (iv).
Supreme Court Bench, N.S., Vacancy, Appnmt., &c., Delay : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5036, 5209 (iii), 6837 (iv).
Supreme Court Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 125 (i).
Three Rivers, Additional Judge : in Com. of Sup., 9682 (v).
Yukon, Court Fees : in Com. of Sup., 137 (i).
——— Judges Allowances : in Com. of Sup., 126 (i).
——— Law Books : in Com. of Sup., 136 (i).
——— Prisoners, Maintenance of : in Com. of Sup., 135 (i).
——— Witnesses Fees, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 135 (i).
Kamloops, Lower Nicola Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 7610 (iv).
Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Ry. Co.'s B. No. 141 (Mr. Galliher) M. to receive Pet., 3744 (ii) ; 4375 ; 1°*, 4550 ; 2°*, 4977 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 113.)
Kaslo, Dismissal of Mr. S. H. Green as Postmaster : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 2331 (ii).
Keewatin Act Amt B. No. 158 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 6103-4 (iv) ; Order dschd., 8176 (v).
Keewatin Ter., Maintenance of Lunatics : in Com. of Sup., 7720 (iv).
Kelly's Cove Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9582 (v).
Kensington Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 2178 (ii).
Kent, Miss A., Dismissal as Postmistress at Kent, N.S. : Ques (Mr. Lancaster) 2331 (ii).
Kentvale Postmaster Sureties, Dismissal, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5977 (iv).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site, Charges *re* : Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) on M. for Sup., 6656 (iv).
——— Judgment of Exchequer Court, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6664, 7584 (iv).
——— Rep. of Evidence, Printing, &c. : Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 8698 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) on M. for conc., 9686 (v).
——— Statement read (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 9706 (v).
Killam, Judge : *See* 'Ry. Com. B. 36.'
Killarney and Little Current Mail Service, Tenders *re* Contract, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 3669 (ii).
Kincardine Harbour, Piers and Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7558 (iv).
'King Edward' and 'St. Lawrence' Strs., SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
King, Mackenzie : *See* 'Labour Gazette,' &c.
'Kingsford,' Dredge, Cost of Operating : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 801 (i).
Kingston and Dom. Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 97 (Mr. Harty) 1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2325 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5113 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 86.)
Kingston Lighthouse Depot, Establishment by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 914 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 915 (i).
Kingston Military Stables : in Com. of Sup., 1561 (i).
Kingston. N.B. and Jubilee Station Mail Contract, Tenders *re*, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 5133 (iii).
Kingston, Penitentiary : in Com. of Sup., 477 (i).
——— Military Barracks : in Com. of Sup., 1560 (i).
Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 137 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 4550 ; 2°*, 4978 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°* 6383 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 114.)
Kitchen, Mr., Contractor for Hillsborough Bridge, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 2138 (ii).
Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 24 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*. 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 115.)
Labels, Union : *See* 'Union Labels.'
Labourers employed by Govt., Political Partisanship : Remarks (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup., 6858 (iv).
Labour Dept. Gazette : in Com. of Sup., 7511 (iv).

'Labour Gazette,' and Partisan Officials : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7511 (v).
Labour Deptl. Rep. : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 54 (i).
——— Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 100 (i).
Labour Unions : *See* 'Aliens,' 'Union Labels.'
Lachine Canal, Cote St. Paul, Water Power used for Manufacturers : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 1515 (i).
——— Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 6294 (iv).
——— Installation of Electrical Appliances : in Com. of Sup., 9354 (v).
——— Lock Gates, Suspension : in Com. of Sup., 6300 (iv).
——— Machinery for Shops : in Com. of Sup., 1240 (i).
——— Mill Street Paving : in Com. of Sup., 6301 (iv).
——— Power House Flumes : in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).
——— Rebuilding Wall Basin, Lock No. 2 : in Com. of Sup., 1421 (i).
——— Rebuilding Wharf below Dock : in Com. of Sup., 1421 (i).
——— Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6306 (iv).
——— St. Gabriel's Basin Walls : in Com. of Sup., 9378 (v).
——— Tail Race Widening : in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).
——— Wall Underpinning : in Com. of Sup., 6298 (iv).
——— Water Privilege, Lease to Wm. Parkyn, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5132 (iii).
Lachute Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1111
La Compagnie de Chemin de fer Electrique : *See* 'Three Rivers,' &c.
'Lady Laurier,' Govt. Str., Accident, Investigation *re* : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2597 (ii).
——— Number of Crew at Halifax : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 2616 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. No. 43 (Mr. Gervais) 1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2042 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 116.)
Lake Champlain Co. : *See* 'St. Lawrence.'
Lake Daulphin, Lowering : in Com. of Sup., 7569 (iv).
Lake Manitoba, Closing *re* Fishing, Protests, &c. : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2901 (ii), 6630 (iv).
Lake St. Francis Outlet Guide Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).
Lake St. John Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv).
Lake St. Peter Permanent Piers : in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv), 9171 (v).
Lake Superior and Sault Ste. Marie Co., Purchase of Steel Rails, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 1995 (i).
Lake Temiscaming Wharfs : in Com. of Sup., 7559 (iv).
Lakeville and North Lake Mail Service, Complaints *re* : Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 9612 (v).
Lake Winnipeg Fish Hatcheries : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2905 (ii).
Lambert's Pier, P.E.I., Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4373 (iii).
Land Titles Act Amt. B. No. 162 (Mr. Oliver) 1°*, 6104 (iv); 2°*, 9082 ; in Com., 9082 ; 3°*, 9085 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 18.)
Langly Wharf Protection Bank : in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
Laprairie Ice Piers : in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv), 9590 (v).
L'Ardoise Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 6838, 7407 (iv).
Larry's River Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Lavaltrie Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup. 7306 (iv).
Law Clerk, Railways and Canals, Appnmt. of : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup. 9066 (v).
Lawson, Mr. H., Dismissal of as Postmaster, Cor., &c. : M. for Copy* (Mr. A. Martin) 1398 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1062 (i).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Laws, Printing and Binding : in Com. of Sup., 6948 (iv).
Leach, Mr. R. E. A., Emplymt. by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1151 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1065 (i).
Lead Bounties, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 7222 (iv).
Leather Trunks for Members : in Com. of Sup., 6606 (iv).
Lebonk and Thunder Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 61 (Mr. Bole) 1°*, 1241 ; 2°*, 1338 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 117.)
Lefebvre, A. P., Dismissal from Markstay Post Office, Investigation, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Broder) 7096 (iv).
Legal, M'gr., Quotation *re* Separate Schools, N. W.T..: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6187 (iv).
Legislation by O.C., Payments of Moneys, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6700 (iv).
Legislation, House of Commons : in Com. of Sup., 238 (i), 6268, 6592 (iv).
See 'House of Commons.'
Lemieux, Jos., Appnmt. *re* Lightship Service, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1762 (i).
Lennoxville Post Office, Construction of : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4373 (iii).

Lepreaux Point Light, &c., Caretaker, Investigation *re* Dismissal : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6475 (iv).
Leslie, Capt., Wrecking Plant in St. Lawrence Channel : Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 2476 (ii).
Lesser Slave Lake Post Office, Establishment, Mail Service, &c. : Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7018 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) in Com. on B. 69, 8163 (v).
Letter Carriers, Bonuses, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 215 (i).
——— Contract *re* Boots, &c.: (Remarks) in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).
——— Payments on Sick Leave, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 173-6 (i).
——— Uniforms, Contracts *re* : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
Leverette, Geo. Milton, Postmaster, Kitley District, Partisan Conduct as Ret. Officer : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6240 (iv).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Levis Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 7175 (iv).
Levis Property for I.C.R. Purposes, Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) on M. for Sup., 6668 (iv).
Levis Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1112 (i).
Levis Vacancy, Issue of Writ : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 6474 (iv).
Lewis, Edward Norman, M.P., Relief B. 142 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1°*, 4550 ; 2°*, 5136 ; in Com., 5136 ; 3°*, 5137 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 19.)
Library, Accommodation in Archives Building Remarks (Mr. Hyman) in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).
——— Books and Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 6944 (iv).
——— Enlargement of, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6944 (iv).
——— Extension, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).
——— Joint Rep.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 8 (i).
Library and Printing Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add Name, 5685 (iii).
Liege Exhibition : in Com. of Sup., 1832 (i).
——— Cor. between Govt. of Quebec and Dom. *re* : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Lavergne) 9698 (v).
Lt. Governors, Alberta and Saskatchewan B. No. 193 (Mr. Fielding) Res. prop., 8693 ; in Com. on Res., 9033 ; 1°*, 2°*, 9033 ; in Com., 9033 ; 3°*, 9033 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 20.)
Lifeboat Crews, N.S., Number, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 912 (i).
Life Insurance Companies Funds, Total Amount, Par Value, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 3204 (ii).
Life-saving Crew, Grand Manan, N.B., Payments to : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 4921 (iii).
Life Saving Stations and Rewards : in Com. of Sup., 2624 (ii).
Lighting Ottawa Buildings : in Com of Sup., 6816 (iv).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Lighthouse Agencies, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2705 (ii).
Lighthouse in Bay of Quinté : Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) in Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service, Inspection : in Com. of Sup., 2697, 2859 (ii), 9035 (v).
——— Keepers' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 2698 (ii), 9175 (v).
——— Maintenance and Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6636 (iv).
——— Steamers, Ports of Call, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 1850 (i).
Lighthouse Construction as Aids to Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 9175 (v).
Lighthouse Depot at Kingston, Establishment of : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 914 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 915 (i).
——— Prescott, Tenders *re* Contract : Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1340 (i).
Lighthouse Engineers, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2760 (ii).
Lighthouse Keeper, at Bicquet, Name, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3202 (ii).
Lighthouse Revolving Lights, Maintenance : in Com. of Sup., 2704 (ii).
Lighthouse Service and Aids to Nav., Applications from Lighthouse Board : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lewis) 917 (i).
Lighthouse Supply Depots : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2709 (ii).
Lightships, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2706 (ii).
——— Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9035 (v).
See 'Marine.'
L'Ile d'Alma, Removal of Point of Rock : in Com. of Sup., 7307 (iv).
Lindsay Drill Hall, Erection of : Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 271 (i).
Litchfield Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Litigation Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 7247 (iv).
——— Interior Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 7720 (iv).
——— Railways and Canals : in Com. of Sup., 1522 (i).
Little Brook Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Little Current Channel, Georgian Bay : in Com. of Sup., 6886, 7559 (iv).
Little Judique Boat Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Little Pabos Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7307 (iv).

Live Stock, purchased for Indians, Man. and N. W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).

——— Statement ; Read (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 6543 (iv).

Live Stock Records Associations incorp. B. No. 148 (Mr. Fisher) 1° m., 5076 ; 2°* 5922 ; in Com., 5922 ; 3°* 5927 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 21.)

Live Stock Records Associations, Delay to Farmers, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5577 (iii).

——— Notice of resuming in Com. on B. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5808 (iii).

Live Stock Records, Associations : in Com. of Sup., 6680 (iv).

——— Nationalization, Establishment of, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1848 (i), 2185 (ii).

Loans by Govt., Temporary or Permanent, Total Amount, Rate of Interest, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 4921 (iii).

Lobster and Herring Industry, Rep. of Commissioners : Ques. (Mr. McLennan) 4371 (iii). *See* 'Fisheries.'

Lobster Canneries, Licenses, Applications, &c., N.B., District No. 1 : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 584 (i).

Lobster Fishing, Open Season in 1903-4-5 : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 1504 (i).

——— Res. of Board of Trade, Moncton : Read (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 2909 (ii).

Lobsters, Legal Length in Bay of Fundy, Changes *re* : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 583 (i).

——— Licenses, District No. 1, N.B., Number issued by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 910 (i).

Locked Boxes : *See* 'Post Office.'

Locomotive Machinery for I.C.R. Shops : in Com. of Sup., 6428 (iv).

Locomotives, I.C.R., Purchase of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1964 (i).

Logberg Printing Co., Winnipeg, Payments to : Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4373 (iii).

——— Remarks *re* Question (Mr. Taylor) 4374 (iii).

Lloydminster as Meridian Divisional Line : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8634 (v).

Lloydminster Immigrant Building, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6734 (iv).

London Barracks : in Com. of Sup., 1562 (i).

London By-Election, Resignation of Mr. W. F. Maclean : Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6384 (iv).

London Drill Hall, Electric Wiring : in Com. of Sup., 6732 (iv).

——— Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 8384 (v).

London Electoral District, Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 8001 (v).

London Military Stores, Magazine, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1562 (i).

London Militiamen at Niagara : Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* London Elections, 7249 (iv). *See* 'Militia.'

London Post Office Building : in Com. of Sup., 1563 (i).

London and Saint Clair Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 32 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 118.)

London Vacancy, Issue of Writ : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 6473 (iv).

——— Issue of Writ : Notification (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6311 (iv).

Longueuil Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1113 (i).

Lotbinière Wharf Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).

Louisburg, Old Fort, C.B., Preservation of : in Com. of Sup., 9170 (v).

Louise Embankment, Quebec Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 770 (i).

Lowe, Mr., Refusal to accept Boat 'Neptune' : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 6472 (iv).

——— Honorarium to: in Com. of Sup., 6473 (iv).

Lowville to Milton Mail Contract, Distance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 9080 (v).

Lumber purchased by Govt. for Grenville Canal, Price, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1514 (i), 2711 (ii).

Lumpjaw in Cattle, Prevention of : Remarks (Mr. Barr) on conc., 6917 (iv).

Lunenburg Dredging Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7408 (iv).

L'Union Saint Joseph du Canada incorp. B. No. 151 (Mr. Belcourt) M. to present Pet., 2490 ; M. to receive Pet., 2491 (ii) ; 1°*, 5783 (iii) ; 2°*, 5976 (iv) ; in Com., and 3°*, 8146 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 170.)

Lurcher and East Point Lightships, Amounts paid to Contractors, Renewals, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lewis) 2333 (ii).

'Lurcher' Lightship, Expenditure, *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 2747 (ii).

——— Investigation *re* Accident : Statement Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2851 (ii).

——— Memoranda to Dep. Minister of Marine : M. for Copies* (Mr. Lewis) 2333 (ii).

——— Rep. of Capt. Salmon, Laid on Table, 2878 (ii).

——— Submarine Signal *re* : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 2873 (ii). *See* 'Marine,' &c.

Mackenzie, District of, B. No. 157 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 6103 (iv) ; Order dschd., 8176

Mackenzie and Dauphin, Man., Special Reps. from Ret. Officers, Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1336 (i).

Macleod Board of Trade, Pets. *re* Mail Service : Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 9612 (v).

Macleod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co.'s B. No. 78 (Mr. Turriff) 1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 119.)

McAlpine, Mr. E. H., Litigation Expenses *re* Purchase of Canada Eastern Ry.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1522 (i).

McCormack & Sharples Patent Relief, Pet. *re* : M. (Mr. Calvert) to receive, 6558 (iv).

McDermot, Clara Bidwell, Relief B. No. 152 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 5919 (iii) ; 2°*, 5976 ; in Com., 6275, 6347 ; 3° m., 6376 ; agreed to (Y. 38, N. 13) 6377 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 121.)

McDonald, Mr. J. L., Dismissal as Indian School Teacher, N.S.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 6514 (iv).

McGill University Grant to Ry. Transportation School : in Com. of Sup., 9381 (v).

McGillicuddy, Mr. D., Emplymt. by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6601 ; Letter to Sir William Mulock, Ref. to, 6601 (iv).

McKenzie, D. D., M.P., Resignation *re* Autonomy B.: Remarks (Mr. Porter) in Com. on B. 69, 8474 (v).

——— Ques. of Order (Mr. A. Johnston) 8475 ; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 8476 (v).

McKnight, Mr. A., Dismissal as Postmaster from Boissevain P.O.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2327 (ii).

McLaren's Creek Bridge, Trent Canal : in Com. of Sup., 9379 (v).

McMichael, Mr., Customs Inspector, Duties, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 406 (i).

McPherson's Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1735 (i).

Mabou Harbour Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 7408 (iv).

M. C. B. Coupler for Rolling Stock, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 2178 (ii).

Maccan Mail Contract, Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 188 (i).

Madoc and Eldorado Ry. Bonus, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 7261 (iv).

Magann & Finn, Payments to *re* Port Colborne Contract : in Com. of Sup., 1232 (i).

Magdalen Island Breakwaters and Piers : in Com. of Sup., 7308 (iv).

Magdalen Island SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 906 (i).

Magog Post Office, Erection of : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5784 (iii).

Magog Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1114 (i).

Mahone Bay Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7408 (iv).

Mail Bags, Locks, Repairs, &c., Contracts *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 205 (i).

Mails carried free by Rys.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 185 (i).

Mail Contracts, Tenders, Competition, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup. 179 (i).

Mail Delivery, Free System, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 729 (i).

Mail Distributing Station, Montreal, Purchase of Site : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 915 (i).

Mail Service, General Vote : in Com. of Sup., 219 (i), 6629 (iv).

——— Miscellaneous Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 9609 (v).

——— System of Payments : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).

See 'Post Office.'

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 864, 919 (i), 6901, 6909, 7087, 7176 (iv), 8691, 9616, 9680 (v).

——— Information *re* System, Utility, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 923 (i).

Mail Subsidies *re* Newfoundland Service : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).

Main à Dieu Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7409 (iv).

'Maisonneuve' Steam Launch, Expenditure by Govt. *re* : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1849 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2744 (ii).

Major's Hill Park, Maintenance : in Com. of Sup., 6817 (iv).

Maladie du Coït, Horse Disease : Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 6702 (iv).

Malignant Cove Channel Piers : in Com. of Sup., 7409 (iv).

Mallein Test for Cattle : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 2317 (ii).

Manchester SS. Line Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 932 (i).

Man. and N.W.T. Govt., Officials, Resignation, &c., 1904 : Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1344 (i).

Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Pets., &c., *re* : M. (Mr. W. J. Roche) for Copies, 1768 (i).

——— M. for Copies* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2067 (ii).

——— O. C. March 21st, 1905, Reply of Man. Govt. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3744 (ii).

Manitoba Boundaries, Res. passed by Man. Legislature : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4082 (iii).

——— Mr. Jackson's Speech *re* Settlement : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4842 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Memorandum *re* Separate Schools : Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3834 ; Cor. read, 3841 (ii).

——— 'Payment of Political Debts,' Ques. of Order : Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3857 (ii).

——— Naming Member, &c. (Mr. Speaker) 3858.

——— 'Scurvy Politician,' Quotation, &c. : Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3863 (ii).

Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation : M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn., 3938 (ii).

Manitoba Boundaries, Letter to Cardinal Rampolla : Read (Mr. Foster) 3956 (ii).
——— Letter of Mr. Chas. Russell to Cardinal Rampolla : Read (Mr. Foster) 3957 (ii).
——— Letter of Mr. Fitzpatrick to Bishops of Quebec : Read (Mr. Bergeron) 4053 (ii).
Manitoba, Dom. Buildings : Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) in Com. of Sup., 857 (i).
——— Renewals, Repairs, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1634 (i).
See 'Public Works.'
Man. Elections, Duties of Ret. Officers, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1506 (i).
Manitoba Election Returns, Duties of Returning Officers : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4678 (iii).
——— Voters' Lists returned to Clerk of Crown: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1405 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1672 (i).
Manitoba Farmers, Relief from Grasshopper Scourge : Ques. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 909 (i).
Manitoba Grenadiers, 95th Batt. Reduction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 909 (i).
Manitoba Lake Fishing, Closing of, Cor., Pets., &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. Crawford) 9698 (v).
Manitoba Public Works, Claims for Damages, Pet. *re* : Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 7571 (iv).
Manitoba School Fund, Amt. paid to Man. Govt. Ques. (Mr. Bole) 379 (i).
See 'Autonomy,' &c.
Manitoba, Stony Mountain Penitentiary : in Com. of Sup., 481 (i).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. : Remarks (Mr. Greenway) on M. for Sup., 6738 (iv).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. No. 114 (Mr. Dyment) 1°* 2185 ; 2°*, 2773 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 6610 ; Sen. Amts., 7625 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 120.)
Manufacturing Industries, Statistics *re* : Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. on B. 5, 1085 (i).
Maple Products, Adulteration of, Prevention by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1340 (i).
Maps for Dom. and N.W.T., Engraving, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7721 (iv), 9307 (v).
Maps, Sale by Govt. : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1476 (i).
Marble Mountain Wharf, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9580 (v).
Marconi Station at Table Head, Glace Bay, Amount expended, Delays, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 383 (i).
Marconi Stations, List : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 2869 (ii).
Marconi System, Grosse Isle : in Com. of Sup., 9604 (v).
Marconi Stations, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6625 (iv).
Marconi Tel. System on Strs. 'Stanley' and 'Minto' : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 188 (i).
Marconi Wireless Cable Service : in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).
Marconi Wireless Tel. Service *re* Govt. Steamers : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2615 (ii).
See 'Wireless,' &c.
Margaree Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7409 (iv).
Margaretville Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7412 (iv).
MARINE :
'Aberdeen,' Boilers, Repairs, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6464 (iv).
'Acadia' Str., Disposition of Fittings, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1849 (i).
Acetylene Gas Lights, Annual Saving, Expenditure, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1592 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
See 'Carbide.'
'Agnes Donahoe,' Schr., Seizure by Uruguayan Govt. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6106 (iv).
——— Seizure : Telegram read (Mr. Wm. Roche) 6137 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) 1507 (i).
Aids to Navigation : in Com. of Sup., 2758 (ii).
Aids to Navigation, *re* St. Lawrence Channel : in Com. of Sup., 2850, 2891 (ii).
——— Repairs to Lighthouses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6636 (iv).
——— programme *re* Boards of Trade : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 6641 (iv).
Anglo-American Tel. Co., P.E.I., Charges, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).
Anticosti Lightships, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 1850 (i).
Arctic Expedition, Capt. Peary's Voyage : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4753 (iii).
Bicquet Lighthouse Keeper, Name, Salary, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3202 (ii).
Bout de L'Isle Ferry Service, Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 9696 (v).
Bronte Pier Lighthouse : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 2868 (ii).
——— Statement *re* : (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 9176 (v).
Brothers' Light, Salary of Keeper : Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 2702 (ii).
Buoy Contracts, Tenders, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2742 (ii).
Buoys, Construction and Maintenance : in Com. of Sup., 2729 (ii).

MARINE—*Con.*

'Canada'-'Cape Breton' Accident, 'Statement of Case': M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 2067 (ii).

——— Report *re* Investigation, Instructions, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2625 (ii).

——— Capt. Salmon's Resignation, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Ames) 384 (i).

'Canada,'. Str., Expenditure *re* Equipment, Names of Employees, Payments to, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 1399 (i).

Carbide for Acetylene Gas Purposes, Quantity purchased: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 914 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2710, 2743 (ii).

'Champlain,' Str., Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 149 (i).

See 'Ice Breakers.'

Coal Supply for Govt. Steamers, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2613 (ii).

'De Levis,' Str., for Hydrographic Survey, Total Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 914 (i).

Dom. Lighthouse Depot, Kingston, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 914 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 915 (i).

'Druid,' Str., Expenditure *re* Maintenance: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 2703 (ii).

Fog Signals, Submarine: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 891 (i).

Gas Plant, Parry Sound, Purchase of Property: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2725 (ii).

Godbout, Mr. J., Lighthouse-keeper, Political Partisanship *re* Dom. Elections: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1343 (i).

Govt. Steamers, Expenditure *re* Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1349 (i).

——— Maintenance, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2595 (ii), 6464 (iv).

——— Purchase of Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2617 (ii).

——— Statement of Expenditure: Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2597 (ii).

Grand Manan, N.B., Life-saving Crew, Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 4921 (iii).

Halifax Lightship, Maintenance, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2708 (ii).

Harbours and Boards of Commissioners, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1063 (i).

Harbours Buoys, Maintaining, Placing, &c., Contracts *re*: M. (Mr. Ames) for Ret.*, 917 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, Marine Dept., Que.: in Com. of Sup., 2448 (ii).

Harrison, Capt., Allowance *re* Services: in Com. of Sup., 6466 (iv).

MARINE—*Con.*

Hospital Dues for Sick Mariners Fund, Surplus, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2687 (ii).

Hydrographic Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 2679 (ii), 6623 (iv), 9172 (v).

See 'De Levis.'

Ice-Boats, Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9177 (v).

Ice-breaker 'Montcalm,' Accident to, Information: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4752 (iii).

——— Statement (Mr. Préfontaine) 4752 (iii).

Ice-breakers *re* St. Lawrence Channel: in Com. of Sup., 6464 (iv), 9617 (v).

——— Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9034 (v).

See 'Champlain.'

'James W.', Schooner, Rescue of Crew by SS. 'Durango': Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4198 (iii).

Kingston Lighthouse Depot, Establishment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 914 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 915 (i).

'Lady Laurier,' Govt. Str., Accident, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2597 (ii).

——— Number of Crew at Halifax: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 2616 (ii).

Lemieux, Jos., Appnmt. *re* Lightship Service, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1762 (i).

Lepreaux Point Light, &c., Caretaker, Investigation *re* Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6475 (iv).

Leslie, Capt., Wrecking Plant in St. Lawrence Channel: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 2476 (ii).

Lifeboat Crews, N.S., Number, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 912 (i).

Life-saving Crew, Grand Manan, N.B., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 4921 (iii).

Life Saving Stations and Rewards: in Com. of Sup., 2624 (ii).

Lighthouse Agencies, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2705 (ii).

Lighthouse Construction as Aids to Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 9175 (v).

Lighthouse Service and Aids to Nav., Applications from Lighthouse Board: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lewis) 917 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 2850 (ii), 9035 (v).

——— Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).

Lighthouse, Bay of Quinté: Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) in Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).

Lighthouse Depot at Kingston, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 914 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 915 (i).

——— Prescott, Tenders *re* Contract: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1340 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*
Lighthouse Engineers, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2760 (ii).
Lighthouse Keeper at Bicquet, Name, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3202 (ii).
Lighthouse Keepers' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 2698 (ii), 9175 (v).
Lighthouse Revolving Lights, Maintenance of: in Com. of Sup., 2704 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service Steamers, Ports of Call, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 1850 (i).
Lighthouse Supply Depots: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2709 (ii).
Lightships, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2706 (ii), 6636 (iv).
Lightships, &c., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9035 (v).
'Lurcher' and East Point Lightships, Amounts paid to Contractors, Renewals, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lewis) 2333 (ii).
'Lurcher' Lightship, Expenditure *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 2747 (ii).
——— Investigation *re* Accident: Statement Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2851 (ii).
——— Memoranda to Dep. Minister of Marine: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lewis) 2333 (ii).
——— Rep. of Capt. Salmon laid on Table 2878 (ii).
——— Submarine Signal *re*: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 2873 (ii).
Marconi Wireless Cable Service: in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).
Marconi Wireless Tel. Service *re* Govt. Steamers: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2615 (ii).
——— on Strs. 'Stanley' and 'Minto': Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 188 (i).
Marconi Stations, List: Read (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 2869 (ii).
Marconi Tel. System on Strs. 'Stanley' and 'Minto': Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 188 (i).
Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Circulars *re* Private Tenders, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1399 (i).
Marine Supplies, Purchase of: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 4753 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Orders with or without Tender: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lalor) 1397 (i).
Marine Deptl. Supplies: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lalor) 2594 (ii).
Marine Hospitals, Fernhill Cemetery, Care of: in Com. of Sup., 6628 (iv).
Marine Hospitals for Sick Seamen: in Com. of Sup., 2686 (ii).
Marine Hospital, Yarmouth: in Com. of Sup., 9172 (v).
Marine Insurance, Decrease of Rates: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2865 (ii).
MARINE—*Con.*
Marine Officers at Halifax, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. A. Johnston) 2755 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 102 (i), 2443 (ii), 6266 (iv), 9050 (v).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Préfontaine) 111 (i), 2594 (ii).
Marine Schools: in Com. of Sup., 2639 (ii).
Marine Technical Officers, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9050 (v).
Masters and Mates Examination: in Com. of Sup., 2623 (ii).
Meteorological Building, Toronto, Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1149 (i).
Meteorological Observatory, Removal to Ottawa: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9772 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9800, 9810 (v).
——— Statement (Mr. Préfontaine) 9812 (v).
Meteorological Service: in Com. of Sup., 2679 (ii).
——— Pay-roll List, &c.: M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies*, 917 (i).
Midland Harbour, Range Lights, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 2734 (ii).
——— Statement Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2852 (ii).
Moncton Harbour Master, Appnmt. of Mr. D. Robertson: Ques. (Mr. Stockton) 2329 (ii).
'Montcalm,' Ice-breaker, Accident to: Statement (Mr. Préfontaine) 4752 (iii).
——— Experiments *re* Ice-breaking: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6626 (iv).
——— Rep. of Capt. Koenig, and Cor.: Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2451 (ii).
——— Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 150 (i).
Montevideo, British Seamen Imprisoned in, Litigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2689 (ii).
Naval Militia and Cruiser 'Canada': in Com. of Sup., 9178 (v).
Naval Militia for Canada, Total Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1346 (i).
——— Policy of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2909 (ii).
Obstructions, Removal of in Navigable Waters: in Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).
Ocean and River Service, Amounts of Payments on Pay-roll, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1349 (i).
Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 2595 (ii), 6463, 6623 (iv), 9171, 9617 (v).
———Maintenance of Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 9034 (v).
——— Removing Obstructions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 151 (i).
——— Strs., Names and Tonnage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 1347 (i).
Parry Sound Buoy Contract: Statement Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2856 (ii).

MARINE—*Con.*
Parry Sound Gas Plant, Purchase of Land, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2725 (ii).
'Petrel,' Repairs to Boilers : in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).
Pilotage Service : in Com. of Sup., 2760 (ii).
Prescott Lighthouse Depot, Total Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1148 (i).
P.E.I. Steam Communication Contract with Steam Nav. Co.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5316 (iii)
P.E.I. and Mainland, Winter Communication, Cor., &c., since Confederation : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 9698 (v).
P. E. I. Steam Communication, Snow Blockade and Delay in Mails : Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 1753 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1595 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2203, 2261 (ii).
——— Explanation (Sir William Mulock) 2261 (ii).
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication, Str. 'Stanley,' Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies*, 916 (i)
——— Inspection of Str. 'Stanley' : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 687 (i).
P. E. I. Communication with Mainland : Remarks (Mr. A. Martin), Tel. Read, &c., 831 (i).
——— Tidings of Str. 'Stanley' : Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1338 (i).
P. E. I. Winter Communication, Claims of Travellers *re* Refund of Expenses on account of Delay : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4807 (iii).
——— Investigation *re* Soundings, Tunnel, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2778 (ii).
'Quadra,' Str., Repairs to : in Com. of Sup., 9171 (v).
Reid, Capt., Rep. *re* Submarine Signals : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2886 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Rep. : Presented (Mr. Préfontaine) 2594 (ii).
Ste. Famille Wharfage Dues, Abolition of : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1150 (i).
St. Lawrence Channel, Aids to Navigation : in Com. of Sup., 2858 (ii).
——— Res. from Montreal Board of Trade : Read, 2859 (ii).
——— Res. from Allan SS. Owners : Read, 2860 (ii).
St. Lawrence Channel, Aids to Navigation : Remarks (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com. of Sup., 2891 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 891 (i).
St. Lawrence River Channel, Dredging, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2448 (ii).
——— 'Montcalm' Ice Breaker, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2451 (ii).

MARINE—*Con.*
St. Lawrence Channel, Lights, Buoy Service, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2703 (ii).
——— New Dredge Plant : in Com. of Sup., 9171 (v).
St. Louis, Lake, Buoy and Light Service : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 2704 (ii).
St. Louis, Capt., Certificate *re* Reinstatement: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 591 (i).
Salmon, Capt., Rep. *re* Accident to Lurcher, Laid on Table 2878 (ii).
——— Resignation *re* 'Canada,' &c., Collision: M. (Mr. Ames) for Cor., 384 (i).
See 'Canada-Cape Breton.'
Schools of Navigation : in Com. of Sup., 2639 (ii).
'Scotia,' Str., Certificates of Engineers, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8385 (v).
'Scout,' Str., Compensation Claims *re* Injuries, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 6463 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re* Cost Service : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 2700 (i).
——— Investigation *re* Explosion of Acetylene Gas, Appnmt. of Experts : Remarks (Mr. Monk) 4841 (iii).
——— Repairs, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6643 (iv).
Shipwrecked Seamen : in Com. of Sup., 2688 (ii).
Signal Service *re* Lighthouses : in Com. of Sup., 2760 (ii).
See 'Fog,' &c.
Steamboat Inspection : in Com. of Sup., 6628 (iv).
——— Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii).
Stevens, Douglas, Answer to Capt. Salmon's Rep. *re* 'Lurcher' Accident : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2878 (ii).
Stevens, Mrs. Douglas, Gratuity : in Com. of Sup., 6628 (iv).
Submarine Signal Apparatus : Remarks (Mr. Ganong) in Com. of Sup., 892 (i).
——— Installation : in Com. of Sup., 2871 (ii).
——— Reps. of U.S., List of Stations : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2871 (ii).
Submarine Signal Co. of Boston, Cor. with Min. of Mar., &c. : M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies*, 917 (i).
Sydney Harbour Pilots, Charges *re* Widows and Orphans Fund : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9036 (v).
Tidal Service, Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).
Toronto Island Fog Horns, Nuisance *re* Testing : Remarks (Mr. Kemp) 9281, Cor., &c. (read) 9282 (v).

MARINE—*Con.*
Vessels, List of: Rep. Presented (Mr. Préfontaine) 6907 (iv).
Wharfs, Piers, Docks, constructed by Govt. since 1896: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2777 (ii).
Winter Mail Service, P.E.I., Ice Boat: in Com. of Sup., 2648 (ii).
——— Cor. Read (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2649; Res. from P.E.I. Delegates (read)—(Mr. A. A. McLean) 2651 (ii).
——— Statement of Trips of Ice Boats: Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2675 (ii).
See 'P.E.I.' &c.
Wrecks, Investigation *re*, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6466 (iv).
Wrecking Plant *re* Life Saving Stations: in Com. of Sup., 2624 (ii).
Wrecking Plant *re* St. Lawrence Channel: in Com. of Sup., 2476 (ii).
Express,' I.C.R., Running Time ...ks (Mr. Lavergne) 6831 (iv).
Markey, F. H., Lease to *re* Fishing Rights in N. Western Lakes: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).
Martineau Defalcations, Evidence *re* Bank Suit: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 112 (i).
Martin, Eli, Emplymt. in Customs Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7097 (iv).
Marquette Voters' Lists, Original Copy: M. for Copy* (Mr. Roche) 97 (i).
Maskinongé River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6842, 7325 (iv), 9590 (v).
Masters and Mates Certificate B. No. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) 1°*, 9; on Order for 2°*, 733 (i).
——— B. No. 44 (Mr. Lancaster) 1° m., 684; on Order for 2°, 918, 1399 (i).
Masters and Mates Certificate B. No. 44 (Mr. Lancaster): Remarks on M. to adjn., 3249 (ii).
Masters and Mates Examination: in Com. of Sup., 2623 (ii).
Matchedash Bay Channel Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iv).
Matthews, Geo., Co., Claims *re* Damages by Flooding: in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).
Meadow Creek Ranching Co., Patent *re* Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 6476 (iv).
Meaford Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iv).
——— Mr. A. Pigott's Claims: in Com. of Sup., 9599 (v).
Medical Attendance, Indians, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 9599 (v).
——— Indians, Ont., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 223 (i).
——— P.E.I., Indians: in Com. of Sup., 6537 (iv).
See 'Indians.'
Medical Officers in Militia Districts, Appnmt., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 417 (i).
Medical Officers in Militia, and Independence of Parlt. Act: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 418 (i).
Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. No. 74 (Mr. P. Talbot) 1°*, 1671; 2°*, 1758 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 122.)
Medicine Hat Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
Meetings after six o'clock Recess: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 450 (i).
Megantic Lake Piers: in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
Melbourne and Upper Melbourne Mail Contract, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4372 (iii).
Melfort Mail Service, Complaint from Board of Trade, Saskatchewan, *re* Delays: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9789 (v).
Members introduced: 111, 624, 1846 (i), 5234 (iii), 7420 (iv).
Members Speeches, Delay in Printing at Bureau: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7723 (iv).
Memramcook Ry. Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 1077 (i).
Mess. from His Ex., Opening of Parlt.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 4 (i).
——— Read (Mr. Speaker) 6165 (iv).
——— (Suppl. Estimates) 1906 (read) 8718 (v).
Messengers, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 240 (i).
See 'House of Commons.'
Metal Volatilization Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 183 (Mr. McCool) 1°*, 7810 (iv); M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096; 2°*, 8146; in Com., and 3°*, 9049 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 123.).
Meteghan Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).
Meteorological Building, Toronto, Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1149 (i).
Meteorological Observatory, Removal to Ottawa: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9772 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9800, 9810 (v).
——— Statement (Mr. Prefontaine) 9812 (v).
Meteorological Service: in Com. of Sup., 2679 (ii).
——— Pay-Roll List, &c.: M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies*, 917 (i).
Methylated Spirits, Purchased by Excise Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 1691 (i).
Metric System, Adoption of: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1694 (i).
Mexico Steamers, Subsidy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1560 (i).
Middle Fork Falls, Location of, Sale or Lease by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 9079 (v).
Midland Govt. Dock and Storehouse, Tenants and Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5423 (iii).

Midland Harbour, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 9601 (v).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iv).
——— Range Lights, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 2734 (ii).
——— Statement Read (Mr. Prefontaine) 2852 (ii).
Mileage *re* Mail Service, Additional: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 184 (i).
Military College: *See* 'Royal.'
Militia Act Amt. B No. 170 (Sir Frederick Borden) Res. prop., 6905; in Com. on Res., 6984; 1°*, of B., 6991; on Order for 2°, 7263; 2° m., 9179; in Com., and 3°*, 9198 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 22.)
MILITIA:
Accountant of Militia Board: in Com. of Sup., 434 (i).
Advisory Board *re* Militia, Constitution of, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 415 (i).
Ammunition, Small Arms, Inspection of: in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).
Annual Drill *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 441 (i), 6512 (iv).
Cadet Corps, Ammunition supplied: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) 7815 (iv).
Dominion Arsenal: in Com. of Sup., 9170 (v).
——— Ammunition, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7012 (iv).
——— Col. Gaudet's Salary: in Com. of Sup., 6513 (iv).
——— Establishment of: in Com. of Sup., 445 (i).
Dress Regulation for Military Officers: in Com. of Sup., 438 (i).
Dundonald, Earl of, Cor., O.Cs., &c., *re* Dismissal: M. for Copies* (Mr. Belcourt) 3205 (ii).
Esquimalt and Halifax Garrisons, Situation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9128 (v).
Esquimalt Defences: in Com. of Sup., 9170 (v).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Abandonment by Imp. Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 188 (i).
Halifax and Esquimalt Defences, Cor., O.Cs., &c., with Dom. Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 2334 (ii).
——— Abandonment of by G.B.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9677 (v).
——— Par. in Ottawa 'Journal' *re* Govt. Control: Read (Mr. S. Hughes) 1402 (i).
Halifax Fortifications, Retention of Imperial Troops: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 6510 (iv).
Halifax Military Equipment: Semarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6511 (iv).
Highland Cadet Corps, Montreal, Letter *re*: Read (Mr. Monk) 7813 (iv).
MILITIA—*Con.*
Hospital, St. John's, P.Q., Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5687 (iii).
Inspector General of Militia: in Com. of Sup., 437 (i).
Kentvile Militia Camp, Purchase of Site, Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) on M. for Sup., 6656 (iv).
——— Judgment of Exchequer Court, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6664, 7584 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) on M. for conc., 9686 (v).
——— statement read (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 9706 (v).
——— Rep. of Evidence, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 8698 (v).
King's Regulations and Orders: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 54 (i).
London Militiamen at Niagara: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* London Elections, 7249 (iv).
——— Telegrams read (Sir Frederick Borden) 7331 (iv).
Manitoba Grenadiers, 95th Batt. Reduction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jackson) 909 (i).
Medical Officers in Militia Districts, Appnmt., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 417 (i).
Military Buildings, Fredericton, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 728 (i).
Military Camp Casualties, Indemnity *re*: Remarks (Mr. Worthington) in Com. of Sup., 9147 (v).
Military Camps: Remarks (Mr. Worthington) in Com. of Sup., 442 (i).
Military Camp, Establishment of at S. Simcoe: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 9712 (v).
Military Depots, Chain of, Ref. to in General Statement, on Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) 9112 (v).
Military School for Montreal, Selection of Site: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7009 (iv).
Military Sites, Purchased of: Remarks (Mr. Worthington) in Com. of Sup., 427 (i).
Military Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
Military Training Camp, Central Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. White) 268 (i).
Militia and Defence, Accountant's Salary: in Com. of Sup., 9067 (v).
——— Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 9068 (v).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 112 (i).
Militia Council, Appnmt. of Officers: Remarks (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. of Sup., 415 (i).
——— Memorandum laid on Table (Sir Frederick Borden) 9073 (v).
——— Memorandum: Read (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9116 (v).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Militia Council, Regulations: Read (Sir Frederick Borden) 420 (i).
——— Appnmt. of Heads: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 432 (i).
Militia, Equipment for Defences: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 446 (i).
Militia Estimates, Permanent Force (general statement): in Com. of Sup., 9105 (v).
——— Unfair Criticism *re*: Remarks (Sir Frederick Borden) 9099 (v).
Militia Force, Reduction of: Explanation (Sir Frederick Borden) on M. for Sup., 6992 (iv).
——— Infantry Corps, Reduction of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Belcourt) 7019 (iv).
Militia Medical Officers, Disqualifications as Members of H. of C.: Inquiry for Cor. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8997 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., Cor. read, 9149 (v).
Militiamen at London Elections, Voting, Tel.: Read (Sir Frederick Borden) 7331 (iv).
See 'London.'
Militiamen, Pensions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6957 (iv).
Militia, Officers gazetted *re* Examinations, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 8886 (v).
——— Orders and Civil Servants: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 1260 (i).
——— Pay and Allowance: in Com. of Sup., 415 (i), 6510 (iv).
———Staffs of Officers, Reduction in Number: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 5315 (iv).
——— Stores: in Com. of Sup., 6513 (iv).
———Tranportation: in Com. of Sup., 6513 (iv).
Miltimore, Lt. J. M., Application *re* Permission to attend Cavalry School, Toronto: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 6383 (iv).
Ninety-Fifth Batt, Reduction and Disbandment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jackson) 909 (i).
Pay and Allowance *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 6510 (iv).
Permanent Force, Recruiting Points, Total Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5977 (iv).
Plains of Abraham, Number of Acres purchased by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
Quebec Military School, Improvement of: Remarks (Mr. O. E. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 9162 (v).
Rifle Grants: in Com. of Sup., 444 (i), 9169 (v).
Ross Rifles, Examination of, &c.: Remarks (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9123 (v).
Ross Rifle Factory, Tank on Martello Tower: Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 431 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Royal Military College: in Com. of sup., 7000 (iv), 9170 (v).
Royal Scots Armoury, Military Properties: in Com. of Sup., 9169 (v).
Sherbrooke Armouries, Provision for Militia, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 266 (i).
——— Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 191 (i).
Simcoe Military Camp, Establishment of: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 9712 (v).
S.A. War, King's Medals for Canadian Soldiers: M. for Cor., &c.,* (Mr. Worthington) 3204 (ii).
Sussex Rifle Range, Inspector: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7011 (iv).
Target Ranges: in Com. of Sup., 445 (i).
Uniforms for Militia, Regulation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 438 (i).
Veterans of 1866 and 1870, Grants of Lands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6047 (iv).
Woodstock, N.B., Rifle Range, Purchase of Land: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 5132 (iii).
Milk River Ranche, Quarantine, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2312 (ii).
Mill Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).
Mille Vache Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 7310 (iv).
Miltimore, Lt. J. M., Application *re* Permission to attend Cavalry School, Toronto: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 6383 (iv).
Miminegash Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1735 (i).
——— Contract *re* Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1350 (i).
——— Dredging, Commencement of Work: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3834 (ii).
Mineral Specimens for Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 6269 (iv).
Mines Branch, Int. Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 6264 (iv).
Mines Branch, Smelting Ore Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 9303 (v).
Ministers' Absence from House: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1285 (i).
Ministerial Changes since 1904, Mr. Aylesworth's Position (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1336
Ministers of Finance and Interior, Absence, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 321 (i).
'Minto,' Str., Losses to P.E.I. Merchants *re* Damaged Goods: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2623 (ii).
Mint, Royal, Building: in Com. of Sup., 606 (i).
Mint, Royal Canadian, Estimated Cost, Capacity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2185, 2326 (ii).
——— Establishment of in Can., Cor. with Imp. Govt.: M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies*, 916 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 2595 (ii), 7424 (iv), 8387 (v).

Miscellaneous Expenditure, Charwomen : in Com. of Sup., 6268 (iv).

Miscellaneous Legal Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 6723 (iv).

Miscou Harbour Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7498 (iv).

Mistook Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7310 (iv).

Mitchell Bridge, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1940 (i).

Mitchell, Diversion of Line, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1940 (i).

Molsons Bank B. No. 14 (Mr. Ames) 1° m., 317; 2°*, 415; in Com.. 1755; 3°*, 1755 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 124.)

Monarch Bank of Canada incorp. B. No. 164 (Mr. Gordon) 1°*, 6232; 2°*, 6868 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8655 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 125.)

Moncton Harbour Master, Appnmt. of Mr. D. Robertson : Ques. (Mr. Stockton) 2329 (ii).

Moncton, Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 1946 (i), 9391 (v).

——— Shops, Capacity of : Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 1965 (i).

Money transmitted through Mail, Par. in Quebec Papers *re* Legislation : Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4807 (iii).

'Montcalm.' Ice-breaker, Accident to : Statement (Mr. Préfontaine) 4752 (iii).

——— Experiments *re* Ice breaking : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6626 (iv).

——— Rep. of Capt. Koenig, and Cor. : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2451 (ii).

——— Total Cost : Ques. (Mr. Morin) 150 (i).

See 'Marine.'

Monterey Electric and Gas Co.'s B. No. 89 (Mr. Macdonell) 1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 126.)

Montevideo, British Seamen imprisoned in, Litigation *re* : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2689 (ii).

See 'Marine—Agnes,' &c.

Mont Louis Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7310 (iv).

Montmagny Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7311 (iv).

Montmorency Falls Cribwork : in Com. of Sup., 7311 (iv).

Montmorency Wharf, Expenditure *re* by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 1015 (i).

——— Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 6852 (iv).

See 'Chateau Richer,' &c.

Montreal Barracks : in Com. of Sup., 1118 (i).

Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. No. 138 (Mr. Piché) 1°*, 4550; 2° m., 4703 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6275 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 127.)

Montreal Customs, Dep. Collector, Appnmt. of: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 256 (i).

Montreal Examining Warehouse : in Com. of Sup., 1119 (i).

Montreal Free Port, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 7317 (iv).

Montreal Grain Warehouses, Preparation of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Piché) 1345 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Power B. No. 192 (Mr. Préfontaine) 1° m., 9028 ; 2°*, 9288 ; in Com., 9288 ; 3°*, 9288 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 23.)

Montreal and G.B., St. John and Manchester, SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 932 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commission, Appnmt. of Members : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 150 (i).

——— Expenditure, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 779 (i).

Montreal Harbour, Grain Conveyors, Preparation of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Piché) 2187 (ii).

——— Permanent Sheds, &c., Cor. between Govt., &c.: M. for copies (Mr. Monk) 153 (i).

——— Preparation of Plans and Specification, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Piché) 2186 (ii).

——— Claims of P. Lyall & Sons, &c.: M. (Mr. Ames) for Ret.*, 1397 (i).

———Ques. (Mr. Ames) 687 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Question, 696 (i).

——— Cor. between P. W. St. George and Mar. Dept.: M. for Copies (Mr. Ames) 689 (i).

——— Rep. of Mr. Geo. S. Green, *re* Plans, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 3204 (ii).

——— Steel Sheds, Contract *re* : Remarks (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. of Sup., 761 (i).

Montreal Harbour, Raising of Sunken Elevator: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 151 (i).

Montreal Inland Revenue Building : in Com. of Sup., 1119 (i).

——— Addition, Site, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 1120 (i).

Montreal Military Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1125 (i).

Montreal, Ottawa, Kingston & Co. : *See* 'Kingston and Dom., &c.'

Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. No. 47 (Mr. Geoffrion) 1°*, 728 ; 2°*, 1101 (i).

Montreal Postal Station : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1128 (i).

Montreal Post Office, Charges *re* Registered Letters : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 183 (i).

——— Illegal Stamping of Letters for Election Matters : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 194 (i).

——— cor. read (Sir William Mulock) 194 (i).

Montreal Post Office, Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1127 (i).

——— New Station : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 222 (i).

——— Pneumatic Installation, System : in Com. of Sup., 1131 (i).

Montreal Post Office, St. Catherine St. Branch, Rents paid and unsanitary condition : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 201 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 182 (i).

——— Stealing of Cheques, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 198 (i).

Montreal, Quebec, &c., Harbours, Dues and Charges *re* Transportation Problem : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).

Montreal, Quebec and Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 73 (Mr. Gervais) 1°*, 1592 ; 2°*, 1757 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 128.)

Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s B. No. 96 (Mr. Geoffrion) 1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 129.)

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness, Collections, &c. : M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 402 (i).

Montreal Wharfs, Removal of Shoals, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 7319 (iv).

Moosejaw and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 20 (Mr. Scott) 1°*, 318 ; 2°*, 415 (i) ; in Com., 2715, 2762 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 130.)

Moosejaw Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).

Moose Lake Fishing Licenses, Grants to by Govt. : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).

Moose Mountain Indian Agency, Letter from Rev. E. Mackenzie : Read (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 9337 (v).

Morning Sittings : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9081 (v).

Morrell River Bridge Swing Span, P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 2177 (ii).

——— Complaints *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5035 (iii).

Morrison, Hector D., Customs Officer at Pinette, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2330 (ii).

Motions, Notices of, and Order Paper : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9523 (v).

Mounted Police Act Amt. B. No. 8 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) Res. prop., 59 ; in Com., 98 ; 1°*, 109 ; 2°*, 459 ; in Com., 459 ; 3°*, 465 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 24.)

See 'N. W. M. P.' &c.

Mount Stewart Wharf, P.E.I. : Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 9585 (v).

Mud Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7500 (iv).

Municipal Telephone System, Application *re* Port Arthur, &c., before Ry. Commission : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 595 (i).

See 'Telephone.'

Murphy, Albert Edward Relief B. No. 126 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 3091 ; 2°*, 3400 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 131.)

Murray Bay and Riviere Ouelle SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 938 (i).

Murray Canal Inspector : Remarks (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. of Sup., 1512 (i).

Murray Canal Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 1495 (i).

Murray Harbour Branch, P.E.I. Ry., Amount due Contractors, &c. : (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2064 (ii).

——— Claims for Land Damages from T. Curley, &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2334 (ii).

——— Completion, Delegation *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 265 (i).

——— Completion, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Martin) 189 (i).

——— Total Expenditure to Jan., 1905 : Ques. (Mr. A. McLean) 106 (i).

Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 2038, 2127 (ii), 8692, 9482 (v).

See 'I.C.R.-P.E.I. Ry.'

Museum, Geological : in Com. of Sup., 754 (i).

See 'Interior,' &c.

Musquodoboit Postmaster, Dismissal (remarks) on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6224 (iv).

See 'Stewart.'

Mutual Reserve Insurance Co., Payment of Claims, &c. : Ques. (Mr. T. Martin) 2332 (ii).

Narrows Lake Quarry Channel : in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).

National Boundary Fence : in Com. of Sup., 8672 (v).

See 'N.W.T. Boundary,' &c.

National Transcontinental Ry. : *See* 'G.T.P. Ry.,' &c.

Naturalization Act, Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 6957 (iv).

Naturalization and Aliens Act Amt. B. No. 184 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1°*, 7906 (iv) ; 2°*, 8685 ; in Com., 8685, 8689 ; 3°*, 8690 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 25.)

Naval Militia and Cruiser 'Canada' : in Com. of Sup., 9178 (v).

Naval Militia of Canada, Total Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1346 (i).

——— Policy of Govt. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2909 (ii).

Neepawa Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).

Nelson River, &c., Fishing Rights : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).

New Brunswick Southern Ry., Negotiations *re* Purchase, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 584 (i).

New Campbellton Ballast Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).

New Carlisle Wharf Pier Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7312 (iv).

Newcastle Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).

Newcastle Station Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1967 (i).
Newfoundland Mail Subsidies : in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).
New London, P.E.I., Breakwater Repairs : in Com. of Sup.. 1735 (i).
Newport Breakwater Extension, Que. : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Newport Landing Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).
Newspapers, Sensational Reports *re* Interviewing Prisoners : Remarks (Mr. Lavergne) 3250 (ii).
New Westminster, B.C., Dom. Exhibition, Grant : in Com. of Sup., 9339, 9608 (v).
——— Penitentiary, Payment to W. A. Duncan : in Com. of Sup., 9684 (v).
Niagara Fruit Growers' Association, Cor. *re* : Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 9395 (v).
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. No. 39 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 132.)
Niagara-Welland Power Co.'s B. No. 40 (Mr. Guthrie) 1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1710 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 133.)
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s B. No. 34 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., 1706 ; 3°*, 1755 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 134.)
Nicolas, Mr., Emplymt. by Geological Survey Dept. : on Conc., 9685 (v).
Nicolet, Controverted Election, Certificate from Judges : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 9081 (v).
Nicolet Pier Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7313 (iv).
Ninety-Fifth Battalion, Reduction and Disbandment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 909 (i).
Nixon, Jos., Appnmt., as Lands Agent at Macleod, N.W.T. : Explanation (Mr. Oliver) 6110 (iv).
——— Appnmt. as Land Agent : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5718 (iii).
——— Charges *re* Irregularities : M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8098 (v).
——— Delays in Answers to Questions : Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 9075 (v).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 6048 (iv).
——— Investigation : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8697 (v).
——— M. (Mr. Foster) to reduce Vote *re* Salary, 9316 (v).
——— Second Investigation, Letter *re* Payment of Money : Read (Mr. Foster) 9787 (v).
See 'Interior,' &c.
Noel Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).
Noonday Gun, Firing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 121 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co. and Bonuses *re* Immigrants : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9318 (v).
——— Notice of M. (Mr. Osler) 9329 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7705 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8182 (v).
——— Prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) on M. for Sup., 9437 ; Neg. (Y. 40, N. 76) 9480 (v).
——— Protests *re*: Remarks (Mr Monk) 8887 (v).
——— Inquiry for Contract (Mr. U. Wilson) 8145 (v).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 7906 (iv).
North Bay Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1563 (i).
Northern Bank B. No. 104 (Mr. Bole) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 135.)
North Hastings, Census Enumerators, Payments to : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. on B. 5, 1077 (i).
North Thompson River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
North Thompson River, B.C., Improvements *re* Navigation, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5783 (iii).
Northwest Cases, Re-hearing before Ry. Commission : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 56 (i).
Northwest Coal and Coke Ry. Co.'s B. No. 140 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 4550 ; 2°*, 4977 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 100.)
Northwest Irrigation Act Amt. B. No. 161 (Mr. Oliver) 1° m., 6104 (iv) ; 2°*, 8775; in Com., 8775 ; 3°*, 8885 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 26.)
N. W. Land Titles Office, Registrars' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 9249 (v).
N. W. Mounted Police, Patrol Boat : in Com. of Sup., 9178 (v).
——— Pay of Force, N. W. Ter.: in Com. of Sup., 8657 (v).
——— Pensions : in Com. of Sup., 6957 (iv).
——— Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 78 (i).
——— Yukon Force : in Com. of Sup., 8662 (v).
See 'Mounted Police,' &c.
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. No. 28 (Mr. Turriff) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., for 3°*, 2714 (ii) ; 3° m., 2325 ; on Order for 3*, 2714 (ii) ; 3° m. 6346 ; Sen. Amts., 7683 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 136.)
N. W. Ter. Autonomy : *See* 'Autonomy,' &c.
Northwest Territories B. No. 160 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 6104 (iv) ; 2° m., 8763 ; in Com., 8764 ; 3°*, 9408 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 27.)
N. W. T. Boundary, Erection of Wire Fencing, Contract *re* : Ques (Mr. Clements) 5478 (iii).
——— Contract *re* Erection of Wire Fencig : M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5578 (iii).

N. W. T., Boundary Line, Wire Fence Contract, Letter from Dep. Min. Cory and Hon. R. F. Sutherland: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5689-91 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5808 (iii), 5961 (iv).

Northwest Territories, Govtl. Grant : in Com. of Sup., 9622 (v).

N. W. T. Govt. Lands, Sale of in 1903-4, Rates &c: M. for O.C.* (Mr. Foster) 164 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 1154 (i).

N. W. T. Govt. Officials, Interference *re* Elections and Political Partisanship : Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 9713 (v).

N. W. T. Grazing Leases, Number issued, Names of Lessees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5478 (iii).

N. W. T. Officials and Interference in Political Campaigns : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9254 (v).

Northwest Territories Representation Act Amt. B. No. 156 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 6046 (iv) ; 2°*, 8769 ; in Com., 8769 ; 3°*, 8885 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 28.)

N. W. T. Supreme Court Judges, Additional : in Com of Sup., 9683 (v).

Northwest Ters. Surveys, Number of Milles, Total Cost, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1396 (i).

N. W. Ter., Voters' Lists : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2594 (ii).

Notre Dame du Portage Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).

Oaths of Office, Administration of, B. No. 1 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1°*, 5, pro forma.

Obstructions, Removal of in Navigable Waters : in Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).
See 'Marine.'

Ocean and River Service, Amount of Payments on Pay-roll, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1349 (i).

Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 2595 (ii), 6463, 6623 (iv), 9171, 9617 (v).

——— Maintenance of Steamers : in Com. of Sup., 9034 (v).

——— Removing Obstructions &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 151 (i).

——— Strs., Names and Tonnage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 1347 (i).

Officials dismissed by Mr. Whitney : Remarks (Mr. Finlay) in Com. of Sup.. 6863 (iv).

Ogden's Pond Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).

Oil and Supplies, I.C.R., Purchases *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2246 (ii).

Oka Indians, Settlement of Claims, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 235 (i).

Oliphant Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).

Oliver, Hon. Frank, Appnmt. as Minister of Interior : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4201
See 'Interior' &c.

Ontario Boundaries, Cor. with Dom. Govt.: Inquiry for (Mr. Barker) 3590 (ii).

——— Cor. with Ross Govt.: Inquiry for (Mr. Barker) 4078 (ii).

Ontario Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp B. No. 105 (Mr. Boyce) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 ; in Com., 2772 ; 3°* 2950 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 137.)

Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 113 (Mr. Dyment) 1°* 2185 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5132 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 138.)

Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s, Limited, B. No. 86 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 1933 (i) ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 2715, 2763, 3134 ; 3°*, 3135 (ii) ; Sen. Amts., 9817 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 139.)

Ontario Subsidies, Letter from Premier of Ont. to Fin. Min.: Read (Mr. Henderson) 6092 (iv).

Orangemen, Attack by Quebec papers 'Yellow Dog' Quotations : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. on B. 39, 8350 (v).
See 'Autonomy,' &c.

Order, Ques. of, Naming Member : Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3858 (ii).

——— Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 3879 (ii).

Order, Ques. of, 'Political Advantage,' Charges by Mr. Belcourt *re* Mr. Foster's Speech on Autonomy Bill, 3517 ; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 3520 (ii).
See 'Personal,' 'Privilege.'

Original Construction, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1912 (i).

Orillia Public Building, Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).

Ormrod, Wm., Dismissal from Burritt's Rapids Locks : Ques. (Mr. Reid) 8384 (v).

Oshawa Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 9600 (v).

Oshawa Harbour Revenues, Amounts, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1504 (i).

Oshawa Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1564 (i).

Otonabee River, Damages by Floods, Claim of Mr. Jas. Clarke : M. (Mr. Ward) for Copy of Cor., 1396 (i).

Otonabee River, Peterborough Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6886, 7564 (iv).

Ottawa, Additions to Eastern Block : in Com. of Sup., 9547 (v).

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Surveys : Inquiry for Copies of Plans, &c. (Mr. White) 822 (i).

Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. No. 92 (Mr. Belcourt) 1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 (ii); in Com., 4965, 5736 (iii), 5963 ; 3°*, 5973 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 141.)

Ottawa, Bridges : in Com. of Sup., 6889, 7585 (iv).

Ottawa Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 603, 754 (i), 6814 (iv), 9550 (v).
——— Additions, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
——— Corry Block, Rentals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6818 (iv).
——— Elevator Attendance : in Com. of Sup., 1667 (i), 9551 (v).
——— Heating, Engineers, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1667 (i).
——— Heating : in Com. of Sup., 6816 (iv).
——— H. of C. Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).
——— Leased by Govt., Location, Taxes paid, &. : Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 379 (i).
——— Lighting Plant, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1667 (i).
——— P. O. Savings Bank Dept. : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).
——— Purchase of Site, Stmnt., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9605 (v).
——— Rentals : List Read (Mr. Hyman) in Com. of Sup., 1663 (i).
——— Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iv).
——— Stmnt. *re* Rentals, &c. (Mr. Hyman) in Com. of Sup., 9605 (v).
——— Steel Shelving : in Com. of Sup., 1564 (i).
——— Telephone Service : in Com. of Sup., 1669 (i).
——— Treasury Vaults : in Com. of Sup., 6825 (iv).
Ottawa City Act Amt. B. No. 180 (Mr. Fielding) 1°*, 7642 (iv) ; 2°*, 8686 ; in Com., 8686; 3°*, 8688 (v). (5 Edward VII., c., 29.)
Ottawa Coal Sheds : in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).
Ottawa Drill Hall, Increased Accommodation : Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 271 (i).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. No. 12 (Mr. Galliher) 1°, 316 ; 2°*, 404 ; in Com., 1283 ; On Order for 2°, 1338 ; in Com., 1888 ; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1890 (i), 2532 ; on Order for House again in Com., 2714 ; in Com., 2950, 3170 ; 3° m., 3393; Amt. (Mr. Stewart) Neg. (Y. 56, N. 80) 3398; 3°*, 3399 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 140.)
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. No. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3170 (ii).
——— Letter from W. A. Littlejohn, Toronto City Clerk : Read (Mr. Maclean) 3170 (ii).
——— Letter from Sec. Treas. D. R. Street : Read (Mr. Stewart) 3183 (ii).
——— Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3199 (ii).
Ottawa Grounds, Maintenance, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6817 (iv).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Expenditure: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 7280 (iv).
——— Number of Employees : Ques. (Mr. Préley) 382 (i).
Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 18 (Mr. Belcourt) 1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 415 ; in Com., and 3°*, 864 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 142.)
Ottawa, Parliamentary Library, Extension : in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
Ottawa Post Office, Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9551 (v).
——— Restoration and Addition to : in Com. of Sup., 1573 (i).
Ottawa River Ry. Co.'s B. No. 81 (Mr. Pichè) 1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 79.)
Ottawa River Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 7612 (iv).
——— Wharf at Foot of Rideau Canal : in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).
——— Wharf at Riviere du Lievre : in Com. of Sup., 7375 (iv).
Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 143 (Mr. Telford) 1°*, 4644 ; 2°*, 4978 (iii) ; in Com. and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 144.)
Owen Sound Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6886 (iv), 9600 (v).
——— Harbour Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).
Owen Sound P. O., Site *re* : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 1029 (i).
Owen Sound Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 9547 (v) .
Owens : *See* 'David,' &c.
Oxford and London Elections, Resignation of Mr. D. D. McKenzie : Remarks (Mr. Porter) in Com. on B. 69, 8474 (v).
Oxford, N., Electoral District, Vacancy, Issue of Writ ; Notification (Mr. Speaker) 6046 (iv).
——— Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 8177 (v).
——— Notification to Mr. Speaker (Mr. Sproule) 5961 (v).
——— Issue of Writ : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6135 (iv).
See 'London,' &c.
Oyster Culture, Protection *re* : in Com. of Sup., 2912 (ii).
Pacific Bank B. No. 175 (Mr. Galliher) 1° m., 7420 ; 2° m., 7625 (iv) ; in Com., and 3°*, 8146 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 145.)
Pacific Cable Grant : in Com. of Sup., 7239 (iv).
——— Statement Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. of Sup., 7276 (iv).
Packing of Apples : *See* 'Staple Commodities.'
Papal Ablegate : *See* 'Man. Boundaries.'
Paper Goods Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 68 (Mr. Macdonell) 1°*, 1421 ; 2°*, 1541 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 146.)
Parent, Hon. S. N., Appnmt. to G.T.P. Commission : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 699 (i).

Paris Agency, Expenditure *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6958 (iv).

Parker's Cove Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9552, 9576 (v).

Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, &c.: M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5785 (iii).

Parlour and Dining Cars, I.C.R., Profits, &c., *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2254 (ii).

Parole Office, W. T. Archibald, Salary : in Com. of Sup., 6721 (iv).

Parole System for Convicts : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 465 (i).

Parrsboro, Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9579 (v).

——— Landing Pier Addition : in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).

Parry Sound Buoy Contract : Statement read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2856 (ii).

Parry Sound Gas Plant, Purchase of Land, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2725 (ii).

Parry Sound Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7562 (iv).

Paspebiac and Gaspe Basin SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 944 (i).

Passenger and Freight Rates, Advancement of, Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 1542 (i).

Passenger Stations and Freight Sheds, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1977 (i).

Passes issued, &c., I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 2257 (ii).

Passes over I.C.R. for Legislators of Quebec Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. of Sup., 1922, 1925 ; Reply (Mr. Emmerson) 1925 (i).

Patent Act Amts. *re* Relief Bills : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 6559 (iv).

Patent Examiners Salary Increases : in Com. of Sup., 9056 (v).

Patent Medicines, Inspection of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 1725 (i).

'Patent Record': in Com. of Sup., 1472 (i).

'Patent Record' supplied to Members : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com., of Sup., 1827 (i).

Patterson, T. W., Sale of Dom. Lands, B.C., Price paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4371 (iii).

Paul, Jos., Compensation *re* Injuries : in Com. of Sup., 6463 (iv).

Pay and Allowance *re* Militia : in Com. of Sup., 6510 (iv).

See 'Militia,' &c.

Payne, J. L., Salary Increase : in Com. of Sup., 9062 (v).

Pearson, Geo. Relief B. No. 153 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 5919 (iii) ; 2°*, 6868 ; in Com., 7623 ; 3° m., 7624 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 147.)

Peel Head Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).

Pelee Island Cable Line : in Com. of Sup., 7609 (iv).

Pemberton Band of Indians B.C., Purchase of Land : in Com. of Sup., 9339 (v).

Pembroke Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).

Pembroke Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7562 (iv).

Penetanguishene Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7563 (iv).

Penetanguishene Harbour Dredging, Name of Owner of Boat : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2063 (ii).

Penitentiary Coal Contracts, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 478 (i).

Penitentiaries, General Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 465 (i).

See 'Justice,' &c.

Penny Banks, Charters, Stmnt. *re* Business, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 687 (i).

Pensions, Compensation in Lieu of Land : in Com. of Sup., 6956 (iv).

Pension Scheme I.C.R., for Old Age : Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 2492 (ii).

See 'Employees,' &c.

Pensions : in Com. of Sup., 6956 ; conc., 6961 (iv).

Perce (North Cove) Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).

Pere Marquette Ry., Emplymt. of Aliens, Rep. *re* : Laid on Table (Sir William Mulock) 6232 (i).

——— Employees : Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Ingram) 7916 (iv).

Peribonca (Petite Riviere) Removal of Snags : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).

Permanent Force, Recruiting Points, Total Number, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5977 (iv).

See 'Militia,' &c.

Personal Explanation *re* Voting in Ottawa (Mr. Logan) 562 (i).

Peterborough Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1578 (i).

Peterborough Immigrant Homes, Inspection *re* : Remarks (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. of Sup., 7694 (iv).

Petewawa Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7562 (iv).

Petitions, Presenting, Endorsement of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 2490 (ii).

Petition *re* Separate Schools in Autonomy Bill : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2319 (ii).

See 'Autonomy,' &c.

Petit de Grat SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 966 (i).

Petite Riviere, Improvements, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9580 (v).

Petit Rocher Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7500 (iv).

'Petrel.' Repairs to Boilers : in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).

Petroleum Bounties, Payments, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).
Phinney's Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 9552 (v).
Photographs : *See* 'Copyright.'
Pictou Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 9390 (v).
Pictou Cattle Disease, Investigation *re* Cause, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 9079 (v).
Pictou and Cheticamp SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 935 (i).
Pictou and Montague Bridge SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 926 (i).
Pierreville Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6868 (iv).
Piers and Breakwaters, P.E.I., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1737 (i).
Piers and Bridges, General Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7305 (iv).
See 'Pub. Works,' &c.
Pilotage Service : in Com. of Sup., 2760 (ii).
Pinette Customs Officer, Mr. H. D. Morrison : Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2330 (ii).
Pitblado, Isaac Relief B. No. 185 (Mr. Bole) 1°*, 7906 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9049 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 148.)
Plains of Abraham, Number of Acres purchased by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
Pleasant Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).
Plunkett, Geo., Contract *re* Coal for Kingston Penitentiary : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 478 (i).
Plympton Breakwater Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).
Pneumatic Tube Installation in Montreal P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 1131 (i).
——— Toronto P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).
——— Cost, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 217 (i).
Pointe au Baril Route, Georgian Bay : in Com. of Sup., 6888 (iv).
Pointe du Chene Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7500 (iv).
Point Edward Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6869, 7563 (iv).
Point Prim Island Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 1736 (i).
Poirierville Landing Pier, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).
Police Patrol Boats in Northern Waters : in Com. of Sup., 9177 (v).
Political Crisis in Quebec, Par. from 'Le Journal' : Read (Mr. Leonard) 753 (i).
——— Explanation asked for (Mr. Leonard) 822 (i).
'Political Debts, Payment of,' Ques of Order *re* Man. Boundaries : Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3857 (ii).
Pollock, Mr. J. R., Emplymt. by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. Lake) 190 (i).
Poonamalie Dam, Contribution *re* Repairs : Remarks (Mr. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 9379 (v).
Port Arthur Dredging Contract, Advertisement *re* Tenders : Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 6875 (iv).
——— Tender of Conmee & Bowman : M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4458, 4645 (iii).
——— Tenders *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5963 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Boyce) 2685 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2263 (ii), 4921 (iii).
Port Arthur, Fort William and Kaministiquia Harbours, Amount of Expenditure : M. for Ret..* (Mr. S. Hughes) 1398 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1065 (i).
Port Arthur, Fort William Telephone System, Cor. *re* Application to Board of Ry. Commissioners : M. (Mr. Boyce) for Copies, 1391 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 595 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Boyce) 2203 (ii).
Port Arthur Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 784 (i).
Port Bruce Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7563 (iv).
Port Burwell Dredging Contract, Purchase of Dredge, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Blain) 8656 (v).
Port Burwell Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7563 (iv).
Port Burwell Work, Contractor, Prices paid, &c : Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 589 (i).
Port Colborne : in Com. of Sup., 1263 (i).
Port Colborne Breakwater, Elevator, &c., Cor., Papers, &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 2067 (ii).
Port Colborne, Deepening Summit Level : in Com. of Sup., 1232 (i).
——— Eastern Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 815 (i).
——— Elevator : in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1288 (i).
——— Entrance Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1230 (i).
Port Credit Dredging : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6871, 7555 (iv).
Port Dover Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
Port Essington, B.C., and Queen Charlotte Islands Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 9616 (v).
Port Greville Breakwater Extension : in Com., of Sup., 7414 (iv).
Port Hastings Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).
Port Hawkesbury Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6837 (iv).
Port Hood, N.S., Breakwater, Estimated Cost, Approval, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5132 (iii).

Port Hood Harbour, Northern Entrance : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).
Port Hope Piers and Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
Port La Tour Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7415 (iv).
Port Mulgrave and Bras D'Or Lakes SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 934 (i).
Port Mulgrave and Canso SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 935 (i).
Port Perry Dredging, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Christie) 2190 (ii).
Port Stanley, Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
——— Tenders *re* : Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1760 (i).
Porter's Lake Boat Channel to Three Fathom Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 9583 (v).
Porter, Mr. Sydney, Emplymt. by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. Lake) 190 (i).
Portland Cement bought at Quebec : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 435 (i).
Portneuf Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Postage on Newspapers : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 179 (i).
Postage Stamps and Bank Notes, Contract *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 204
Postal Business, Alberta District : M. for Ret. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 599 (i).
Postal Contracts, &c., Patronage for Hamilton : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 6228 (iv).
Postal Map Engraving : in Com. of Sup., 9060 (v).
Postal Rates, Increases, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 221 (i).
Postmasters acting as Political Partisans, Charges *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6240 (iv).
Postmaster, Reduction of Salary : Remarks (Mr. Miller) in Com. of Sup. 6863 (iv).

POST OFFICE :
Alberta District Postal Business, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 599 (i).
Ashcroft and Cariboo Mail Service, Tenders *re* Mail Contract : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3670 (ii).
Benrier, Mr. J. P., Postmaster at St. Claud, Dismissal, &c., Cor. *re* : M. (Mr. Staples) for Cor.*, 1397 (i).
Bisonnette vs. Crown, Illegal Stamping of Letters in Montreal P.O., Cor. read : in Com. of Sup., 194 (i).
Boissevain Postmaster, Mr. A. McKnight, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2327 (ii).
Brantford Letter Carriers : Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) in Com. of Sup., 217 (i).
Cairns, A. W., Salary as P. O. Inspector : in Com. of Sup., 6629 (iv).
Campaign Literature and Franking Privileges: Remarks (Mr. White) 1809 (i).
See 'Franking.'

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Canadian Fast Mail Service and SS. 'Virginian' : Tel. Read (Mr. Emmerson) 9279 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) 9773 (v).
Chesley Postmaster, Vacancy, Appnmt., &c. : Ques. (Mr. Barr) 9081 (v).
Civil Servants' Guarantees *re* P. O. Dept. : Ques. (Mr. Chisholm) 1758 (i).
Coldwater and Lovering Mail Service, Contract *re* : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1848 (i), 2594 (ii).
Country Postmasters, Increases in Salaries : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 143 (i).
Detective Service, P. O. Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 209 (i).
Dobey, J. B.: *See* 'Thessalon Postmaster.'
Doutre, Mr., Dismissal as Postmaster from Beauharnois : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6247 (iv).
Dundas, Ry. Mail Clerk, Reinstatement : in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).
Farmington and Wilmot Mail Contract, Guarantee, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 2330 (ii).
Franking Privilege, Abuse of *re* Circulars of Dental Institute : Remarks (Mr. Ames) 1807 (i).
——— Circular issued by Jacques Cartier Club, &c.: Remarks (Mr. O. E. Talbot) on M. for Ways and Means, 9798 (v).
——— Regulations after Prorogation : Remarks (Mr. Clements) 9395 (v).
——— Use of Rubber Stamp : Remarks (Mr. Barr) 5134 (iii), 5963 (iv).
See 'Campaign,' &c.
Fredericton Post Office, Equipment, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Crocket) 170 (i).
Free Mail Delivery, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 729 (i).
Glenn Ross P. O., Abolition of, &c.: Ques (Mr. Porter) 1149 (i).
Goderich Mail Contract, Tender *re* : Ques. (Mr. Gunn) 2493 (ii).
Green, Samuel H., Postmaster at Kaslo, ..., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 2331 (ii).
Hamilton Cove, P. O. Mail Service and Revenue : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7421 (iv).
Hamilton and Kilbride Mail Contractor, Distance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 9080 (v).
H. of C. Post Office, Locked Boxes, &c.: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 8387 (v).
International Postal Supply Co., Rent of Stamping Machines : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).
Inverness, N.S., Postmaster, Personal Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 8885 (v).
Kaslo, Dismissal of Mr. S. H. Green as Postmaster : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 2331 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Kent, Miss A., Dismissal as Postmistress at Kent, N.S. : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 2331 (i).

Kentvale Postmaster Sureties, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5977 (iv).

See 'Thessalon,' &c.

Killarney and Little Current Mail Service, Tenders *re* Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 3669 (ii).

Kingston, N.B., and Jubilee Station Mail Contract, Tenders *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 5133 (iii).

Lakeville and North Lake Mail Service, Complaints *re* : Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 9612 (v).

Lawson, Mr. Henry, Postmaster at Stanhope, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1062 (i).

——— Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. A. Martin) 1398 (i).

See 'Stanhope.'

Lefebvre, A. P., Dismissal from Markstay Post Office, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 7096 (iv).

Lennoxville Post Office, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4373 (iii).

Lesser Slave Lake Post Office, Establishment, Mail Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7018 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) in Com. on B. 69, 8163 (v).

Letter Carriers, Bonuses, &c., Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 215 (i).

——— Contract *re* Boots, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).

——— Payments on Sick Leave, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 173-6 (i).

——— Uniforms, Contracts *re* : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

Leverette, Geo. Milton, Postmaster, Kitley District, Partisan Conduct as Ret. Officer : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6240 (iv).

Lowville to Milton Mail Contract, Distance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 9080 (v).

Maccan Mail Contract, Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 188 (i).

Magog Post Office, Erection of : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5784 (iii).

Mail Bags, Locks, Repairs, &c., Contracts *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 205 (i).

Mails carried free by Rys.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 185 (i).

Mail Contracts, Tenders, Competition, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 179 (i).

Mail Delivery, Free System, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 729 (i).

Mail Service, P.O. in Com. of Sup., 219 (i), 6629 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Mail Service, Miscellaneous Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 9602 (v).

——— System of Payments : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).

Mail Subsidies *re* Newfoundland Service : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).

Melbourne and Upper Melbourne Mail Contract, Tenders *re* : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4372 (iii).

Melfort Mail Service, Complaint from Saskatchewan Board of Trade *re* Delays : Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9789 (v).

Mileage *re* Mail Service, Additional : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 184 (i).

Money transmitted through Mail, Par. in papers *re* Legislation : Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4807 (iii).

Montreal Post Office, Charges *re* Registered Letters : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 183 (i).

——— Illegal Stamping of Letter for Election Matters : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 194 ; Cor. read (Sir William Mulock) 194 (i).

——— Improvements, New Station : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 222 (i).

See 'Pneumatic.'

——— St. Catherine St. Branch, Unsanitary Condition : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 182 (i).

——— Stealing of Cheques, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 198 (i).

Musquodoboit Postmaster, Dismissal (remarks) on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6224 (iv).

——— Letter read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9613 (v).

Newfoundland Mail Subsidies : in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).

See 'Trade and Commerce,' &c.

Newpapers, Postage : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 179 (i).

Pneumatic Tube Installation in Montreal P. O. : in Com. of Sup., 1131 (i).

——— in Toronto P. O. : in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).

See 'Toronto.'

Postage Stamps and Bank Notes, Contract *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 204 (i).

Postal Business, Alberta District : M. for Ret. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 599 (i).

Postal Contracts, &c., Patronage for Hamilton, Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 6228 (iv).

Postal Rates, Increases, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 221 (i).

Postmasters acting as Political Partisans, Charges *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6240 (iv).

Postmasters Reduction of Salary : Remarks (Mr. Miller) in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Post Office, Dept., Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 95. 165 (i), 6240 (iv), 9058 (v).
——— Inspectors' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 144 (i).
——— Outside Service : in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).
——— Provisional Allowance : in Com. of Sup., 166 (i).
Post Office, Assessment System, Collections *re* : Ques. (Mr. Chisholm) 3671 (ii).
——— Official, Compassionate Allowance to P. Callery : in Com. of Sup., 6628 (ii).
——— Regulations to Postmasters *re* Distribution of Packages : Remarks (Mr. Barr) on M. for Sup., 6834 (iv).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Barr) 6961 (iv).
——— Rep. presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 54 (i).
Post Offices in N.W.T., Establishment of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 223 (i).
Powers, Jas., Postmaster at Wheatley River, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4374 (iii).
See 'Wheatley.'
P.E.I. Mail Service, Delays, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 1152 (i).
——— Letter from Mr. Pottinger : Read (Sir William Mulock) 1153 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Martin, P.E.I.) 280 (i.)
Railway Mail Clerks : in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).
See 'Dundas.'
Ramsay and New Ross Mail Service, Tenders *re* : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 9696 (v).
Rural Mail Delivery, Establishment in Can., Probable Cost, &c.: M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. Lennox) 2067 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 220 (i).
St. Abdon Post Office, Establishment of, Recommendation *re* : Ques. (Mr. Morin) 6653 (iv).
St. James Division Branch P. O. : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 218 (i).
See 'Montreal.'
Ste. Marguerite Postmaster, Dismissal of L. Laflamme : Ques. (Mr. Morin) 6477 (iv).
Shelburne Postmaster, Dismissal, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies (Mr. Barr) 595 (i).
Sherbrooke Post Office, Improvements, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 191 (i).
——— Postal Delivery Service : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 378 (i).
Stamping Machines : *See* 'International,' &c.
Stanhope, P.E.I., Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1062 (i).
——— Cor., Reps., &c. : M. for copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 1398 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Stanhope Postmaster, Dismissal, Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. Martin) 4810 (iii).
See 'Lawson.'
Thessalon Postmaster, Appnmt. and Sureties: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 6105 (iv).
——— Dismissal of W. J. Dobie : M. for Cor. (Mr. Boyce) 3202 (ii).
——— Irregularities, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) on M. for Sup., 6192 (iv).
——— Salary Warrants issued : Inquiry for (Mr. Boyce) 6239 (iv).
——— Papers laid on Table (Sir William Mulock) 6332 (iv).
——— further papers laid on Table (Sir William Mulock) 6646 (iv).
——— M. to reduce Salary (Mr. Foster) 9772 (v).
Toronto Post Office, Additional Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 1591 (i).
——— Pneumatic Postal Service, Contract *re*: Remarks (Mr. Hyman) 5921 (iii).
——— Contract *re* Trench (Mr. Foster) 5922 (iii).
——— Pneumatic Service : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5807 (iii).
Victoria Harbour Mail Contracts : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2191 (ii).
'Virginian's' Trip : *See* 'Canadian Fast Mail,' &c.
Waverley Postmaster, Duties and Residence, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5427 (iii).
Waverley, Postmaster, Personal Duties, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5807 (iii).
Wheatley River Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. James Power, Cor., &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 9698 (v).
See 'Power.'
Winter Mail Service : in Com. of Sup., 6467 (iv).
See 'Marine,' 'P.E.I.'
Yukon, Mail Service : in Com. of Sup., 203 (i).
——— Post Office Officials, Salaries, Living Allowances, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).
Poultry Raising on Experimental Farm : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6183 (iv).
Pound Net Licenses issued by Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 2892 (ii).
Pound Net Licenses, Little Current, Cor. between A. E. Dyment and Govt. *re* : M. for copies* (Mr. Crocket) 1399 (i).
Powers, Jas., Postmaster at Wheatley River, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4374 (iii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Presbyterian College of Halifax B. No. 123 (Mr. Sinclair) 1°*, 2681 ; 2°*, 3136 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 149.)

Prescott Lighthouse report, Total Area, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1148 (i).
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Immigration Agent, Salary, &c. : Reps., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 452 (i).
——— Immigration Office G.B., Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 592 (i).
——— Visit to Canada : Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 451 (i).
Preferential Tariff, Value of Imports, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 152 (i).
See 'Customs,' &c.
Preventive Service, *re* Excise : in Com. of Sup., 1688 (i).
Prime Minister, Salary Increase : *See* 'First Minister.'
Prince Albert, Court Room : in Com. of Sup., 124 (i).
——— Jail : in Com. of Sup., 481 (i).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
P.E.I. and Great Britain SS. Subsidy, Claims f SS. Cos. : in Com. of Sup., 927 (i).
P.E.I. and G.B. SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 7088 (iv).
——— Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7088 (iv).
P.E.I. Communication with Mainland : Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) Tel. read, &c., 831 (i).
P.E.I. Dredging, Number and Names of Harbours, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 148 (i).
P.E.I. Fisheries, Supervision, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1762 (i).
P.E.I. and Mainland SS. Communication, Train Service : Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 280, 697 (i).
P.E.I. Mail Service, Delays, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 1152 (i).
——— Letter from Mr. Pottinger : Read (Sir William Mulock) 1153 (i).
P.E.I. Delay in Mail Service : Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2203, 2261 (ii).
——— Explanation (Sir William Mulock) 2261 (ii).
P.E.I. Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions, Res. from Mar. Board of Trade : Read (Mr. Daniel) 907 (i).
P.E.I. Steam Communication, Contract with Steam Nav. Co. : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5316 (iii).
P.E.I. Steam Communication with Mainland, Delays, &c. : Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1595 (i).
——— Snow Blockade and Delay in Mails : Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 1753 (i).
P.E.I. Subsidy, Additional Grant, Cor., &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 3205 (ii).
P.E.I. and Mainland SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 919 (i).
P.E.I. and Newfoundland SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 940 (i), 7092 (iv).
P.E.I. and W. Indies SS. Subsidy, Amount paid, Representations *re* : Ques. (Mr. Martin, P.E.I.) 591 (i).
P.E.I. Tunnel, Delegation *re* : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6644 (iv).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Claims of Travellers *re* Refund of Expenses on account of Delay : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4807 (iii).
——— Cor., &c., since Confederation : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 9698 (v).
——— Investigation *re* Soundings, Tunnel, &c. : M. for Cor. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2778 (ii).
——— Str. 'Stanley,' Cor., &c. : M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies*, 916 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1338 (i).
——— Inspection of Str. 'Stanley' : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 687 (i).
P.E.I. Mount Stewart Shipping Facilities, Wharf Accommodation, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1763 (i).
P.E.I. Railway : in Com. of Sup., 2025, 2027 (ii), 8692 (v).
——— Bloomfield Agent's House : in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).
——— Branch Lines, Survey and Construction, Cor., &c. : M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies*, 916 (i).
——— Cardigan to Montague Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 9482 (v).
——— Claims for Damages, Amounts paid, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. Kemp) 383 (i).
——— Georgetown Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 9486 (v).
——— Land Expropriations, Papers laid on Table (Mr. Emmerson) 8528 (v).
——— Murray Harbour Branch Extension to Jan. 1st, 1905 : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 106 (i).
——— Murray Harbour Branch : in Com. of Sup., 7494 (iv), 9488 (v).
——— Stanley Bridge, &c., Surveys *re* : Ques. (Mr. Martin, P.E.I.) 266 (i).
——— Water Service Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 2170 (ii).
——— West Cape Branch Surveys : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 589 (i).
——— Working Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 6901, 6908 (iv).
See 'I.C.R.,' &c.
P.E.I. Tel. Co. : *See* 'Anglo-American.'
Printing Bureau, Addition to : in Com. of Sup., 1575 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6897 (iv).
——— Enlargement of and Outside Printing : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6948 (iv).

Printing Bureau, New Machinery Plant : in Com. of Sup., 9614 (v).

Printing, Miscellaneous : in Com. of Sup., 6723, 6901, 6948, 6957 (iv).

Prisoners, Maintenance of in N.W.T. : in Com of Sup., 122 (i).

Private Bills Pets., Extension of Time : (Mr. Grant) M. *re* Report, 318, 448 (i).

——— Remarks *re* Debating (Mr. Speaker) 318 (i).

——— M. to extend Time (Mr. Galiher) 4375 (iii).

——— M. (Mr. Gervais) 2203 (ii).

Private Bills, 12th Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Grant) 2491 (ii).

Private Cars, I.C.R., Number, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2258 (ii).

See 'Ry. Commission,' &c.

Privileges, Ques. of *re* Separate Schools : (Mr. Lake) 3649 (ii).

Privy Council Office : in Com. of Sup., 71 (i).

Privy Councillors : *See* 'Cabinet Ministers.'

Prohibitionist Principles, Charges by P.M.G. : Personal Explanation (Mr. Foster) 842 (i).

Prorogation, Date of : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9790 (v).

——— Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. : Read (Mr. Speaker) 9815 (v).

Protection to Women and Children, Amt. to Criminal Code *re* Wife Beaters : Ques. (Mr Ames) 591 (i).

'Protestants driven out of Quebec,' Ref. to in Autonomy Bill Speech (Mr. Lemieux) 3305 ; Reply (Mr. Sproule) 3306 (ii).

'Protestant Govt.,' Ref. to in Speech on Autonomy Bill : (Mr. Fielding) 3006 (ii).

Protestant Schools, Ref. to by Mr. Fielding : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Speech on Autonomy Bill, 3462 (ii).

Provident Savings Association incorp. B. No. 134 (Mr. Gervais) 1°*, 4370 ; 2°*, 4598 (iii) ; in Com. 5974 ; 3°*, 5976 (ii) : Sen. Amts., 9078 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 151.)

Provincial Autonomy *re* N. W. Ters., Cor. between Govts. : M. for Copies (Mr. Monk) 599 (i).

See 'Autonomy,'

Provincial Rights, Par. in 'Le Soleil' : (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjn.. 1745 (i).

Provincial Stocks in G. B. : *See* 'Colonial Stock Act.'

Provincial Subsidies, Discussion *re*, in Com. on Autonomy Bill, 5434 (iii).

Provincial Subsidies, Readjustment *re*, Memoranda, &c. : M. for Copies (Mr. Carvell) 2100 (ii).

Pryor, J. A., Relief B. No. 127 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 3091 ; 2°*, 3400 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 150.)

Public Accounts Com. : M. (Mr. McIsaac) 582 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Meeting, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 7100 (iv).

——— Calling Meeting, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 403 (i).

Public Accounts Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 97 (i).

Public Accounts, Reporting Evidence, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9616 (v).

——— Presented (Mr. Paterson) 50 (i).

Public Buildings, Comparison with U. S. System of Rentals : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1024 (i).

Public Buildings in Towns, Erection of, Amounts first voted, Population, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1398 (i).

——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. Foster) 4751 (iii).

——— Erected since Confederation, Cost, &c.: M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) for Ret.*, 1398 (i).

——— Govt. Policy *re* Construction : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 852 (i).

——— Govt. Policy *re* : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 1027 (i).

Public Functionaries, Salaries : *See* 'Lt. Governors.'

Public Works Act Amt. B. No. 54 (Mr. Hyman) 1° m., 819 ; 2°*, 1679 ; 3°*, 1806 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 32.)

Public Works Health Act : in Com. of Sup., 1845 (i).

Public Health, Organized Districts Quarantine : in Com. of Sup., 1841 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS :

Actonvale Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1101 (i).

Alexandria P. O., Contract *re*, Delay, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Macdonnell) 1760 (i).

Aliens employed on Govt. Works at Sault Ste. Marie : Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 1412 (i).

Allandale Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 9595 (v).

Amherstburg Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7546 (iv).

Amherst Pier, N.S., Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4371 (iii).

Anderson and Kennedy's Lake Outlets : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).

Annapolis, Queen's Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 9576 (v).

Anse à Beaufils Pier Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7285 (iv).

Anse aux Gris Fonds Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7285 (iv).

Anse St. Jean Pier Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7286 (iv).

Anse L'Ilot Landing Piers : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).

Antigonish Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 846, 1015 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Apple River Wharf, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 1727 (i), 7395 (iv).
Arbitration and Awards *re* Public Works : in Com. of Sup., 7611 (iv).
Architects for Military Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).
Architects for Public Works, Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7618 (iv).
Arichat (west) Landing Piers : in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Armouries, Generally, Construction of : in Com. of Sup., 1649 (i).
Armouries, Supervision and Control, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 423 (i).
Ashcroft and Dawson Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 6896 (iv).
Assay Office, Vancouver, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7720 (iv).
Baddeck Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7396 (iv), 9585 (v).
Banff, N.W.T., Water Works and Sewage Construction : in Com. of Sup., 9306 (v).
Barachois Boat Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7396 (iv).
Barachois de Malbaie Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).
Barrie (Allandale) Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 9595 (v).
Barrington Passage Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).
Barry's Wharf, Madawaska River : in Com. of Sup., 6873 (iv).
Bass River Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7397 (iv).
Batiscan Channel Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7322 (iv).
Battery Point Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 9552 (v).
Battleford Bridge, N.W.T., Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7587 (iv).
Bayfield Pier, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7546 (iv).
Bay St. Lawrence. Boat Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7397 (iv).
——— Telegraph Lines : in Com. of Sup., 7606 (iv).
Bear Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7397 (iv).
Beaujeu Bank Pier : in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Beaverton Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7546 (iv).
Beckerton Public Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7397 (iv).
Belle River Dredging Channel : in Com. of Sup., 7546 (iv).
Belle River Wharf, P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 9585 (v).
Belleville Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1547 (i).
Beloeil Guide Piers and Booms : in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Bersimis to Godbout Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 7608 (iv).
Bic Harbour Wharf at Pointe à Coté : in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).
——— Land purchased from P. Ross, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1850 (i).
Blanche River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7547 (iv).
Blind River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6870 (iv).
Boisdale Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9585 (v).
Bourgeois Inlet Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).
Bowmanville Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1549 (i).
Bracebridge Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7547 (iv).
Brandon Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1633 (i).
Brantford Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1550 (i).
Breakwaters, &c., N.S., Govt. Policy *re* : Remarks (Mr Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9553 (v). 9553 (v).
Breton Cove Boat Landing : in Com. of Sup., 7397 (iv).
Bridges, Dominion, Generally : in Com. of Sup., 7592 (iv).
Bridgeburg Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1550 (i).
Bridgewater Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Broad Cove, Harbour Works : in Com. of Sup., 7403 (iv).
——— Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Bronte Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7548 (iv).
Bryson Bridge Reconstruction : in Com. of Sup., 7585 (iv).
Buildings, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1641 (i), 6735 (iv).
——— Renewals, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1641 (i).
Buildings, Generally, Fuel, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6822 (iv).
——— Inspection by Architects, Clerks, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1642 (i).
——— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1670 (i).
Buildings, Manitoba : in Com. of Sup., 1633 (i), 9549 (v).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i), 7284 (iv).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 846, 1015 (i).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 1637 (i), 6734 (iv), 9550 (v).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 1547 (i), 9547 (v).
——— Ottawa : in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v). *See* 'Ottawa.'
——— Quebec : in Com. of Sup., 1101 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Buildings, Quebec, Renewals, Repairs, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1107 (i).
Burford Armoury : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com., 1649 (i).
Cacouna Wharf, Expenditure *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7096 (iv).
Calgary, Land Titles Office : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
——— Post Office Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
Campbellton, Public Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1048 (i).
——— Wharf, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1744 (i).
Canning Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Canso Public Building in Com. of Sup., 1023 (i).
Canton Fabre Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7288 (iv).
Cape Tormentine Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7497 (iv).
Carillon Work, Emplymt. of Labourers, Affidavit read *re* Political Influence : Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 6856 (iv).
See 'Canals,' &c.
Carlos Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Cascumpec Sandhills Channel, P.E.I., Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2773 (ii).
Chambord Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7289 (iv).
Champlain Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7290 (iv).
Chance Harbour Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7497 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Stockton) in Com. of Sup., 9588 (v).
Chateauguay River Dredging and Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 6847, 7322 (iv).
See 'St. Louis,' &c.
Chateau Richer Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7290 (iv).
——— Expenditure by Govt. for Public Works: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Morin) 109 (i).
——— Public Works, Dates of Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3202 (ii).
——— Removal of Obstruction : Remarks (Mr. Morin) 1154 (i).
——— Wharf, Expenditure by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 1015 (i).
See 'Montmorency.'
Chatham Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1551 (i).
——— Contract, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 587 (i).
Chezzetcook (east) Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Chicoutimi, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7377 (iv).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1106 (i).
Chilliwack Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Clark's Harbour, Removal of Rocks from Channel : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Clifton Breakwater Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7497 (iv).
Cobourg, Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1554 (i).
——— Piers, Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7548 (iv).
Collingwood, Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6879 (iv).
——— Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iv).
Columbia River, General Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Country Harbour, Removal of Obstructions : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Court Houses, &c., N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
Cow Bay, Fort Morien Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 7399 (iv).
Cow Bay Run Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7401 (iv).
Creosoted Timber for Piers and Breakwaters, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1737 (i).
Crowe's Landing Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9600 (v).
Culloden Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7401 (iv).
Cunningham Point Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Dams across Rivers, Govt. Policy *re*: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 6839 (iv).
Depot Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7552 (iv).
Descente Des Femmes, Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7307 (iv).
——— Tel. Lines : in Com. of Sup., 9604 (v).
Desjardins Wharf, Allumette Island : in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).
Devil's Island Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv), 9551 (v).
Digby Pier Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Dipper Harbour Breakwater, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7498 (iv), 9588 (v).
——— Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 912 (i).
Disraeli Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 9593 (v).
——— Expenditure *re* : Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 1729 (i).
Doucet's Landing, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6849, 7298 (iv).
Douglastown Isolated Block : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Dredges employed at Port Arthur, Expenditure, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 790 (i).
Dredges, Govt., Built at Toronto : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 2456 (ii).
Dredges used in Govt. Works, Expenditure *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 795 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Dredging, B.C., New Plant : in Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv).
Dredging Contracts, Govt. Policy *re* : Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 1419 (i)
Dredging Plant, Generally : in Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv), 9604 (v).
——— Man., New Plant : in Com. of Sup., 7577 (iv).
——— Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv).
——— Number of Vessels, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6890 (iv).
——— Ont. and Que., New Plant : in Com. of Sup., 7577 (iv).
——— working expenses : in Com. of Sup., 7579 (iv).
——— P.E.I., New Plant : in Com. of Sup., 7576 (iv).
——— New Vessel : in Com. of Sup., 6891 (iv).
Dredging Vessels, Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6890, 7576 (iv).
Drill Hall, Fredericton, Tenders *re* Construction : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 729 (i).
Durham Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7498 (iv).
Eastern Channel, St. Maurice River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7326 (iv).
East Templeton Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7300 (iv).
Echo Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9598 (v).
Economy Pile Wharf Extension : in Com. of Sup., 9579 (v).
Edmonton Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).
Edmonton and Qu'Appelle Tel. Lines : in Com of Sup., 7633 (iv).
Eel Cove Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
English River, Removal of Obstructions : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
Escoumain Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7303 (iv).
Fairford River Bed Outlet : in Com. of Sup., 7569 (iv).
Fernie, B.C., Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1641 (i).
Fort Lawrence Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 6838 (iv).
——— Name of Contractor, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5034 (iii).
Fort William Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 784 (i).
Ft. William and Port Arthur Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6900 (iv).
See 'Port Arthur,' &c.
Fraser River Ship Channel Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7574 (iv).
Fraserville Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7323 (iv).
Fredericton Military Buildings, Tender *re* Construction : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 728 (i).
Freeport Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Frude's Point Wharf Enlargement, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).
Gabarus Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Gatineau Point Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7303 (iv).
Gatineau River Slides and Booms : in Com. of Sup., 7630 (iv).
Georgeville Wharf Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Georgian Bay, Canal Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 7637 (iv).
——— Survey via French River, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9547 (v).
——— Surveys, Engineers Reps., &c. : Ques. (Mr. Brabazon) 192 (i).
Georgian Bay Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6886 (iv).
Gimli Wharf, Lake Winnipeg : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9577 (v).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1034 (i).
——— Purchase of Site : Ques. (Mr. Blain) 9697 (v).
Goderich Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7553 (iv).
Grand Bend, Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7553 (iv).
——— Delay in Building, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1344 (i).
Grand Mechins Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7303 (iv).
Grand Piles Dam, St. Maurice River : in Com. of Sup., 7326 (iv).
Grand River, Ont., Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6873 (iv).
Grand Rivière de Beaupré Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Great Salmon River Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7498 (iv).
Greece's Point Wharf, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 2063 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 7301 (iv).
See 'Carillon.'
Grondine's Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Grosse Isle, Hospital Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9608 (v).
——— Marconi System : in Com. of Sup., 9604 (v).
——— Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7305 (iv).
——— Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 1108 (i), 6734 (iv).
——— Quarantine Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 9604 (v).
Guelph Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1555 (i).
Haileybury Wharf Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 6887, 7556 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Half Island Cove Breakwater, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9584 (v).
Halifax, Detention Hospital : in Com. of Sup., 1037 (i).
——— Dom. Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1036 (i).
——— Immigrant Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1036 (i).
Hamilton Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1559 (i).
——— Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Harbours, Docks and Slides, Working Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Generally : in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
——— Man. : in Com. of Sup., 7569 (iv).
——— N.B. : in Com. of Sup., 1744 (i), 7497 (iv), 9588 (v).
——— N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 1727 (i), 6837, 7237, 7395 (iv), 9551 (v).
——— N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv), 9602 (v).
——— general repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
——— Ont. : in Com. of Sup., 6729, 6869, 7546, 7555 (iv), 9595 (v).
——— P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 1734 (i), 9585 (v).
——— Quebec : in Com. of Sup., 770 (i), 6436, 6839, 7285 (iv), 9590 (v).
Harrigan Cove Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7403 (iv).
Hawkesbury Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1560 (i).
Higgin's Shore Pier, P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 1734 (i).
Honora Wharf Freight Shed : in Com. of Sup., 9597 (v).
Honora Wharf Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 6887 (iv).
Howard's Cove, P.E.I., Surveys *re* Wharf : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4703 (iii).
Hull Wharf, Total Cost, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2064 (ii).
Huot, Mr. J., Payments to *re* L'Ange Gardien Beach : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1343 (i).
Indian Harbour Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7403 (iv).
Indian Harbour Wharf : Pet. *re*, Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8178 (v).
Inverness Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1040 (i).
Inverness Mines Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7403 (iv).
Irish Cove Wharf, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).
Isle Bizard Wharf Butments, Expenditure *re* : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 2067 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Janvrin's Island Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7406 (iv).
'J. I. Tarte,' Dredge, Defective Boilers, Accident, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2466 (ii).
Kamloops, Lower Nicola Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 7610 (iv).
Kelly's Cove Breakwater, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9582 (v).
Kincardine Harbour, Piers and Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7558 (iv).
'Kingsford,' Dredge, Cost of Operating : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 801 (i).
Kingston, Military Stables : in Com. of Sup., 1561 (i).
——— Royal Military Barracks : in Com. of Sup., 1560 (i).
Lachute Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1111 (i).
Lake Dauphin, Lowering : in Com. of Sup., 7569 (iv).
Lake St. Francis Outlet, Guide Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).
Lake St. John Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv).
Lake St. Peter Permanent Piers : in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv), 9171 (v).
Lake Temiscaming Wharfs : in Com. of Sup., 7559 (iv).
Lambert's Pier, P.E.I., Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4373 (iii).
Langly Wharf Protection Bank : in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
Laprairie Ice Piers : in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv), 9590 (v).
L'Ardoise Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 6838, 7407 (iv).
Larry's River Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Lavaltrie Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv).
Levis Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1112 (i).
L'Ile d'Alma, Removal of Point of Rock : in Com. of Sup., 7307 (iv).
Lindsay Drill Hall, Erection of : Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 271 (i).
Litchfield Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Little Current Channel, Georgian Bay : in Com. of Sup., 6886, 7859 (iv).
Little Judique Boat Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Little Pabos Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7307 (iv).
Little Rock Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Lloydminster Immigrant Building, N.W.T: in Com. of Sup., 6734 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
London, Barracks : in Com. of Sup., 1562 (i).
——— Drill Hall, Electric Wiring : in Com. of Sup., 6732 (iv).
——— Drill Hall, Sale of, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Elson) 8384 (v).
——— Military Stores, Magazine, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1562 (i).
——— Post Office Building : in Com. of Sup., 1563 (i).
Longueuil Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1113 (i).
Lotbiniere Wharf Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Louisburg, Old Fort, C.B., Preservation of : in Com. of Sup., 9170 (v).
Louise Embankment, Quebec Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 770 (i).
Lunenburg Dredging Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7408 (iv).
McPherson's Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1735 (i).
Mabou Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 7408 (iv).
Magdalen Island Breakwaters and Piers : in Com. of Sup., 7308 (iv).
Magog Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1114 (i).
Mahone Bay Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7408 (iv).
Mail Distributing Station, Montreal, Purchase of Site : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 915 (i).
Main a Dieu Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7409 (iv).
Malignant Cove Channel Piers : in Com. of Sup., 7409 (iv).
Manitoba Public Buildings : Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) in Com. of Sup., 857 (i).
Manitoulin Island, Silver Water Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9597 (v).
Marble Mountain Wharf, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9580 (v).
Margaree Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7409 (iv).
Margaretville Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7412 (iv).
Maskinonge River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6842, 7325 (iv), 9590 (v).
Matchedash Bay Channel Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iv).
Meaford Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iv).
——— M. A. Pigott's Claims : in Com. of Sup., 9599 (v).
Medicine Hat Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
Megantic Lake Piers : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
Meteghan Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).
Midland Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 9601 (v).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Midland Harbour, Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iv).
Military Buildings, Fredericton, Tenders *re* Construction : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 728 (i).
Mill Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).
Mille Vaches Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7310 (iv).
Miminegash Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1735 (i).
——— Contract *re* Repairs : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1350 (i).
——— Dredging, Commencement of Work : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3834 (ii).
Miscou Harbour Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7498 (iv).
Mistook Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7310 (iv).
Mont Louis Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7310 (iv).
Montmagny Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7311 (iv).
Montmorency Falls Cribwork : in Com. of Sup., 7311 (iv).
Montmorency, Wharf Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 6852 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re* by Govt. : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 1015 (i).
See 'Chateau Richer.'
Montreal, Barracks : in Com. of Sup., 1118 (i).
——— Examining Warehouse : in Com. of Sup., 1119 (i).
——— Harbour, Raising of Sunken Elevator : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 151 (i).
——— Inland Revenue Building : in Com. of Sup., 1119 (i).
——— Military Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1125 (i).
——— Post Office, Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1127 (i).
——— P. O., Pneumatic Installation, System : in Com. of Sup., 1131 (i).
——— Postal Station : Remarks in Com. of Sup.. 1128 (i).
Montreal, Quebec, &c., Harbours, Dues and Charges *re* Transportation Problem : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Moosejaw Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
Mount Stewart, P.E.I., Wharf : Remarks : (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 9585 (v).
Mud Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7500 (iv).
Narrows Lake, Quarry Channel : in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).
New Campbellton Ballast Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).
New Carlisle Wharf, Pier Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7312 (iv).
Newcastle Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).
Neepawa Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
New London, P.E.I., Breakwater Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 1735 (i).
Newport Breakwater Extension, Que. : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Newport Landing Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).
Nicolet Pier Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7313 (iv).
Noel Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).
North Bay Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1563 (i).
North Thompson River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
——— Improvements *re* Navigation, Expenditure, &c. : Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5783 (iii).
Notre Dame du Portage Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Ogden's Pond Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).
Oliphant Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).
Orillia Public Building, Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).
Oshawa, Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 9600 (v).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1564 (i).
Otonabee River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
Ottawa, Alexandra Bridge, Lighting, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 7586 (iv).
Ottawa Bridges : in Com. of Sup., 6889 (iv).
——— Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7585 (iv).
Ottawa Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 603, 754 (i), 6814 (iv), 9550 (v).
——— Additions to Eastern Block : in Com. of Sup., 9547 (v).
——— Archives Building, Erection of : in Com. of Sup., 603 (i).
———Art Gallery : in Com. of Sup., 7618 (iv).
——— Astronomical Observatory, Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
——— Buildings leased by Govt., Location, Taxes paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 379 (i).
——— Carpets purchased, Quantity, Value, Duty paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Osler) 8266 (v).
——— Clerks of Works, Salaries, &c., Dom. Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1642 (i).
——— Coal Sheds : in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).
——— Corry Block, Rental, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6818 (iv).
——— Deptl. Buildings, Purchase of Site, &c. (Stmnt.) : in Com. of Sup., 9605 (v).
——— Drill Hall, Increased Accommodation : Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 271 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Ottawa Buildings, Elevator Attendance : in Com. of Sup., 1667 (i), 6916 (iv), 9551 (v).
——— Engineers, Draughtsmen, &c., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6895 (iv), 9382 (v).
——— Engineers, Firemen, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6822 (iv).
——— Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6817 (iv).
——— Geological Museum : in Com. of Sup., 754 (i).
——— electric lighting, contract *re* : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 760 (i).
——— Grounds, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6817 (iv).
——— Heating, Engineers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1667 (i), 6816 (iv).
——— H. of C., Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).
——— House of Commons, Remodelling, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
——— ventilation of Chamber : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7812 (iv), 8695 (v).
——— Library Accommodation in Archives Building : Remarks (Mr. Hyman) in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).
———Library, Extension : in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
——— remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).
——— Lighting Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 6816 (iv).
——— Lighting Plant, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1667 (i).
——— Major's Hill Park, Maintenance : in Com. of Sup., 6817 (iv).
——— Mint Building : in Com. of Sup., 606 (i).
——— Parliament Buildings, Additions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
——— Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, &c.: M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5785 (iii).
——— Post Office Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9551 (v).
——— Post Office, Restoration and Addition to : in Com. of Sup., 1573 (i).
——— Printing Bureau, Addition to : in Com. of Sup., 1575 (i).
——— Rentals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1663 (i), 6818 (iv).
——— Rentals : List read (Mr. Hyman) in Com. of Sup., 1663 (i), 9605 (v).
——— Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iv).
——— Rideau Hall, Improvements, Grounds, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6823 (iv), 9550 (v).
——— Steel Shelving : in Com. of Sup., 1564 (i).
———Telephone Service : in Com. of Sup., 1669 (i), 6814 (iv).
——— Treasury Vaults : in Com. of Sup., 6825 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Ottawa Buildings, Western Deptl. Block, Addition to : in Com. of Sup., 766 (i).

Ottawa River Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 7612 (iv).

Ottawa, Wharf at Foot of Rideau Canal : in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).

Owen Sound, Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6886 (iv).

——— Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9600 (v).

——— Harbour Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).

——— P.O., Site *re* : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 1029 (i).

——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 9547 (v).

Parker's Cove Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9552, 9576 (v).

Parrsboro, Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9579 (v).

——— Landing Pier Addition: in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).

Parry Sound Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7562 (iv).

Peel Head Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).

Pelee Island Cable Line : in Com. of Sup., 7609 (iv).

Pembroke Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).

Pembroke Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7562 (iv).

Penetanguishene Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7563 (iv).

Penitentiary Coal Contracts, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com.of Sup., 478 (i).

Perce (North Cove) Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).

Peribonca (Petite Riviere) Removal of Snags: in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).

Peterborough Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1578 (i).

Petewawa Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7562 (iv).

Petit Rocher Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7500 (iv).

Petite Riviere Improvements, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9580 (v).

Phinney's Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 9552 (v).

Pierreville Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6868 (iv).

Piers and Bridges, General Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7305 (iv).

Piers and Breakwaters, P.E.I., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1737 (i).

Pleasant Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).

Plympton Breakwater Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).

Pointe du Chene Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7500 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Point Edward Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6869, 7563 (iv).

Point Prim Island Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 1736 (i).

Poirierville Landing Pier, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).

Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Tender of Conmee & Bowman : M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4458, 4645 (iii).

——— Fort William and Kaministiquia Harbours, Amount of Expenditure : M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Hughes) 1398 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1065 (i).

——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. Boyce) 2685 (ii).

——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. S. Hughes) 4921 (iii).

Port Arthur Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 784 (i).

Port Bruce Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7563 (iv).

Port Burwell, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7563 (iv).

——— Contractor, Prices paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 589 (i).

——— Dredging Contract, Purchase of Dredge, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 8656 (v).

Port Credit Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6871 (iv).

Port Dover Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).

Porter's Lake Boat Channel to Three Fathom Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 9583 (v).

Port Greville Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).

Port Hastings Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7414

Port Hawkesbury Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6837 (iv).

Port Hood Harbour, Northern Entrance : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).

——— Breakwater, Estimated Cost, Approval, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5132 (iii).

Port Hope Piers and Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).

Port La Tour Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7415 (iv).

Portneuf Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).

Port Perry Dredging, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Christie) 2190 (ii).

Port Stanley, Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).

——— Tenders *re* : Ques. (Mr. Macdonnell) 1760 (i).

Prince Albert Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).

P.E.I. Dredging, Number and Names of Harbours, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1148 (i.)

P.E.I. Mount Stewart Shipping Facilities, Wharf Accommodation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1763 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Public Buildings in Towns, Erection of, Amounts first voted, Population, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1398 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4751 (iii).
Public Buildings erected since Confederation, Cost, &c.: M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) for Ret.*, 1398 (i).
——— Govt. Policy *re* Construction : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 852 (i).
Public Works, Balance of Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 7628 (iv).
——— Clerical Assistance : in Com. of Sup., 7620 (iv), 9605 (v).
——— Contracts, Names of Tenderers, &c.: M. (Mr. Lewis) for Ret.*, 916 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 94 (i), 6724 (iv), 9071 (v).
——— Deptl. Rep., Date of Issue, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) 755 (i).
——— Deptl. Rep., Delay in bringing down : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 601 (i).
——— Presented (Mr. Hyman) 731 (i).
Public Work Labourers, Political Partisans : Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 6859 (iv).
Public Works and Marine Dept., Line of Demarcation *re* Works : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6841 (iv).
——— in Com. of Sup., 9171 (v).
Public Works, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1727 (i).
Public Works, Portfolio, Appnmt. of Minister, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5961, 6047 (iv).
——— Acting Minister, Unconstitutionality of: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1936 (i).
——— Cabinet Vacancy : M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjn., 5471 (iii).
——— Minister, Rumoured Resignation : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5035 (iii).
——— Returns : Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 9688 (v).
——— Supervision, Charges, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7588 (iv).
——— Technical Books, Purchase, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7627 (iv).
Pugwash, N.S., Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).
Quaco Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iv).
Qu'Appelle and Edmonton Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 6893 (iv).
Quebec Drill Hall, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1145 (i).
Quebec Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 770 (i), 6724 (iv).
——— Transfer to Mar. Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 771 (i).
Quebec, Immigration Pier : in Com. of Sup., 1138 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Quebec, Trachoma Hospital : in Com. of Sup., 1138 (i), 9547 (v).
Rama Wharf on Lake Couchiching: in Com. of Sup., 9602 (v).
Rapide Plat Enlargement, Upper Entrance : in Com. of Sup., 6289 (iv).
Ray's Creek, N.S., Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9576 (v).
Red Deer Court House, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1639 (i).
Red Point Wharf, P.E.I.,: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 9586 (v).
Regina Post Office Customs House, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1639 (i).
Repentigny Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Richelieu Bridge at Sorel, Inquiry for O.C., &c. (Mr. Foster) 8098 (v).
——— Papers laid on Table, 8268 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Sup., 6960 (iv).
Richelieu River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7376 (iv).
Richibucto, Extension Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iv).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 6730 (iv).
——— explanation (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup., 6813 (iv).
Richmond Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 1738
Rimouski Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7320 (iv).
River Hebert Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).
Rivière du Lièvre, Little Rapids Dam: in Com. of Sup., 7325 (iv).
——— Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6839 (iv).
Ottawa River Wharf at Rivière du Lièvre : in Com. of Sup., 7375 (iv).
Rivière du Loup Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7323 (iv).
Rivière Ouelle Pier Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7375 (iv).
Rivière aux Renards Breakwater Pier : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Rivière Verte Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
Roads and Bridges, Ottawa : in Com. of Sup., 6889 (iv).
Rondeau Harbour Works, Tenders *re* : Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1761 (i).
——— Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
Rosseau Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9600 (v).
Round Hill Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9552 (v).
Rustico Harbour Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1738 (i).
Rustico Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1593 (i).
St. Alexis, Ha Ha Bay Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
St. Alphonse de Bagotville Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6868 (iv).
St. Alphonse Wharf, Que. : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
St. Andrè de Kamouraska Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
St. Angel Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1759 (i).
St. Anicet and Ste. Barbe Waterways : in Com. of Sup., 7380 (iv).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière Pier Reconstruction: in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
St. Boniface Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).
St. Catharines Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1578 (i).
St. Charles Borromèe Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
Ste. Famille Wharf, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1149 (i).
Ste. Famille Wharf Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
Ste. Fidele Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
St. Francis Lake (Beauce) Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
St. François, Isolated Block : in Com. of Sup., 7391 (iv).
St. François Wharf, Expenditure *re* in Sept., Oct. and Nov., 1904 : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1343 (i).
St. Francois de Sales Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7391 (iv).
St. Fulgence Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7392 (iv).
St. Gèdèon Island Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7392 (iv).
St. Geneviève Piers : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
St. Ignace Channel Dam, Plan, Completion, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 592 (i).
St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
St. Jean, Orleans Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).
St. John, Drill Hall, N.B. : in Com. of Sup., 1049 (i), 7503 (iv).
——— Detention Building : in Com. of Sup., 1050 (i).
——— Harbour, N.B. : in Com. of Sup., 9588 (v).
——— Harbour Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7503 (iv).
——— Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 1052 (i).
——— River Tidal Waters : in Com. of Sup., 7503 (iv).
——— Tidal Water, Contribution *re* Wharfs : in Com. of Sup., 9590 (v).
——— Tributaries : in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
St. Johns, P.Q., Military Hospital, Contract *re* Repairs, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5687 (iii).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1143 (i).
St. Joseph's Pier, Lake Huron, Delay *re* Completion : Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2774 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Dredging, St. Mary's Current : in Com. of Sup., 814 (i).
St. Lawrence (lower) Removal of Rock : in Com. of Sup., 7308 (iv).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Suction Dredge, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6437 (iv).
——— Description Read (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 6447 (iv).
St. Louis River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7379 (iv).
See 'Chateauguay,' &c.
St. Mary's Current, St. Lawrence Channel, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 814 (i).
St. Mary's Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1578 (i).
St. Maurice River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6851, 7326 (iv).
St. Maurice District Slides and Booms : in Com. of Sup., 7579 (iv).
St. Peter's Bay Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1739 (i).
St. Peter's Breakwater, P.E.I., Tenders *re*, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5035 (iii).
St. Simeon Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).
St. Therèse Island, Dredging : in Com. of Sup. 7376 (iv).
St. Timothèe Wharf, Repairs, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7305 (iv).
Sacrè Coeur Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
Saguenay River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7377 (iv).
Salmon River, B.C., Removal of Obstructions: in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
Sandwich Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1579 (i).
Sarnia, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
——— Post Office Building : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 862 (i).
Saskatchewan (North) River Survey : in Com. of Sup., 9602 (v).
Saskatoon Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1640 (i), 9550 (v).
Saugeen River, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 9602 (v).
——— Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie, Dredging Govt. Dock, Total Amount expended, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5426 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6881 (iv).
Savage Harbour, P.E.I., Proposed Improvements : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3361 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Scott's Bay Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7415 (iv).
Seaforth Post Office : Remarks (Mr. Gunn) in Com. of Sup., 858 (i).
Selkirk Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1634 (i).
——— Wharf : Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Severn River, Removal of Obstructions at Macdonald's Chute : in Com. of Sup., 9602 (v).
Shelburne Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Shelburne Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1043 (i).
Shellmouth Bridge, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7591 (iv).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1139 (i).
——— Immediate Erection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5784 (iii).
——— Purchase of Land, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Worthington) in Com. of Sup., 427 (i).
Simcoe Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1581 (i).
Skinner's Cove Boat Channel and Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Slides and Booms, Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 7579 (iv).
——— Revenue collected : in Com. of Sup., 7629 (iv).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf . in Com. of Sup., 9593 (v).
——— Dredge Building, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 790 (i).
——— Ice Piers : in Com. of Sup., 6841 (iv).
——— Shipyard, Expenditure *re* Wages, Supplies, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 1399 (i).
——— Shipyard, Purchase of Supplies : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 2457 (ii).
Souris Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).
Spanish River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
Stokes Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9598 (v).
Stratford Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1581 (i).
Strathcona Horse Barracks : in Com. of Sup., 1637 (i).
Summerside Harbour Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1739 (i).
Summerville Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Surveys and Inspection *re* Public Works : in Com. of Sup., 7611 (iv).
Sydney Mines P.O.: in Com. of Sup. 1045 (i).
Sydney, Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1044 (i).
——— Quarantine Station Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Taché, J. C., Special Remuneration *re* Tel. Service : in Com. of Sup., 6897 (iv).
Tatamagouche Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9579 (v).
Telegraph Lines, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7635 (iv).
——— Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 7606 (iv).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6893 (iv).
——— Que: in Com. of Sup., 9604 (v).
Telegraph Service, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 7620 (iv).
Temiscaming Lake, Baie des Pères Wharf: in Com. of Sup. 7287 (iv).
Terrebonne Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7394 (iv).
Thames River Dredging : Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 6872 (iv).
Thessalon Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
Thornbury Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
Three Fathom Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Tignish Breakwater, Tenders *re*, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 7018 (iv).
Toney River, N.S., Boat Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).
Toronto, Customs House, Alterations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1581 (i).
——— Drill Hall, Additional Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 1582 (i).
——— Examining Warehouse, Addition to : in Com. of Sup., 1583 (i).
——— Harbour, Eastern Entrance : in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
——— Harbour, Expenditure from 1880 to 1904 : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 403 (i).
——— Harbour Island Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7567 (iv)
——— Harbour, Straightening of Don River: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. of Sup., 6888 (iv).
——— Harbour Works, Tender *re* Breakwater at Eastern Gap: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1761 (i).
——— Meteorological Building, Erection of : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1149 (i).
——— Military Buildings, Barracks, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1589 (i).
——— Postal Station 'C' Quarters : in Com. of Sup., 1592 (i).
——— Post Office, Erection of a new Building : Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for Sup., 6833 (iv).
——— Post Office, Land, Pneumatic Plant, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).
Trachoma Hospitals in Quebec : in Com. of Sup., 1138 (i), 9547 (v).
Transportation Facilities, Georgian Bay Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 7637 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Transportation Problem and Wharf Buildings : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Trenton, Dredging Trent River : in Com. of Sup., 9600 (v).
Valleyfield Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1144 (i).
Vancouver Island and Salt Spring, Telephone Line : in Com. of Sup., 7610 (v).
Vancouver Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1642 (i).
Victoria Beach Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Victoria Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
Virden Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1634 (i).
Wallace Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Wharf Building, Policy of Govt.: Remarks (Mr Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Wharfs Construction : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 8178 (v).
Wharfs in Tidal Waters : in Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).
Whitby Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6880 (iv).
Whitby Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Christie) 2190 (ii).
White Head Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
White Mud River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Wiarton Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7569 (iv).
Williams Head Quarantine Station Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7576 (iv).
Winnipegosis Channel Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Winnipeg, Customs Examining Warehouse : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).
——— Immigration Building : in Com. of Sup., 1635 (i), 9550 (v).
——— Military Buildings, N.C.O. Quarters : in Com. of Sup., 1635 (i).
——— Postal Station : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).
——— Post Office, Land and Building : in Com. of Sup., 1636 (i).
Wolfville Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Wood Island, Protection to Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1743 (i).
Woodstock, N.B., Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1057 (i).
——— Ownership of Land, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 4920 (iii).
Yamaska River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7394 (iv).
Yarmouth Harbour Retaining Walls : in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Yukon-Ashcroft-Dawson Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 7635 (iv), 9605 (v).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Yukon Buildings, Maintenance, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i).
Yukon Telegraph Lines : in Com. of Sup., 6896 (iv).
Pugwash, N.S., Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).
Quaco Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iv).
'Quadra,' Str., Repairs to : in Com. of Sup., 9171 (v).
Qu'Appelle and Edmonton Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 6893 (iv).
Quarantine, Cattle : in Com. of Sup., 6690; conc., 6911 (iv).
Quarantine, Health of Animals : in Com. of Sup., 2309 (ii).
Quarantine : in Com. of Sup., 1838 (i).
Quarantine Officers, Instructions *re* Examination of Ships : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 2304 (ii).
Quarantine, Organized Districts, Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2302 (ii).
Quebec and Blanc Sablon Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 937 (i), 9617 (v).
Quebec Bridge and G. T. Pacific Construction : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2296, 2298 (ii).
Quebec Centre Electoral District, Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 110 (i).
Quebec Drill Hall, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1145 (i).
Quebec and Gaspé Basin SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 926 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners' Act Amt. B. No. 37 (Mr. Préfontaine) 1°, 582 ; 2° m., 1242 ; in Com., 1243 ; 3°*, 1244 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 33.)
Quebec Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 770 (i), 6724 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Works, Transfer to Mar. Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 771 (i).
Quebec Immigration Pier : in Com. of Sup., 1138 (i).
Quebec Military School, Improvement of : Remarks (Mr. O. E. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 9162 (v).
Quebec and Natashquan SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
Quebec Port and Pilotage B. No. 171 (Mr. Préfontaine) 1°*, 7018 ; 2°*, 7440 ; in Com., 7440 ; 3°*, 7444 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 34.)
Quebec Trachoma Hospital : in Com. of Sup., 1138 (i), 9547 (v).
Questions answered by Ministers : Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 1067 (i).
Quinquennial Census, Alberta and Saskatchewan : in Com. of Sup., 9608 (v).

Railway Act (Express Cos.) Amt. B. No. 4 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1°*, 9 ; on Order for 2°, 109 (i) ; Remarks, 3246 ; wthdn., 3743 (ii).
Railway Act (crossings) Amt. B. No. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) 1°*, 9 ; 2° m., 281 ; M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 312, agreed to (Y. 85, N. 45) 315; in Com., 1780 (i). 3223 (ii).
Railway Act (ry. comn., chairman, &c.) Amt. B. No. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) Res. prop., 319 ; M. for Com., 493, 535 ; in Com., 563 ; 1°*, of B., 582 ; 2° m., 745 ; in Com., 1596 ; 3° m., 1802 ; Amt. (Mr. Lennox), Neg. (Y. 47, N. 93) 1806 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 35.)
——— Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 320 (i).
——— Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) *re* Express Companies, 1619 ; Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Amt. (Mr. Maclean) 1621 (i); Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 1632 (i).
Railways and Canals, Dept. of, B. No. 53 (Mr. Emmerson) 1° m., 817 ; 2°*, 1673 ; in Com., 1673 ; 3°*, 1806 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 37.)
Ry. Act (express Companies) Amt. B. No. 4 (Mr. Maclean) on M. to adjn. : Remarks (Mr. Maclean) 3246 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 109 (i).
Railways and Canals, Dep. Minister, Appnmt. of Mr. Butler and Superannuation of Mr. Schreiber, Duties assigned to, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9678 (v).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep. : Presented (Mr. Emmerson) 908 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 93, 1219 (i), 9061 (v).
——— Extra Clerks, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 1521 (i).
——— Miscellaneous Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 1520 (i).
Railways and Canals, Subsidized by Govt., Amount expended, &c. : M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Ret.*, 916 (i).
Railway Belt Lands, B.C., Settlement *re* Abuses under Crown Timber Regulations : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9295 (v).
Railway Commission, Appnmt. of Chairman : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 54 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Private Car : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1538 (i).
——— Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Lennox) 2007, 2685 (ii) 6136 (iv).
——— Maintenance, Appnmts., &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1524 (i).
——— Names of Employees, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Perley) 403 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 684 (i).
——— Salaries paid, Private Secs., &c. : Ques. (Mr. Blain) 687 (i).
——— Official Cars, Legal Expenses, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 593 (i).
Railway Commission, Re-hearing of N. W. Cases : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 56 (i).
——— Rental of Rooms : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1542 (i).
Railway Commission Rep., Opinion of Min. of Jus. *re* : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6233 (iv).
——— Non-Production of, on M. for Sup. (Mr. Lennox) 6233 (iv).
——— Report : Presented (Mr. Emmerson) 6346 (iv).
——— Staff Salaries and Rep. of Mr. Blair : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1539 (i).
Railway Mail Clerks : in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Railway Passes, Certificate of Identification for Members : M. (Mr. Bergeron) 7249 (iv).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Committee, 4984 (iii).
See 'Rys.—Freight.'
Railway Rep., Delay in bringing down : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 601 (i).
Railway Statistics : in Com. of Sup., 1521 (i).
Railway and Steamboat Accidents, 1904, Investigation *re* Causes, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Martin) 1397 (i).
Ry. Surveys for Joliette Co., Total Expenditure, &c., *re* : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1346 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 2065 (ii).
RAILWAYS :
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s Claims for Damages, Amounts paid, &c. Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2063 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) 7021 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 9382 (v).
Canada Atlantic Ry., Purchase : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Haggart) 2685 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Haggart) 69 (i).
See 'C. A. Ry.'
Canada Eastern Ry. Improvements of Roadbed : Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 1978 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 734 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 4811 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1922 (i).
C. P. R. Land Taxation, *re* Municipalities, Judgment of Sup. Court : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 2022 (ii).
Caplin and Paspebiac Ry., Payments *re* Subsidy : M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 3203 (ii).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Co., Passenger Rates, Ref. to Ry. Commission : Remarks (Mr. Herron) 6836 (iv).
Freight Rates, Advancement of Rebate : Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 1545
——— Discrimination, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 890 (i).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*
Gratuities to Ry. Employees : in Com. of Sup., 2183 (ii).
See 'I.C.R.', &c.
Jacques Cartier Survey, Costs, Reports, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 593 (i).
James Bay Ry., Deviation of Line, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Grant) 9697 (v).
——— Maps or Plans *re* Location, Filing of : Ques. (Mr. Grant) 2190 (ii).
Joliette Co., Ry. Surveys, Total Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1346 (i).
See 'Ry. Surveys.'
McGill University, Grant to Ry. Transportation School : in Com. of Sup., 9381 (v).
Madoc and Eldorado Ry. Bonus, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 7261 (iv).
National Transcontinental : *See* 'G. T. P.'
New Brunswick Southern Ry., Negotiations *re* Purchase, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 584 (i).
Passenger and Freight Rates, Advancement of, Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 1542 (i).
Père Marquette Ry., Emplymt. of Aliens, Rep. *re* : Laid on Table (Sir William Mulock) 6232 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Ingram) 7916 (iv).
Railways and Canals, Subsidized by Govt., Amount expended, &c.: M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Ret*, 916 (i).
Railway Belt Lands, B.C.. Settlement *re*, Abuses under Crown Timber Regulations : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9295 (v).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Committee, 4984 (iii).
See 'Freight Rates.'
Railway Statistics : in Com. of Sup., 1521 (i).
Railway Surveys in Joliette Co., Engineers, Salaries, Instructions, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 2065 (ii).
Tariff *re* Freight Rates Advancement : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1544 (i).
Rama Wharf on Lake Couchiching : in Com. of Sup., 9602 (v).
Ramsay and New Ross Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 9696 (v).
Rapide Plat Enlargement Upper Entrance : in Com. of Sup., 6289 (iv).
Ray's Creek, N.S., Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9576 (v).
Receipts and Expenditures, I. C. R., Total Amount : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 688 (i).
Receiver General's Office : in Com. of Sup., 6249 (iv).
Red Deer Court House, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1639 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. No. 76 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 1671 ; 2° m., 1757 (i) ; in Com., 2325 ; 3°*, 2325 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 152.)
Red Point Wharf, P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 9586 (v).
Regina and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 41 (Mr. Scott) 1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2325 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 153.)
Regina Jail : in Com. of Sup., 481 (i).
Regina Post Office, Customs House, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1639 (i).
Reid, Capt., Rep. *re* Submarine Signals : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2886 (ii).
See 'Marine.'
Repentigny Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Reports, Deptl. Delay in Printing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1575 (i).
REPORTS :
Agriculture : Presented (Mr. Fisher) 321 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s, Part I : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 109 (i).
——— Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 271 (i).
Census (1901) : Presented (Mr. Fisher) 50 (i).
Civil Service Examiners : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5428 (iii).
Civil Service Insurance Act, Statement : Presented (Mr. Paterson) 54 (i).
Civil Service List : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 51 (i).
Dom. Police Commissioner's Report : Presented (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 54 (i).
Geographical Board of Canada : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 625 (i).
Indian Affairs : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 111 (i).
Inland Revenue : Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 51 (i). 4085 (iii).
Interior : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 453 (i).
Justice (Penitentiaries) : Presented (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 271 (i).
Marine and Fisheries : Presented (Mr. Préfontaine) 111 (i).
Militia, King's Regulations and Orders : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 54 (i).
Post Office : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 54 (i).
Public Works : Presented (Mr. Hyman) 731
Secretary of State : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5428 (iii).
Trade and Commerce : Presented (Mr. Paterson) 50, 321 (i).
Reptile Fund, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1576 (i).
Resignation of Conservative Ministers in 1896 : Personal Explanation (Messrs. Foster, Haggart and Taylor) 841 (i).
Resignation of Hon. C. Sifton : *See* 'Sifton,' 'Autonomy.'

Restigouche Bridge, Repairs, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 9385 (v).
Returns and Reports : Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1242 (i).
——— Delay in Producing : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1594 (i).
Returns : Inquiry for, 2262 (ii), 4751 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 5600 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. S. Hughes) 5209 (iii).
Ret. Officers' Dep., Delay in Payments to, Letter from Mr. Walker : Read (Mr. W. J. Roche) 6560 (iv).
Returning Officers for Mackenzie and Dauphin, Man., Special Reps., Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1336 (i).
Returning Officers, Forms and Instructions *re* Dom. Elections : M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 697 (i).
——— Instructions *re* Form of Oath at London and Oxford Elections : M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7331 (iv).
Revenue Collections, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 2204 (ii).
Revenue collected in N. W. Ters., Customs and Inland Rev. : M. for Ret. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 600 (i).
Revenue Cruisers for Customs : in Com. of Sup., 409 (i).
Richelieu Bridge at Sorel : Inquiry for O. C., &c. (Mr. Foster) 8098 (v).
——— Papers laid on Table, 8268 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Sup., 6960 (iv).
Richelieu River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7376 (iv).
Richibucto, Extension Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iv).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 6730 (iv).
——— explanation (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup., 6813 (iv).
Richmond Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 1738
Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s B. No. 103 (Mr. Tobin) 1°*, 2184; on Order for 2°, 2296 ; 2°*, 2297 ; in Com. 3669 ; 3°*, 3669 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 154.)
Rideau Canal Extension : in Com. of Sup., 1333 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1523 (i).
Rideau Hall, Grounds, Renewals, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).
——— Improvements, Grounds, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6823 (iv).
See 'Ottawa,' &c.
Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Change in Boundaries, &c. : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9298 (v).
Rifle Associations, Grants : in Com. of Sup., 444 (i), 9169 (v).
Rimouski Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7320 (iv).
Ritchie, James, Inspection of Masonry *re* Trent Canal, Dismissal, &c. : M. for Cor.* (Mr. Foster) 2777 (ii).
See 'Canals.'
River Hebert Wharf, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).
Riviere du Lievre, Little Rapids Dam, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6839, 7325 (iv).
Riviere du Loup Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7323 (iv).
Riviere Ouelle Pier Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7375 (iv).
Riviere Ouelle Spur Line, Extension, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Barker) in Com. of Sup., 1981 (i).
Riviere aux Renards Breakwater Pier : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Riviere Verte Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
Roads and Bridges, Ottawa : in Com. of Sup., 6889 (iv).
Roads and Road Allowances (Alberta and Saskatchewan) B. No. 195 (Mr. Oliver) 1° m., 9075 ; 2° m., 9525 ; in Com., 9526 ; 3°*, 9529; Sen. Amts., 9819 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 38.)
Robert & Co., Lumber purchased, Prices, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 2711 (ii).
Robertson, Mr. D., Appnmt. as Harbour Master for Moncton : Ques. (Mr. Stockton) 2329 (ii).
Rolled Oats : in Com. on Customs Bill, 9763 (v).
——— in Com. on Ways and Means, 8984 (v).
Rolling Stock Equipment, I.C.R., Number added 1900-4 : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 736 (i).
Rolling Stock, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1986 (i), 2037 (ii), 6428 (iv).
——— Stmnt. of Estimated Cost : Read in Com. of Sup., 9501 (v).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
——— Tenders *re* : Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1761 (i).
Rosseau Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9600 (v).
Ross Rifles, Examination of, &c. : Remarks (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9123 (v).
Ross Rifle Factory, Tank on Martello Tower : Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 431 (i).
Round Hill Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9552 (v).
Rouse, Mr. David, Appnmt. as Customs Collector, Salary, &c. : Ques. Mr. U. Wilson) 452 (i).
Royal Assent : *See* 'Bills.'
Royal Military College Act Amt. B. No. 169 (Sir Frederick Borden) Res. prop., 6904 ; in Com. on Res., 6966 ; 1°* of B., 6984 ; 2°*, 7262 ; in Com., 7262 ; 3°*, 7262 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 39.)

Royal Military College : in Com. of Sup., 7000 (iv), 9170 (v).
——— Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1561 (i).
Royal Mint : *See* 'Mint.'
Royal Scots Armoury, Military Properties : in Com. of Sup., 9169 (v).
Royal Trust Co., Ref. to in Com. on B. 99 (Mr. Fielding) 3651 (ii).
Running Time, I.C.R., Connections at Montreal: Remarks (Mr. Morin) 6831 (iv).
Rural Mail Delivery, Establishment in Can., Probable Cost, &c.: M. for Reps., &c., (Mr. Lennox) 2067 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery System : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 220 (i).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Rustico Harbour, Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1738 (i).
——— Dredging, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1593 (i).
Ryan, Heber W., Emplymt. by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 4458 (iii).
St. Abdon Post Office, Establishment of, Recommendation *re* : Ques. (Mr. Morin) 6653. (iv).
St. Alexis, Ha Ha Bay Pier : Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
St. Alphonse de Bagotville Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6868 (iv).
St. Alphonse Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
St. André de Kamouraska, Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
St. Angel Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1759 (i).
St. Anicet and Ste. Barbe Waterways : in Com. of Sup., 7380 (iv).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, Pier Reconstruction: in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
St. Boniface, Hospital : in Com. of Sup., 1846
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).
St. Catharines Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1578 (i).
St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 948 (i).
St. Charles Borromée Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
St. Cyrille, Diversion of Ry. Line : in Com. of Sup., 1969 (i).
St. Fabien Subway, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1980 (i).
Ste. Famille Wharfage Dues, Abolition of : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1150 (i).
Ste. Famille Wharf, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1149 (i).
——— Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
Ste. Fidèle Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
Ste. Flavie I.C.R., Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 9390 (v).
St. Francis de Sales Wharf : in Com of Sup., 7391 (iv).
St. Francis, Isolated Block : in Com. of Sup., 7391 (iv).
St. Francis Lake (Beauce) Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
St. François and Quebec SS. Subsidy, Requests *re* : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1504 (i).
St. François Wharf, Expenditure *re* in Sept., Oct. and Nov., 1904 : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1343 (i).
St. Fulgence Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7392 (iv).
St. Gédéon Island Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7392 (iv).
Ste. Genevieve Piers : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Ste. Genevieve and Isle Bizard, Expenditure *re*, Cor., &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Monk) 601 (i).
St. George, Mr. P. W., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 152 (i).
St Ignace Channel Dam, Plan, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 592 (i).
St. James Division Branch P.O.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 218 (i).
St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
St. Jean d'Orleans Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).
St. John Detention Building . in Com. of Sup., 1050 (i).
St. John and Digby SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 904, 966 (i).
——— Resolution from Moncton Board of Trade: Read (Mr. Daniel) 904 (i).
St. John Drill Hall. N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1049 (i), 7503 (iv).
St. John, N.B., Dublin, Belfast Winter Service : in Com. of Sup., 902 (i).
St. John, Halifax and London SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 903 (i), 7087 (iv).
——— Memorial from Board of Trade, St. John: Read (Mr. Daniel) 903 (i).
St. John, Halifax and W. Indies Mail Subsidies: in Com. of Sup., 7176 (iv).
——— Res. from Montreal Corn Exchange : Read (Mr. Ames) 7178 (iv).
St. John, Halifax and Yarmouth SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 923 (i), 6901 (iv).
St. John Harbour, Improvements : Remarks (Mr. Stockton) in Com. of Sup., 775 (i).
——— Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7503 (iv).
St. John, N.B., Harbour and Transportation Commission, Reps. *re* : M. for Copies* (Mr. Daniel) 9698 (v).
St. John Harbour, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 9588 (v).
St John, Increased Accommodation I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 9389 (v).
St. John and Minas Basin SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 926, 971 (i).

St. John River, Mail Subsidy paid to Star Line: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 181 (i).
St. John Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 1052 (i).
St. John River, Tidal Water, Contribution *re* Wharfs : in Com. of Sup., 9590 (v).
——— Tidal Waters : in Com. of Sup., 7503 (iv).
——— Tributaries : in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iv).
St. John and St. Martins, N.B., Mail Contract : Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2776 (ii).
St. John and W. Indies and S. America, Mail Subsidies : in Com. of Sup., 8691 (v).
St. John and Westport SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 966 (i).
St. John's, P.Q., Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1143 (i).
St. Joseph's Pier, Lake Huron, Delay *re* Completion : Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2774 (ii).
St. Lambert and Belœil, Double Tracking: in Com. of Sup., 2183 (ii).
St. Lawrence Canals, Deepening Shoals: in Com. of Sup., 6289 (iv).
St. Lawrence Channel, Aids to Navigation : in Com. of Sup., 2858 ; Res. from Montreal Board of Trade : Read, 2859 ; Res. from Allan SS. Owners : Read, 2860 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com. of Sup., 2891 (ii).
——— Lights, Buoy Service, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2703 (ii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
St. Lawrence Navigation, Aids to : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 891 (i).
——— Channel, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2448 (ii).
——— 'Montcalm,' Ice Breaker, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2451 (ii).
——— St. Mary's Current : in Com. of Sup., 814 (i).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, New Dredge Plant : in Com. of Sup., 9171 (v).
St. Lawrence (lower) Removal of Rock : in Com. of Sup., 7308 (iv).
——— Suction Dredge, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6436 (iv).
——— description read (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 6447 (iv).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Total Expenditure, &c., *re* Supplies, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 2455 (ii).
St. Lawrence Ice Blockade, Damages *re* : Remarks (Mr. Broder) 280 (i).
St. Lawrence Islands, Govt. Control *re* Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Walsh) 6477 (iv).
St. Louis, Capt., Certificate *re* Reinstatement : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 591 (i).
St. Louis Exhibition : Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 1832 (i).
St. Louis Lake, Buoy and Light Service : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 2704 (ii).
St. Louis River, Feeders and Waterways : in Com. of Sup., 7379, 7380 (iv).
Ste. Marguerite Postmaster, Dismissal of L. Laflamme : Ques. (Mr. Morin) 6477 (iv).
St. Mary's and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 15 (Mr. McIntyre) 1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 415 ; in Com., and 3°*, 864 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 155.)
St. Mary's Current, St. Lawrence Channel, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 814 (i).
St. Mary's Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1578 (i).
St. Maurice River Channel Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6851, 7326 (iv).
St. Maurice District Slides and Booms : in Com. of Sup., 7579 (iv).
St. Maurice Valley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 173 (Mr. Bureau) Pet. presented, 6826 ; M. to receive Pet., 7017 ; 1°*, 7175 ; 2°*, 7261 (iv) ; in Com. and 3°*, 8655 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 156.)
St. Moïse Station Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1976 (i).
St. Ours Canal, Booms and Piers : in Com. of Sup., 1499 (i).
——— Landing Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6302 (iv).
St. Paul Land and Hydraulic Co.'s Lease, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2777 (ii).
St. Peter's Bay Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1739 (i).
St. Peter's Breakwater, P.E.I., Tenders *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5035 (iii).
St. Peter's Canal, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).
——— Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6308 (iv).
St. Regis Lockup : in Com. of Sup., 237 (i).
St. Siméon Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).
St. Stephen and Black Bay SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 936 (i).
St. Thérèse Island, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7376 (iv).
St. Timothée Wharf, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7305 (iv).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary : in Com. of Sup., 480 (i).
Sabbath Day Legislation, Reference Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 9684 (v).
Sackville Railway Station, Tenders *re* Erection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 5133 (iii).
Sacre Cœur Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
Saguenay River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7377
Salmon Canning Fisheries, B.C., Suspension, &c., Representations *re* : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 269 (i).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.
Salmon, Capt., Resignation *re* 'Canada,' &c., Collision : M. (Mr. Ames) for Cor., 384 (i).

Salmon, Capt., Rep. *re* Accident to 'Lurcher,' Laid on Table, 2878 (ii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Salmon Hatcheries and Provincial Fishing Licenses : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2905 (ii).
Salmon River, B.C., Removal of Obstructions : in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
Salvation Army Colonies, Rider Haggard's Rep.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 6188 (iv).
See 'Immigration.'
Sandwich Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1579 (i).
Sarnia, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
——— Post Office Building : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 862 (i).
Saskatchewan Bill, Conference *re* Boundaries : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8268 (v).
——— Papers *re* Population, &c., Laid on Table, 8267 (v).
Saskatchewan Boundaries, Addition to : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. on B. 69, 5621 (iii).
Saskatchewan, Province of, Financial Clauses : prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2914 (ii).
——— Deb.: *See* 'Autonomy Bills.'
Saskatchewan Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 111 (Mr. Scott) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2773 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 157.)
Saskatchewan (North) River Survey : in Com. of Sup., 9602 (v).
Saskaztchewan, Permanent Capital at Regina : Remarks (Mr. Lamont) 1596 (i).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Issue of Patents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8267, 8655 (v).
Saskatoon Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1640 (i), 9550 (v).
Saugeen River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 9602 (v).
Saugeen River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie Bonded Warehouse *re* Soft Coal, Establishment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5688 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Construction : in Com. of Sup., 1334 (i).
——— Contracts *re* Construction : in Com. of Sup., 1406 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie, Celebration *re* Ship Canals : in Com. of Sup., 9621 (v).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal Dredging, U.S. and Canadian Contractors, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 589 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Govt. Dredging Dock, Total Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5426 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6881 (iv).
Savage Harbour, P.E.I., Proposed Improvements: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3361 (ii).
Saw-logs, Export Duty, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Sup., 752 (i).
Sbarretti, Memorandum *re* Separate Schools : *See* 'Manitoba Boundaries,' &c.
Sshool Lands sold by Auction in N.W.T., Number of Acres : Ques. (Mr. Lake) 730 (i).
Schools of Navigation : in Com. of Sup., 2639
Schreiber, Mr. : *See* 'Railways and Canals.'
Schukin, Ivan, Claim of, Cor. with Int. Dept. and Dom. Lands Office at Yorkton, &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 2334 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iv).
'Scotia,' Str., Certificates of Engineers, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8385 (v).
Scott's Bay Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7415 (iv).
'Scout,' Str., Compensation Claims *re* Injuries, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 6463 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re* Coast Service : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 2700 (ii).
——— Investigation *re* Explosion of Acetylene Gas, Appnmt. of Experts : Remarks, 4841 (iii).
——— Repairs, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6643 (iv).
See 'Marine,' &c.
'Scurvy Politician,' Ques. of Order *re* Quotation : Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3863 (ii).
Seaforth Post Office : Remarks (Mr. Gunn) in Com. of Sup., 858 (i).
Seamen's Act Amt. B. No. 38 (Mr. Préfontaine) 1° m., 583 (i) ; 2°*, 2114 ; in Com., 2115 (ii); wthdn. 4749 (iii).
——— B. No. 147 (Mr. Préfontaine) 1°*, 4750 (iii) ; 2°*, 7424 ; in Com., 7424 (iv), 9029 ; 3°*, 9031 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 40.)
——— Victoria Board of Trade Res. : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 7432 (iv).
See 'Shipwrecked,' 'Marine,' &c.
Secretary of State, Deptl. Employees, Salaries, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Belcourt) 8655 (v).
——— Number of Employees : Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 8147 (v).
——— Deptl. Report : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier 5428 (ii).
——— Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 74 (i), 6248 (iv), 9071 (v).
Secret Service, Expenditure *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6958 (iv).
Seed Grain, Advance to Settlers, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 9307 (v).
Seed Grain, Indians, Man and N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
——— Indians, N.B. : in Com. of Sup., 6516 (iv).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. No. 7 (Mr. Fisher) M. for Com. on Res., 52 ; in Com., 54 ; 1°*, 66 ; 2° m., 322 ; in Com., 322, 1155, 1788 ; 3°, m., 1868 ; 3°*, 1886 (i) ; Sen. Amts., 7583 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 41.)

Selkirk Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1634 (i).
Selkirk Ret. Officers, Occupation, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 1761 (i).
Selkirk Wharf Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Semaphores, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1986 (i).
Senate and House of Commons (indemnity) B. No. 202 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) Res. prop., 9701 ; in Com. on Res., 9726 ; 1°* of B., 9733 ; 2°*, 9791 ; in Com., 9791 ; 3°*, 9792 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 43.)
Senate and House of Commons Conferences, Mess. from the Senate : Read (Mr. Fielding) 9028 (v).
——— M. (Mr. Fielding) to conc., 9280 (v).
Senate Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 6620, 6943 (iv).
Separate Schools, Circulars addressed to Orange Lodge : Remarks on prop. Res. (Mr. Hughes) *re* Imp. Parliament, 2405 (ii).
Separate School Pamphlet, Official Authorization for Distribution, Preparation, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2328 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2006 (ii).
Separate Schools, Pets. from E. Assa. : Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Sproule) 2412 (ii).
Separate Schools, Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Lake) 3649 (ii).
——— *See* 'Autonomy Bill,' 'Man. Boundaries.'
'Seguin,' Str., Purchase by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3834 (ii).
Sergeant-at-Arms, Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 240 (i), 6610 (iv).
Sessional Clerks, House of Commons : in Com. of Sup., 239 (i), 6595 (iv).
Sessional Messengers : in Com. of Sup., 6612 (iv).
Sessional Pages : in Com. of Sup., 6613 (iv).
Sessions of Parliament, Delays in bringing down Estimates, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9085 (v).
Settlers' Effects, Duty *re* : in Com. of Ways and Means, 8996 (v).
Severn River, Removal of Obstructions at Macdonald's Chute : in Com. of Sup., 9602 (v).
Seymour, Mr. D. G., Complaint *re* Homestead Location : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9033, 9294 (v).
Shadwell, Mr. J. B., Gratuity to : in Com. of Sup., 6435 (iv).
Shaw, Mr. J. B., Retirement, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lake) 264 (i).
Shelburne Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Shelburne Postmaster, Dismissal, &c., Cor. *re* : M. for Copies (Mr. Barr) 595 (i).
Shellmouth Bridge, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 7591 (iv).
Shellmouth Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1043 (i).
Sherbrooke Armouries, Provision for Militia, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 266 (i).
——— Immediate Erection, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5784 (iii).
——— Purchase of Land, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Worthington) in Com. of Sup., 427 (i).
——— Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 191 (i).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1139 (i).
Sherbrooke Postal Delivery Service : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 378 (i).
Sherbrooke Post Office, Improvements, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 191 (i).
Sheriff of Yukon, Allowances : in Com. of Sup., 132 (i).
Ships Safety B. No. 21 (Mr. Sinclair) 1°*, 319 ; 2°*, 601 ; in Com. 731 (i).
Shipwrecked Seamen : in Com. of Sup., 2688 (ii).
Sifton, Hon. Clifford, Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill : Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1851 (i).
Signal Service *re* Lighthouses : in Com. of Sup., 2760 (ii).
Silver Coins, Worn, &c., Redemption of : Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 688 (i).
See 'Finance,' &c.
Silver Water, Manitoulin Island Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9597 (v).
Simcoe Military Camp, Establishment of : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 9712 (v).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Simcoe Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1581 (i).
Skinner's Cove Boat Channel and Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Slides and Booms, Facilities, Govt. Policy *re* : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 7579 (iv).
——— Revenue collected : in Com. of Sup., 7629 (iv).
Small-Pox on American Ships, Expenditure *re* Mar. Provs.: Remarks (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 2689 (ii).
Small-pox Epidemic in Man., Expenses *re* : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 2306 (ii).
——— Prevention in N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 1841 (i).
Smart, Jas. A., Dep. Min. of Interior, Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4370 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 115 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 6419 (iv).
Smelting Ore, Mines Branch : in Com. of Sup., 9303 (v).
Smith, Mr. E. D., Charges by Min. of Agr. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 874 (i).

Smith, Mr. E. D., Statements *re* Cold Storage : Remarks (Mr. Fisher) 874 (i).

Snow Blockades, I.C.R., Delay in Service, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2028 (ii).

See 'I.C.R.', 'P.E.I.', &c.

Sorel, Deep Water Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9593 (v).

——— Dredge Building, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 790 (i).

——— Ice Piers : in Com. of Sup., 6841 (iv).

Sorel Shipyards, Dredge Building: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 6448 (iv).

——— Expenditure *re* Wages, Supplies, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 1399 (i).

——— Purchase of Supplies : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 2457 (ii).

Soulanges Canal Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 1421 (i), 6290 (iv).

Souris Public Building, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).

S. Africa and Canada SS. Service, Dates of Sailing, Values, &c.; of Exports : M. (Mr. A. Johnston) for Ret.*, 1397 (i).

S. Africa and Canada SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 971 (i).

S. A. War, King's Medals for Canadian Soldiers: M. for Cor.*, &c. (Mr. Worthington) 3204 (ii).

South Shore Ry. Co. and the Quebec Southern Co.'s B. No. 149 (Mr. Brown) 1°*, 5783 (iii) ; 2°*, 6868 (iv) ; M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 9072 ; M. to place on Order Paper for Com., 9278 ; in Com., 9340, 9586 ; 3°*, 9587 ; Sen. Amts., 9815 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 158.)

Sovereign Fire Assurance Co. of Canada's incorp. B. No. 26 (Mr. E. F. Clarke) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., 1755 ; 3°*, 1757 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 159.)

Spanish River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).

Speaker, Election of : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2 (i).

Speaker, Dep.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to appoint, 50 (i).

Speeches of Members, Delay in Printing at Bureau : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7723 (iv).

Speech from Throne : *See* 'Address.'

Spirits in Bond, Age Limit, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. on B. 176, 8679 (v).

Standard Gauge, P.E.I. Ry., Cost of Construction : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2181 (ii).

Stanhope P. O., Dismissal of Mr. H. Lawson, Cor., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 1398 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1062 (i).

See 'Post Office,' &c.

Stanley Bridge, P.E.I. Ry. Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Martin, P.E.I.) 266 (i).

——— Total Cost, Claim for Damages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Martin, P.E.I.) 587 (i).

Staple Commodities Packing and Sale B. No. 121 (Mr. Fisher) M. for Com. on Res., 676 ; in Com. on Res., 681, 736 (i), 2413 ; 1°* of B., 2441 ; 2° m., and in Com., 2841 ; 3°*, 2850 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 44.)

——— Administration B. No. 155 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1°*, 5960 (iii) ; 2°*, 5979 ; in Com., 5979 ; 3°*, 5983 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 45.)

Staples, Inspection, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 9616, 9681 (v).

Station Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 6429 (iv).

Statistical Year-Book : *See* 'Year-Book.'

Statistics, Collection, &c., Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. on B. 5, 1003 (i).

Statutes, Revision Commission : in Com. of Sup., 8672 (v).

——— Indexing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 8673 (v).

——— Completion of : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 745 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 6 (Mr. McCarthy) 1°*, 58 ; 2° m., 315 ; Ref. to Sel. Com., 316 (i).

Steamboat Inspection, Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii), 6628 (iv).

Steel Rails, Fastenings, &c., I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1988 (i), 2038 (ii).

Steel Sheds, Montreal Harbour, Approval of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 151 (i).

See 'Montreal,' &c.

Stenographers, N. W. Ter. Sup. Court : in Com. of Sup., 125 (i).

Sterling Bank of Canada B. No. 182 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 7810 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146 ; in Com., and 3°*, 8655 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 160.)

Stevens, Douglas, Answer to Capt. Salmon's Rep. *re* 'Lurcher' accident : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2878 (ii).

Stevens, Mrs. Douglas, Gratuity : in Com. of Sup., 6628 (iv).

Steward for Speaker's Rooms, Appnmt. of : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 240 (i).

Stewart, Mr. J. Sprott, Charges *re* Dismissal : Letter read (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9613 (v).

See 'Musquodoboit.'

Stokes Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9598 (v).

Stoney Indians, Depleting Game, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 6548 (iv).

Stony Mountain Penitentiary, School Fees : in Com. of Sup., 9684 (v).

Storm Signals at Headlands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 9176 (v).

Stratford Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1581 (i).

Strathcona Horse Barracks : in Com. of Sup., 1637 (i).

Submarine Signal Apparatus : Remarks (Mr. Ganong) in Com. of Sup., 892 (i).

Submarine Signal Bells. Installation : in Com. of Sup., 2871 (ii).
——— reps. of U.S., List of Stations : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2871 (ii).
Submarine Signal Co. of Boston, Cor. with Min. of Mar., &c.: M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies*, 917 (i).
Summerside Drill Hall : Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 1562, 1662 (i).
Summerside Harbour Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1739 (i).
Summerside Improvements, P.E.I. Ry : in Com. of Sup., 2176 (ii).
Summerville Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Sunday Customs Collections, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 413 (i).
Sunday Observance Legislation, Payment for Legal Services : in Com. of Sup., 6722 (iv).
——— Govt. Legislation, *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 8656 (v).
Superannuation Scheme, I.C.R. : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 2241 (ii).
See 'Employees,' &c.
Supply B. No. 168 (Mr. Fielding) Res. prop., 6966 ; 1°* ; 2°* ; in Com., and 3°*, 6966 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 1.)
——— B. No. 206 (Mr. Fielding) M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9798 ; in Com., 9800 ; 1°*, 2°*, 9801 ; in Com., 9801 ; 3°*, 9801 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 2.)
Supply : M. for Com. (Mr. Paterson) 50 (i).

SUPPLY :
COMMITTEE :
Administration of Justice : *See* 'Justice.'
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics :
Aid to Agricultural Societies, 1829 (i).
Archives, 1823 (i), 6679 (iv).
Criminal Statistics, 1473 (i).
Dairying Interests, To promote, 6938, 7014 (iv).
Dairying Interests, Live Stock, &c., 6932 (iv).
Dom. Exhibition, New Westminster, 9608 (v).
Exhibitions, 1831 (i), 6269 (iv).
Experimental Farms, 6165 (iv), 9608 (v).
For Renewing Can. Exhibit at Imp. Institute, 1836 (i).
Fumigating Stations, 1831 (i).
General Statistics, 1827 (i), 6274 (iv).
Historical Data *re* Acadians, 1830 (i).
Live Stock Records, 6680 (iv).
Patent Record, 1472 (i).
Printing, &c., of Bulletins, 6926 (iv).
Quinquennial Census, Man., Saskn. and Alta., 9608 (v).
Year Book, 1474 (i).
Charges of Management :
General Vote, 69 (i), 6249 (iv), 8691, 9052 (v).
Civil Government :
Agriculture, 91 (i), 9053-57 (v).
Auditor General's Office, 77, 90 (i), 6721 (iv).
Board of Civil Service Examiners, 75 (i), 6249 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Civil Government—*Con.*
Contingencies :
Agriculture, 92 (i), 9057 (v).
Auditor General's Office, 6721 (iv).
Finance, 118 (i), 6268 (iv).
Governor General's Secretary's Office, 70 (i), 6248 (iv).
Interior, 116 (i).
Justice, 73 (i).
Labour, 100 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, 105 (i), 2442 (ii), 6265 (iv).
Militia and Defence, 9068 (v).
North-west Mounted Police, 78 (i).
Post Office, 95 (i), 6240 (iv), 9060 (v).
Privy Council Office, 72 (i).
Public Printing and Stationery, 76 (i).
Public Works, 94 (i).
Railways and Canals, 94 (i).
Secretary of State, 75 (i).
Trade and Commerce, 9034 (iv).
Customs, 78 (i), 9069 (v).
Depts. Generally, 121 (i), 6268 (iv).
Finance, 119 (i), 6268 (iv), 9060 (v).
Geological Survey, 122 (i), 6248 (iv).
Governor General's Secretary's Office, 70 (i), 9053 (v).
High Commissioner's Office, 120 (i).
Indian Affairs, 116 (i).
Inland Revenue, 89 (i), 9069 (v).
Interior, 114 (i), 6264 (iv), 9070 (v).
Justice, 72 (i).
Labour, 100 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, 102 (i), 6265 (iv), 9050 (v).
Militia and Defence, 112 (i), 9067 (v).
North-west Mounted Police, 78 (i).
Post Office, 95 (i), 9058 (v).
Privy Council Office, 71 (i).
Public Printing and Stationery, 76 (i).
Public Works, 94 (i), 6724 (iv), 9071 (v).
Railways and Canals, 93 (i), 9061, 9066 (v).
Secretary of State, 74 (i), 6248 (iv), 9071 (v).
Trade and Commerce, 96 (i).
Culling Timber, 7236 (iv).
Customs :
Gratuity to Jeffrey Foot, 6434 (iv).
Gratuity to Widow of Late J. B. Shadwell, 6435 (iv).
Gratuity to Widow of Late John Turner, 6435 (iv).
Salaries, Contingent Expenses, &c., 256, 405 (i).
Salaries, Travelling Inspectors, Expenses, &c., 405 (i).
Dominion Lands :
Contingencies, 6406 (iv), 9292 (v).
Mines Branch, Iron Ore Electric Smelting, 9303 (v).
Salaries, &c., 9251 (v).
Extra Clerks, &c., 9289 (v).
Surveys, &c., 6406 (iv), 8671, 9306 (v).
Timber Lands Protection of, 9297 (v).
Dominion Police :
General Vote, 137 (i).
Excise :
Adulteration of Food, 1699, 1710 (i).
Extra Duty Pay *re* Overtime, 1688 (i).
Methylated Spirits, 1690 (i).
Preventive Service, 1688 (i).
Provisional Allowances to Officers, 1690 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Excise—*Con.*
Salaries, &c., 1679 (i).
To pay Collectors of Customs Allowance for Duty collected, 1689 (i).
To pay L. A. Fréchette for Translation, 1690 (i).
Travelling Expenses, Rent, Fuel, &c., 1689 (i), 6724 (iv).
Weights and Measures :
Metric System, 1698 (i).
Rent, Fuel, Travelling Expenses, &c., 1695 (i).
Salaries, &c., 1692 (i).
Salaries *re* Light Inspection, 1696 (i).
Fisheries :
Bait Freezers, 9620 (v).
Commission on Fisheries, 9172 (v).
Fog Fish, Reduction Works *re* 9173 (v).
Fish-breeding Establishments, &c., 2904 (ii), 6635 (iv).
Fishing Bounty, Expenses *re*, 6636 (iv).
Fish-curing Establishments, 9173 (v).
Honorarium to R. N. Venning, *re* Russian Seizures, 6630 (iv).
New Boilers, &c., Cruiser 'Petrel,' 6630 (iv).
Oyster Culture, 2911 (ii).
Protection Service, 2907 (ii).
Salaries to Overseers, &c., 2878 (ii), 6630 (iv).
Geological Survey :
Books for Library, 8671 (v).
Compiling of Field Notes, &c., 8670 (v).
General Vote, 8669 (v).
Metallurgical, Petrographical Assistance, 8671 (v).
Special Surveys in B.C. and Yukon, 8669 (v).
To pay Frank Nicolas, 9249 (v).
Govt. of Northwest Territories :
Land Titles Offices, Expenses, &c., 9249 (v).
Govt. of Yukon Teritory :
Additional Living Allowance, Major Z. T. Wood, 9250 (v).
General Vote, 7716 (iv), 9622 (v).
Grant for Local Purposes, 7718 (iv), 9250 (v).
Immigration :
Agents' Salaries, Can., G. B. and Foreign Countries, 7684 (iv), 9226, 9308 (v).
Contingencies in Canada, British and Foreign Countries, 6384, 7709 (iv).
Indians :
British Columbia :
Dom. Exhibition at New Westminster, 9339 (v).
Industrial Schools, &c., 6556 (iv), 9339 (v).
Medical Attendance, &c., 6555 (iv).
Miscellaneous, 9339 (v).
Pemberton Reserve, 9339 (v).
Travelling Expenses, 6556 (iv).
Generally :
P. H. Bryce, Medical Inspector, 6558 (iv).
Printing and Stationery, 6558 (iv)
Manitoba and N.W.T.:
Annuities, 6538 (iv).
Implements, 9336 (v).
Live Stock, 6539 (iv).
Provisions, &c., 6550 (iv), 9338 (v).
Seeds, 6539 (iv).
Surveys, 6552 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Indians—*Con.*
New Brunswick :
Medical Attendance, 6516 (iv).
Miscellaneous and Unforseen, 6517 (iv).
Relief and Seed Grain, 6516 (iv).
Salaries, 6516 (iv).
Supt.'s Salary, 9336 (v).
Nova Scotia :
General Vote, 6514 (iv).
Ontario and Quebec :
Blankets, &c., 226 (i).
General Legal Expenses, 237 (i).
Grant for Agriculture Society, Munceys, 237 (i).
Indian Treaty No. 9, Expenses *re*, 9336 (v).
Land Management Fund, 236 (i).
Legal Expenses, 9335 (v).
Medical Attendance, 223 (i).
Park in Thousand Islands, 9335 (v).
Salaries of Chiefs, &c., and Agent Oka, 235 (i).
Schools, 225, 230 (i).
St. Regis Lockup, 237 (i).
Surveys of Reserves, 236 (i).
P.E.I.:
Medical Attendance, 6537 (iv).
Yukon :
Inspection of Staples :
Further Amount, Wages and Contingencies, 6901 (iv), 9616, 9681 (v).
Inspector's Salaries, &c., 7224 (iv).
Justice :
Atlin District, Judge's Allowance, 9683 (v).
Exchequer Court :
General Vote, 125 (i).
Judges' Travelling Expenses, 122 (i).
Miscellaneous, including N.W.T., 101, 102 (i), 6721 (iv).
Prince Albert, Court House, &c., 124 (i).
Remuneration of N.W.T. Stenographers, 125 (i).
Salary, County Court Judge, N.S., 124 (i).
Supreme Court :
General Vote, 125 (i).
Three Rivers, Judge, 9682 (v).
Yukon :
Fees, &c., 135 (i).
Judges' Travelling Allowances, 126 (i).
Law Books, 136 (i).
Living Allowances, &c., 132 (i).
Maintenance of Prisoners, 134 (i).
Miscellaneous Expenditure, 137 (i).
Legislation :
General :
Printing and Binding, 6948 (iv).
Printing, &c., of Laws, 6948 (iv).
Voters' Lists, 6897, 6954 (iv).
House of Commons :
Committees, 6594 (iv).
Contingencies, 239 (i).
Debates, 239 (i), 6592 (iv).
General Vote, 6268 (iv).
Salaries, 238 (i).
Sergeant-at-Arms Estimate, 240 (i).
One Additional Messenger, 6613 (iv).
Pages, 6613 (iv).
Sessional Messengers, 6610 (iv).
Sessional Clerks, 239 (i), 6595 (iv).
Stationery, 6594 (iv).
Telephone Com., Expenses *re* Translation, 9621 (v).
Voters' Lists, &c., 6897 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Legislation—*Con.*
Library :
Books, 6944 (iv).
Salaries, 6944 (iv).
Senate :
Further Amount for Contingencies, 6620, 6943 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service :
Agencies, Rents and Contingencies, 2705 (ii).
Aids to Navigation, &c., 2758, 2850 (ii), 9175 (v).
Expenses *re* Late Fall Navigation, Upper Lakes, 6645 (iv).
Maintenance and Repairs, &c., 2706, 2725 (ii), 6636 (iv), 9035 (v).
Marconi Stations, 2869 (ii).
Montreal Pilot Commissioner's Court, 2760 (ii).
Parry Sound, Buoy Depot, 9175 (v).
Repairs to Str. 'Scout,' 6643 (iv).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 2697 (ii), 9175 (v).
Salaries of Temporaries, Draughtsmen, &c., 2760 (ii).
Signal Service, 2760 (ii).
Submarine Signals, 2871 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions :
Amount authorized by Statute, 7094 (iv).
Annapolis and Hull, 966 (i), 9622 (v).
Baddeck, Grand Narrows and Iona, 934 (i).
Canada and G.B., 864 (i).
Canada and Mexico, 895 (i), 9622, 9680 (v).
Canada and New Zealand, 7094 (iv).
Canada and South Africa, 971 (i).
Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie, 934 (i), 9616 (v).
Gaspé Basin and Paspebiac, 944 (i).
Gaspé Basin and Quebec, 926 (i).
Grand Manan and Mainland, 922 (i).
Halifax and Canso, 937 (i).
Halifax and Nfld., via Cape Breton Ports, 906 (i).
Halifax, Nfld. and Liverpool, 902 (i).
Magdalen Islands and Mainland, 906 (i).
Manchester and Canada, 932 (i).
Petit du Grat and Mulgrave, 966 (i).
Murray Bay and River Ouelle, 938 (i).
Pictou and Cheticamp, 935 (i).
Port Mulgrave and Bras d'Or Lakes, Ports, 934 (i).
Port Mulgrave and Canso, 935 (i).
Pictou, &c., and Montague Bridge, 926 (i).
Port Essington and the Queen Charlotte Islands, 9616 (v).
P.E.I. and G.B., 927 (i), 7088 (iv).
P.E.I., Cape Breton and Nfld., 940 (i), 7092 (iv).
Quebec and Blanc Sablon, 936 (i), 9617 (v).
Quebec and Murray Bay, &c., 938 (i), 7091 (iv).
Quebec and Natashquan, &c., 967 (i).
St. John and Annapolis Basin, &c., 966 (i)
St. John and Digby, 904 (i).
St. John, Dublin and Belfast, 902 (i).
St. John and Glasgow, 902 (i).
St. John, Halifax and London, 903 (i), 7087 (iv).
St. John, Halifax and W. I. and South America, 7087, 7176 (iv), 8691 (v).
St. John and Halifax, via Yarmouth, 923 (i), 6901 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions—*Con.*
St. John and Minas Basin, &c., 926, 971 (i), 8691 (v).
St. John, Westport, &c., 966 (i).
St. Stephen, Campobello and Black Bay, 936 (i).
Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence, 937 (i).
Tadousac and St. Catherine's Bay (winter) 948 (i).
Victoria and San Francisco, 906 (i).
Victoria, Vancouver and Skagway, 7091 (iv).
Victoria and Vancouver Island Ports, 938 (i).
Wrecking Plant on St. Lawrence River, 957 (i), 7094 (iv).
Marine Hospitals :
Care of Sick Seamen in Mar. Provs. and Repairs, 2686 (ii).
St. John, N.B., Grant to Fernhill Cemetery 6628 (iv).
Shipwrecked and Distressed Seamen, 2688 (ii).
Yarmouth, Marine Hospital, 9172 (v).
Militia :
Annual Drill, 441 (i), 6512 (iv).
Armoury, 5th Royal Scots, 9169 (v).
Arms, &c., Purchase of Lands, 9105 (v).
Dominion Arsenals, 445 (i), 7012 (iv), 9170 (v).
Salary, Lt.-Col. F. M. Gaudet, 6513 (iv).
Esquimalt Defences, 9170 (v).
Grants to Rifle Associations, &c., 444 (i). 9169 (v).
Louisburg, Preservation of Old Fort Site, 9170 (v).
Militia Stores, 6513 (iv).
Military Survey, 439 (i).
Pay and Allowances, 415 (i), 6510 (iv).
Royal Military College, 7000 (iv), 9170 (v).
Transport and Freight, 6513 (iv).
Miscellaneous :
Academy of Arts, 6959, 7238 (iv).
Army and Navy, Remission of Customs, Duty *re*, 6724, 6812 (iv).
Assay Office, Vancouver, 7720 (iv).
Astronomical Work of Interior Dept., 7719 (iv).
Banff Park, Construction of Roads, &c., 6423 (iv).
Water Works, &c., 9306 (v).
Can. Bank of Commerce, Compensation *re* Yukon, 9615 (v).
'Canada Gazette,' 6723 (iv).
Canada Temperance Act, Expenses *re*, 6957 (iv).
Canadian Mining Institute, 7247 (iv)
Champlain, Monument at St. John, N.B., 9340 (v).
International Boundary Line Wire Fence, 8672 (v).
Keewatin, Maintenance of Lunatics, 7720 (iv).
'Labour Gazette,' 7511 (iv).
Legal Expenses, 6723, 7247, 7720 (iv).
Litigated Matters between Dom. and Provs., 6959 (iv).
Maps, Lithographing, &c., 6424, 7721 (iv), 9307 (v).
Naturalization Act, Expenses *re*, 6957 (iv).
Pacific Cable, 7239, 7276 (iv).
Paris Agency, 6958 (iv).
Printing, 6723, 6901, 6957 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Miscellaneous—*Con.*
Printing Bureau, Plant, 9614 (v).
Public Accts. Com., Expenses *re*, 9616 (v).
Quebec City, Contribution *re* International Congress of Americanistes, 9621 (v).
Relief for Distressed Canadians, 7247 (iv).
Revised Statutes, Commission, 7241 (iv), 8672 (v).
Sault Ste. Marie Canals, Celebration *re*, 9621 (v).
Seed Grain, 9307 (v).
Sunday Observance Legislation, Legal Services *re*, 6722 (iv).
Tariff Commission, 9614 (v).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, 7248 (iv).
Unforseen Expenses, 6958 (iv).
Yoho Park Reserve, Roads, &c., 7719 (iv).
Mounted Police :
General Vote, 6957 (iv), 8657 (v).
Yukon :
Pay of Force, 8662 (v).
Ocean and River Service :
Allowance to Capt. J. Harrison *re* SS. 'Grecian,' 6466 (iv).
Coast Service and Surveys, N. W. Coasts of Canada, 6468 (iv).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance, &c., and Ice Breakers, 2595 (ii), 6463 (iv), 9034 (v).
Additional Ice Breakers, 9617 (v).
Honorarium to A. P. Low, 6473 (iv).
Ice Boats, New, Vc., 9177 (v).
Masters' and Mates' Examination, 2623 (ii).
Naval Militia, 9178 (v).
New Boilers, &c., Str. 'Aberdeen,' 6464 (iv).
Patrol Boat, N.W.M.P. in Hudson's Bay, 9178 (v).
Patrolling Northern Waters, &c., 9177 (v).
'Quadra,' Str., Repairs, 9171 (v).
Removal of Obstructions in Navigable Waters, 2647 (ii).
Rewards for Saving Life, 2624 (ii).
School of Navigation, 2639 (ii).
Tidal Service, 2647 (ii).
Winter Mail Service, 2648 (ii), 6467 (iv).
Wrecks, Investigations into, 6466 (iv).
Wrecking Plant, Mar. Provs., &c., 9177 (v).
Penitentiaries :
B.C., To pay W. A. Duncan, 9684 (v).
Dorchester, 480 (i).
Edmonton Jail, 481 (i), 9684 (v).
General, 465 (i).
Salary of W. P. Archibald, Parole Officer, 6721 (iv).
Manitoba, 481 (i), 9684 (v).
Prince Albert Jail, 481 (i).
Regina Jail, 481 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul, 480 (i).
Pensions :
Compensation in Lieu of Land, 6956 (iv).
Fenian Raid, 6956 (iv).
Rebellion of 1885, &c., 6957 (iv).
Post Office :
A. W. Cairns, P. O. Inspector, Salary, 6629 (iv).
Compassionate Allowance to Family of the late P. Callery, 6628 (iv).
Mail Service, 176 (i), 6629 (iv), 9609 (v).
Miscellaneous, 194 (i).
Outside Service, 138, 165 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Capital :
Buildings :
Astronomical Observatory, 9542 (v).
Dom. Archives, 603 (i).
Eastern Building, 9547 (v).
New Block, 9605 (v).
Parlt. Buildings, Additions to Main Block 9542 (v).
Royal Mint, 606 (i).
Victoria Memorial Museum, 754 (i).
Western Deptl. Block, Addition, 765 (i).
Harbours and Rivers :
Ontario :
Port Arthur, &c., Harbour Improvements, 784 (i), 6729, 6900 (iv).
Port Colborne, Harbour Improvements, 815 (i).
Quebec :
Dredge 'J. Israel Tarte,' Explosion, Compensation *re*, 6463 (iv).
Montreal Harbour, St. Mary's Current, 814 (i).
Permanent Piers, Lake St. Peter, &c., 6453 (iv), 9171 (v).
Quebec Harbour Improvements, 770 (i), 6724 (iv).
River St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 2448 (ii).
New Dredge below Quebec, 6436 (iv), 9171 (v).
Transportation Facilities :
Georgian Bay to Montreal, Surveys, 7637 (iv), 9547 (v).
Public Works—Collection of Revenue :
Collection of Slide and Boom Dues, &c., 7629 (iv).
Gatineau River, Use of Booms at Cascades, 7630 (iv).
Land and Cable Lines, Lower St. Lawrence, 7632 (iv).
Repairs and Working Expenses, Harbours, Slides, &c., 7632 (iv).
Telegraph Lines, B.C., 7635 (iv).
N.W.T., 7633 (iv).
P.E.I., 7632 (iv).
Yukon Territory (Ashcroft-Dawson) 7635 (iv).
Telegraph Service Generally, 7636 (iv).
To pay Upper Ottawa Improvement Company, 7629 (iv).
To pay J. C. Taché, 6897 (iv).
Public Works—Income :
Buildings :
British Columbia :
Dom. Buildings, Renewals, &c., 1641 (i), 6735 (iv).
Fernie, Public Building, 1641 (i).
New Westminster, Public Building, 1641 (i).
Vancouver, Public Building, 1642 (i).
Generally :
Armouries, Construction, 1649 (i).
Salaries to Resident Clerks, &c., 1642 (i).
Manitoba :
Brandon Drill Hall, 1633 (i).
Dom. Buildings, Improvements, 1634 (i).
Neepawa, Public Building, 9549 (v).
St. Boniface, Public Building, 9549 (v).
Selkirk, Public Building, 1634 (i).
Virden, Drill Hall, 1634 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Manitoba—*Con.*
Winnipeg, District Military Stores Building, 1635 (i).
Examining Warehouse, 9549 (v).
Immigration Building, 1635 (i), 9550 (v).
Military Buildings, Quarters, 1635 (i).
New Postal Office, 1636 (i).
Postal Station, 9549 (v).
New Brunswick :
Campbellton, Public Building, 1048 (i).
General Vote, 7283 (iv).
Richibucto, Public Building, 6730, 6813 (iv).
St. John, Drill Hall, 1049 (i), 7503 (iv).
Immigration Detention Building, 1050 (i).
Quarantine, Partridge Island, 1052 (i).
Woodstock Armoury, 1057 (i).
Northwest Territories :
Barracks for Strathcona Horse, 1637 (i).
Calgary, Public Buildings, 1638 (i).
Land Titles Office, 1638 (i).
Court Houses, &c., 1638 (i).
Edmonton, Dom. Lands Office, 9550 (v).
Immigrant Building, 9550 (v).
Jail, 1638 (i).
Public Building, 9550 (v).
Lloydminster, Immigrant Building, 6734 (iv).
Medicine Hat, Public Building, 1638 (i).
Moosejaw, Public Building, 1638 (i).
Prince Albert, Public Building, 1638 (i).
Red Deer, Court House, 1639 (i).
Regina, Public Buildings, 1639 (i).
Saskatoon, Public Building, 1640 (i), 9550 (v).
Nova Scotia :
Antigonish, Public Building, 846, 1015 (i).
Canso, Public Building, 1023 (i).
Glace Bay, Public Building, 1034 (i).
Halifax, Dom. Building, 1036 (i).
Immigrant Building, 1036 (i).
New Public Building, 1037 (i).
Inverness, Public Building, 1040 (i).
Shelburne, Public Building, 1043 (i).
Sydney, Public Building, 1044 (i).
Sydney Mines, Public Building, 1045 (i).
Ontario :
Belleville, 1547 (i).
Bowmanville, 1549 (i).
Brantford Drill Hall Addition, 1549 (i).
Bridgeburg, Public Building, 1550 (i).
Chatham Armoury, 1551 (i).
Cobourg Armoury, 1554 (i).
Guelph Armoury, 1555 (i).
Hamilton Drill Hall, 1559 (i).
Hawkesbury, Public Building, 1560 (i).
Kingston Military Barracks, R.C.F.A., 1560 (i).
Military Buildings for Field Battery, 1561 (i).
Military College, Addition to Drill Hall, 1561 (i).
——— Servants' Quarters, 1561 (i).
——— Stable, 1561 (i).
London Drill Hall, 6732 (iv).
Military Magazine, 1562 (i).
New Stores Building, 1562 (i).
Post Office, 1563 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
North Bay, Public Building, 1563 (i).
Orillia, Public Building, 9549 (v).
Oshawa, Public Building, 1564 (i).
Ottawa Deptl. Buildings :
Fittings for Savings Bank Branch, 9549 (v).
Improvements in Main Building, 1565 (i).
New Coal Shed, 1565 (i).
Pavement on Wellington St., 1571 (i).
Post Office Repairs, &c., 1573 (i).
Printing Bureau, Additions, &c., 1575 (i).
Steel Drawers, &c., 1564 (i).
Owen Sound, Public Building, 9547 (v).
Peterborough Armoury, 1578 (i).
St. Catharines Drill Hall, 1578 (i).
St. Mary's, Public Building, 1578 (i).
Sandwich, Public Building, 1579 (i).
Simcoe Public Building, 1581 (i).
Stratford Armoury, 1581 (i).
Toronto, Customs House, 1581 (i).
Drill Hall, 1581 (i).
Examining Warehouse, 1583 (i).
Military Buildings, Barracks, 1589 (i).
Post Office, Additions, Pneumatic Plant, 1590 (i).
——— Additional P. O. Station, 1591 (i).
——— Postal Station 'C,' 1592 (i).
Prince Edward Island :
Souris, Public Building, 1047 (i).
Quebec :
Actonvale, Public Building, 1101 (i).
Chicoutimi, Public Building, 1106 (i).
Dom. Buildings, Repairs, &c., 1107 (i).
Grosse Isle, Quarantine Station, 1108 (i), 6734 (iv).
Lachute, Public Building, 1111 (i).
Levis, Public Building, 1112 (i).
Longueuil, Public Building, 1113 (i).
Magog, Public Building, 1114 (i).
Montmagny, Public Building, 1117 (i).
Montreal, Barracks for Permanent Corps, 1118 (i).
Examining Warehouse, 1119 (i).
Inland Revenue Building, Addition, 1119 (i).
Military Buildings, New Stores Building, 1125 (i).
Post Office, Improvements, 1127 (i).
Post Office, Pneumatic Tube System, 1131 (i).
Quebec :
Hospital, 1138 (i), 9547 (v).
Immigrants Buildings, Generally, 1138 (i).
St. Johns Public Building, 1143 (i).
Sherbrooke, Public Building, 1139 (i).
Valleyfield, Public Building, 1143 (i).
Rents, Repairs, &c. :
Dom. Buildings, Caretakers, &c., 1663 (i), 6822 (iv).
Fuel, 6822 (iv).
Furniture, 6817 (iv).
Rents, 6818 (iv).
Ottawa, Dom. Buildings :
Additional Fittings, Treasury Vault, 6825 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Rents, Repairs, &c.—*Con.*
Ottawa, Dom. Buildings—*Con.*
Elevator Attendance, 667 (i), 6816 (iv), 9551 (v).
Fuel, 1670 (i).
Grounds, 6817 (iv).
Heating, Engineers' Salaries, &c., 1667 (i), 6816 (iv).
Lighting, 1667 (i), 6816 (iv).
Major's Hill Park, 6817 (iv).
Post Office Fittings and Supplies, 9551 (v).
Removal of Snow, 6823 (iv).
Rents, 1663 (i).
Repairs, &c., 6815 (iv).
Rideau Hall, including Grounds, 6823 (iv), 9550 (v).
Telephones, 1669 (i), 6814 (iv).
Rents, 1663 (i).
Yukon :
Yukon, Public Buildings, &c., 1666 (i).
Dredging :
British Columbia :
General Vote, 7579 (iv).
To replace Snag Boats, &c., 7578 (iv).
General Dredge Repairs, 6890, 7576 (iv).
Manitoba :
Generally, 7579 (iv).
New Plant :
Generally, 7578 (iv), 9604 (v).
Manitoba, New Tug, &c., 7577 (iv).
Mar. Provs., 6891, 7578 (iv).
Ont. and Quebec, 7577 (iv).
Ont. and Que.:
Generally, 7579 (iv).
P.E.I.:
New Dredge and Scows, 6891, 7576 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers :
British Columbia :
Anderson and Kennedy Lake, Clearing Outlets, 7573 (iv).
Chilliwack, Wharf, 7573 (iv).
Columbia River, General Improvements, 7573 (iv).
Above Revelstoke, Obstructions, 7573 (iv).
Below Revelstoke, Improvements, 7574 (iv).
Improvements above Golden, 7574 (iv).
Improvements below Golden, 7574 7574 (iv).
Fraser River, Ship Channel, 7574 (iv).
Harbours, Rivers, and Bridges, General Improvements, 7575 (iv).
Langley, Protection Works, &c., 7575 (iv).
North Thompson River, 7575 (iv).
Salmon River, Removal of Obstructions, &c., 7575 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, Dredging, &c., 7575 (iv).
Williams' Head, Quarantine Station, 7576 (iv).
Generally, 7576 (iv).
Manitoba :
Lake Dauphin, Lowering, 7569 (iv).
Lake St. Francis Outlet, 7572 (iv).
Quarry Channel at Narrows, Lake Manitoba, 7572 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Manitoba—*Con.*
Selkirk, Wharf Extension, 7573 (iv).
Wharf on Lake Winnipeg at Gimli, 7573 (iv).
White Mud River, Dredging, 7573 (iv).
Winnipegosis, Mossy River Channel, 7573 (iv).
New Brunswick :
Campbellton, Wharf Extension, 1744 (i).
Cape Tormentine, Harbour Improvements, 7497 (iv).
Chance Harbour, Breakwater, 7497 (iv).
Clifton, Breakwater, 7497 (iv).
Dipper Harbour, 7498 (iv), 9588 (v).
Durham Wharf, 7498 (iv).
Great Salmon River, Groyne and Breakwater, 7498 (iv).
Miscou Harbour, Wharf, 7498 (iv).
Mud Cove, Breakwater, 7500 (iv).
Petit Rocher, Breakwater, 7500 (iv).
Pointe du Chêne, Breakwater, 7500 (iv).
Quaco Harbour, Improvements, 7501 (iv).
Richibucto, Pier Extension, 7501 (iv).
River St. John Tributaries, 7501 (iv).
Wharfs, &c., 7502 (iv).
St. John Harbour, 7503 (iv), 9588 (v).
Northwest Territories :
General Repairs, 7573 (iv).
North Saskatchewan River, Surveys, 9602 (v).
Nova Scotia :
Annapolis, Repairs to Queen's Wharf, 9576 (v).
Apple River, Wharf, 1727 (i), 7395 (iv).
Baddeck, Wharf, 7396 (iv), 9585 (v).
Barachois, Boat Harbour, 7396 (iv).
Barrington Passage, Wharf, 9581 (v).
Bass River, Wharf Repairs, 7397 (iv).
Battery Point, Breakwater, 9552 (v).
Bay St. Lawrence, Boat Harbour, 7397 (iv).
Bear Cove, Breakwater, 7397 (iv).
Beckerton, Public Wharf, 7397 (iv).
Boisdale, Wharf, 9585 (v).
Bourgeois Inlet, 9581 (v).
Breton Cove, Boat Landing, 7397 (iv).
Bridgewater, Dredging, 7398 (iv).
Broad Cove Marsh, Wharf Repairs, 7398 (iv).
Carlos Cove, Breakwater, 7398 (iv).
Clark's Harbour, Removal of Rocks, 7398 (iv).
Country Harbour, Improvements, 7398 (iv).
Cow Bay (Port Morien), 7399 (iv).
Cow Bay Run, Breakwater, 7401 (iv).
Culloden, Breakwater, 7401 (iv).
Cunningham's Point, Wharf, 7402 (iv).
Devil's Island, Breakwater, 7402 (iv), 9551 (v).
Digby Pier, Repairs, 7402 (iv).
East Chezzetcook, Breakwater, 7402 (iv).
Economy, Wharf, 9579 (v).
Fort Lawrence, Landing Pier, 6838 (iv).
Freeport, Landing Pier, 7402 (iv).
Frude's Point, Wharf, 9581 (v).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Gabarus, Harbour Improvements, 7402 (iv).
General Vote, 7237 (iv).
Georgeville Wharf, 7402 (iv).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements, 9577 (v).
Habitant River, Wharf, 7402 (iv).
Half Island Cove, Breakwater, 9584 (v).
Harrigan's Cove, Wharf, 7403 (iv).
Indian Harbour, Wharf, 7403 (iv).
Inverness (Broad Cove) Mines Harbour, Repairs, 7403 (iv).
Irish Cove, Wharf, 9578 (v).
Janvrin's Island, Wharf, 7406 (iv).
Jersey Cove (Eel Cove), Wharf, 7407 (iv).
Kelly's Cove, Wharf, 9582 (v).
L'Ardoise, Breakwater Extension, 6838, 7407 (iv).
Larry's Breakwater, 7407 (iv).
Litchfield, Breakwater, 7407 (iv).
Little Brook, Breakwater, 7407 (iv).
Little Judique, Boat Harbour, 7407 (iv).
Lunenburg, Dredging Harbour, 7408 (iv).
Mabou Bridge, Breakwater, 7408 (iv).
Mahone Bay, Dredging, 7408 (iv).
Main-à-Dieu, Breakwater, 7409 (iv).
Malignant Cove, Harbour, 7409 (iv).
Marble Mountain, Wharf, 9580 (v).
Margaree Harbour, Improvements, 7409 (iv).
Margaretsville Harbour, Repairs, &c., 7412 (iv).
Meteghan Cove, Breakwater, 7413 (iv).
Mill Cove, Breakwater, 7413 (iv).
New Campbellton, Ballast Wharf, 7413 (iv).
Newport Landing, Wharf, 7413 (iv).
Noel, Wharf, 7413 (iv).
Ogden's Pond, Channel Protection, 7413 (iv).
Parker's Cove, Breakwater, 9552, 9576 (v).
Parrsboro Harbour, 9578-9 (v).
Pembroke, Breakwater, 7414 (iv).
Phinney's Cove, Breakwater, 9552 (v).
Petit Rivière, Improvements, 9580 (v).
Pleasant Bay, Wharf, 7414 (iv).
Plympton, Breakwater, 7414 (iv).
Poirierville, Landing Pier, 9581 (v).
Porter's Lake, Channel, 9583 (v).
Port Greville, Breakwater, 7414 (iv).
Port Hastings, Wharf, 7414 (iv).
Port Hawkesbury, Wharf, 6837 (iv).
Port Hood, Pier Repairs, 7414 (iv).
Port La Tour, Breakwater, 7415 (iv).
Pugwash, Wharf, 9578 (v).
Ray's Creek, Wharf, 9576 (v).
River Hebert, Wharf, 9578 (v).
Round Hill, Wharf, 9552 (v).
Scott's Bay, Extension Breakwater, 7415 (iv).
Shelburne Harbour, Dredging, 7418 (iv).
Skinner's Cove, Boat Channel, 7418 (iv).
Summerville, Wharf, 7418 (iv).
Sydney Quarantine Station, Wharf, 9578 (v).
Tatamagouche, Wharf, 9579 (v).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Three Fathom Harbour, Protection Works, 7418 (iv).
Toney River, Boat Harbour, 9581 (v).
Victoria Beach, Wharf, 7418 (iv).
Wallace Harbour, Repairs, 7419 (iv).
West Arichat, Wharf, 7419 (iv).
White Head, Wharf, 7419 (iv).
Wolfville Wharf, Reconstruction, &c., 7419 (iv).
Yarmouth Harbour, Protection Works, 7419 (iv).
Ontario :
Amherstburg, Harbour, 7546 (iv).
Barrie, Pier, 9595 (v).
Barry's Bay, Madawaska River, 6873 (iv).
Bayfield, North Pier Extension, 7546 (iv).
Beaverton, Harbour, 7546 (iv).
Blanche River, 7547 (iv).
Blind River, Dredging, 6870 (iv).
Bracebridge Wharf, 7547 (iv).
Bronte, Harbour Improvements, 7547 (iv).
Cobourg; Pier Repairs, 7548 (iv).
Collingwood, Harbour Improvements, 6879, 7548 (iv).
Crowe's Landing, Wharf, 9600 (v).
Depot Harbour, Breakwater, 7552 (iv).
Echo Bay, Wharf, 9598 (v).
Georgian Bay and Point au Baril Route, 6888 (iv).
Goderich Harbour Improvements, 7553 (iv).
Grand Bend, Breakwater, 7553 (iv).
Grand River, Dredging, 6873 (iv).
Haileybury, Wharf, 6887, 7556 (iv).
Hamilton, 7556 (iv).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, General Improvements, 7555 (iv).
Honora Wharf, 6887 (iv), 9597 (v).
Kincardine Harbour, 7558 (iv).
Lake Temiscaming, Wharf, 7559 (iv).
Little Current, Channel Improvements, 6886, 7559 (iv).
Matchedash Bay, Channel Improvements, 7560 (iv).
Meaford Harbour, Improvements, 7560 (iv), 9599 (v).
Midland Harbour, 7560 (iv), 9601 (v).
Newcastle Pier, 7561 (iv).
Oliphant, Wharf, 7561 (iv).
Oshawa, Harbour, 9600 (v).
Ottawa, Wharf at Foot of Rideau Canal 7561 (iv).
Owen Sound, Protection Works, 7561 (iv), 9600 (v).
Dredging, 6886 (iv).
Parry Sound, Wharf, 7562 (iv).
Pembroke, Wharf, 7562 (iv).
Penetanguishene, Dredging, 7563 (iv).
Petewawa Wharf, 7562 (iv).
Point Edward, Dredging, 6869, 7563 (iv).
Port Bruce, Wharf, 7563 (iv).
Port Burwell, Improvements, 7563 (iv)
Port Dover, Improvements, 7564 (iv).
Port Hope, Repairs, &c.. 7564 (iv).
Port Stanley, Harbour Improvements, 7564 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Rama, Wharf, 9602 (v).
River Otonabee, Dredging at Peterborough, 6886, 7564 (iv).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements, 7564 (iv).
Rosseau, Wharf, 9600 (v).
Sarnia, Dredging, 7564 (iv).
Saugeen River, Improvements, 7565 (iv), 9602 (v).
Sault Ste. Marie, 6881 (iv).
Severn River, 9602 (v).
Silverwater, Wharf, 9597 (v).
Spanish River, Dredging, 7565 (iv).
Stokes Bay, Wharf, 9598 (v).
Thessalon Breakwater, 7565 (iv).
Thornbury, Dredging, 7565 (iv).
Toronto Harbour, Eastern Entrance, 7565 (iv).
Extension of Island Breakwater, 7567 (iv).
Trenton, Dredging, 9600 (v).
Whitby Harbour, 6880 (iv).
Wiarton, Dredging, 7569 (iv).
Prince Edward Island :
General Vote, 9585 (v).
Higgin's Shore Pier, Reconstruction, 1734 (i).
McPherson's Cove, Wharf, 1735 (i).
Miminegash Harbour Works, 1735 (i)
New London, Breakwater, 1735 (i).
Point Prim Island, Wharf, 1736 (i).
Repairs to Piers, &c., 1737 (i).
Creosoted Timber, 1737 (i).
Richmond Bay, Grand River Wharf, 1738 (i).
Rustico Harbour Breakwater (South Entrance), 1738 (i).
St. Peter's Bay, Breakwater, 1739 (i).
Summerside Harbour, Breakwater, 1739 (i).
Wood Islands, Breakwater, 1743 (i).
Quebec :
Anse à Beaufils, Pier, 7285 (iv).
Anse aux Gris Fonds, Improvements, 7285 (iv).
Anse à L'Ilot, Pier, 9591 (v).
Anse St. Jean, Pier, 7286 (iv).
Baie des Pères, Wharf, &c., 7287 (iv).
Barachois de Malbaie, Breakwater, 7287 iv).
Belœil Guide Piers, &c., 7287 (iv).
Bic Harbour, Wharf, 7287 (iv).
Canton Fabre, Wharf, 7288 (iv).
Chambord, Wharf, 7289 (iv).
Champlain, Wharf, 7290 (iv).
Château Richer, Harbour Improvements, 7290 (iv).
Desjardins, Allumette Island, Wharf, 7298 (iv).
Disraeli Wharf, 9593 (v)
Doucet Landing, Dredging, 6849, 7298 (iv).
Douglastown, Isolated Block, 9592 (v).
East Templeton, Wharf, 7300 (iv).
English River, Removal of Obstructions, 9591 (v).
Escoumains, Pier, 7303 (iv).
Gatineau Point, Wharf, &c., 7303 (iv).
Grands Méchins, Breakwater, 7303 (iv).
Grande Rivière Beaupré, 9592 (v).
Grondines, Wharf, 9592 (v).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Grosse Isle, Extension Pier, &c., 9608 (v).
Harbours and Rivers, General Repairs, 6868, 7305 (iv).
Lake Megantic, Piers, 9591 (v).
Lake St. Francis, Wharves, 9591 (v).
Lake St. John, Dredging, 7306 (iv).
Laprairie Ice Piers, and Protection Walls, 7306 (iv), 9590 (v).
Lavaltrie, Pile Wharf, &c., 7306 (iv).
Le Tableau, Wharf, &c., 7307 (iv).
Little Pabos, Harbour Improvements, 7307 (iv).
L'Ile d'Alma, Removal of Rocks, 7307 (iv).
Lotbinière, Wharf Improvements, 9592 (v).
Lower St. Lawrence, Removal of Rocks, 7308 (iv).
Magdalen Islands, Breakwater and Piers, 7308 (iv).
Mille Vaches, Landing Pier, 7309 (iv).
Mistook (Deslisle) Wharf, 7310 (iv).
Mont Louis, Wharf, 7310 (iv).
Montmagny, Wharf, 7311 (iv).
Montmorency Falls, Cribwork, &c., 6852, 7311 (iv).
New Carlisle, Wharf, 7312 (iv).
Newport Breakwater, 9592 (v).
Nicolet River, Dredging, &c., 7312 (iv).
Notre Dame du Portage, Wharf, 7314 (iv).
Peel Head Bay (Missisquoi Bay), Wharf, 7314 (iv).
Petit Rivière Peribonka, Removal of Snags, 9591 (v).
Percé Wharf, 9592 (v).
Pierreville, Wharf, 6868 (iv).
Portneuf, Wharf, 7314 (iv).
Repentigny, Wharf, 7314 (iv).
Rimouski, Pier Extension, 7320 (iv).
River Batiscan, Dredging, 7322 (iv).
River Chateauguay, Dredging, 6847, 7322 (iv).
Enlargement at Discharge into St. John River, 7322 (iv).
River du Loup, (en haut), Dredging &c., 7325 (iv).
(Fraserville), Harbour, 7323 (iv).
River Lièvre, Dam Reconstruction, &c., 6839, 7325 (iv), 9590 (v).
River Maskinongé, Dredging, 6842, 7325 (iv).
River Ottawa, Wharf at Lièvre River, 7375 (iv).
River Ouelle, Pier, 7325, 7375 (iv).
River Renards, Breakwater, 9592 (v).
River Richelieu, St. Thérèse, Dredging, 7376 (iv).
River Saguenay, Dredging, 7377 (iv).
River St. Louis, Improvements, 7379 (iv).
River St. Louis, Feeders, &c., 7380 (iv).
River St. Maurice, Channel, 7326 (iv).
River St. Maurice, Dam, 7326 (iv).
——— Dredging Eastern Channel, 6851, 7330 (iv).
River Verte, Improvements, 7390 (iv).
Sacre Cœur, Wharf, 7390 (iv).
St. Alexis, Pier, 7390 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
St. Alphonse de Bagotville, 6868 (iv), 9591 (v).
St. André de Kamouraska, Wharf, &c., 7390 (iv).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, Pier, 7390 (iv).
St. Charles Boromée, Wharf, 7390 (iv).
Ste. Famille, Extension Pier, 7390 (iv).
St. Fidèle, Wharf, 7390 (iv).
St. François, Isolated Block Approach, 7391 (iv).
St. François de Sales, Wharf, &c., 7391 (iv).
St. Fulgence, Wharf, 7392 (iv).
St. Gédéon Islands, Wharf, 7392 (iv).
St. Genevieve, Piers, 9592 (v).
St. Jean, Wharf, 7393 (iv), 9592 (v).
St. Siméon, Wharf Extension, 7393 (iv).
Sorel, Ice Piers, 6841 (iv).
Deep Water Wharf, 9593 (v).
Terrebonne, Wharf, &c., 7394 (iv).
Yamaska River, Dredging, 7394 (iv).
Miscellaneous :
Arbitrations and Awards, Payment *re*, 7611 (iv).
Authorized Works, Balances *re*, 7628 (iv).
Cement Testing Laboratory, 7613 (iv).
Chief Architect's Office, Salaries, &c., 7618 (iv).
Chief Engineer's Office, Salaries, &c., 6895 (iv).
Deep Waterways Commission, 6894 (iv).
National Art Gallery, 7618 (iv).
Survey of Head Waters of Ottawa River, 7612 (iv).
Surveys and Inspections, 7611 (iv).
Technical Books of Reference, 7627 (iv).
Telegraph Service, Staff, 7620 (iv).
Temporary Clerical Assistance, &c., 7620, 7626 (iv), 9605 (v).
Transportation Commission, 7627 (iv), 8692 (v).
Roads and Bridges :
Battle River, Bridge at Battleford, 7587 (iv).
Bryson Bridge, 7585 (iv).
Colonization Roads in Man. and N. W. T., 7594 (iv).
Dom. Traffic Bridges, Generally, 7592 (iv).
Ottawa City, Dufferin and Sappers' Bridges, &c., 6889, 7585 (iv).
Ordinary Repairs, &c., 7585 (iv).
Shellmouth Bridge over Assiniboine River, 7591 (iv).
Slides and Booms :
St. Maurice River, 7579 (iv).
Telegraph Lines :
British Columbia :
Kamloops—Lower Nicola, 7610 (iv).
Nanaimo—Parksville, Alberni, &c., 9604 (v).
Vancouver Island—Salt Spring Island Telephone, 7610 (iv).
Mar. Provinces :
Mabou, Cheticamp, &c., to Bay St. Lawrence, 7606 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Telegraph Lines—*Con.*
North-west Territories :
Qu'Appelle, Edmonton and Moosejaw, 6893 (iv), 9604 (v).
Ontario :
Pelee Island and Mainland, 7609 (iv).
Quebec :
Bersimis to Godbout, 7608 (iv).
Descente des Femmes to Sacré-Cœur, 9604 (v).
Grosse Isle, Marconi, 9604 (v).
Yukon :
Ashcroft-Dawson, 9605 (v).
Quarantine :
Cattle Quarantine, 6690 (iv).
Health of Animals, 2309 (ii).
Organized Districts, Salaries, &c., 2301 (ii).
Public Health, &c., 1841 (i).
Public Works Health Act, 1845 (i).
Steamer for Service at Grosse Isle, 1838, (i).
Steamer for Service at William Head, 1841 (i).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 1845 (i).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospitals, 1846 (i).
Railways and Canals :
Canals :
Beauharnois, Repairs, 6307 (iv).
Chambly :
Denault's Farm, Culvert, 6301 (iv).
Macadamized Road, 9378 (v).
Strengthening Banks, 9378 (v).
Cornwall :
Concreting Apparatus, 6298 (iv).
Enlargement, 1219 (i).
Filling in between old and new Locks, 1494 (i).
Improvements, 9381 (v).
Reducing Shoals West of Cornwall, 6289 (iv).
Farran's Point, Acetylene Gas Plant, 6308 (iv).
Galops, Enlargement, 1220 (i).
Removing Shoals below Lock 28, 9354 (v).
To stop Leak in Bank, 1492 (i).
Galops Rapids, To complete Channel, 1230 (i).
Generally :
Staff and Repairs, 1546 (i).
Sunday Service, 1547 (i).
Grenville, Guide Piers, Greece's Point, &c., 1499 (i), 6305 (iv).
Lachine, Atwater Avenue Bridge, 1240 (i).
Electrical Installation, 1240 (i), 9354 (v).
Enlargement and Improvements, 6294 (iv).
Lock Gates, 6300 (iv).
Machinery for Shops, 1240 (iv).
Paving Mill St., 6301 (iv).
Power House, Flume, 6299 (iv).
Rebuilding Wall, Basin No. 2, 1421 (i).
Rebuilding Wharf below Dock, 1421 (i).
Repairs, 6306 (iv).
Slope Walls, 6294 (iv).
Underpinning Wall, Basin No. 2, 6298 (iv).
Walls, St. Gabriel Basin, 9378 (v).
Widening Tail Race, 6299 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Canals—*Con.*
Murray, To rebuild Piers, &c., 1495 (i).
North Channel, Dam, &c., 1230 (i).
Rapide Plat, Upper Entrance Enlargement, 6289 (iv).
Rideau, Extension, 1333 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie, Construction, 1334, 1406 (i).
St. Ours, New Boom and Pier, 1499 (i).
Wharf, 6302 (iv).
St. Peter's, Dredging, 6303 (iv).
Repairs, 6308 (iv).
Soulanges :
General Repairs, &c., 1421 (i).
Steel Bridge at Power House, &c., 6290 (iv).
Trent :
Construction, 1420, 1471, 1476 (i).
Dams, Surveys *re*, 9376 (iv).
Holland River, Surveys, 9359 (v).
Improvements, 1499 (i).
Lowering Floor of Lock, 6302 (iv).
McLaren's Creek, Road, 9379 (v).
Staff on Dams, 9383 (v).
Survey of Routes, &c., 6291 (iv), 9354 (v).
To complete New Dam, Peterborough, 6303 (iv).
To pay Geo. Matthews Co. Claim, 6303 (iv).
Welland, Electric Light Power Plant, 1231 (i), 9377 (v).
Lowering Head of, Lock No. 1, 6309 (iv).
Port Colborne, Elevator, 1266, 1288 (i).
Improvements at Entrance, 1230 (i).
Removing Obstructions, 1231 (i).
Retaining Wall, Rock Cut, 1499 (i).
Stone Protection to Banks of New Canal, 1496 (i).
Summit Level Deepening, Port Colborne to Thorold, 1232, 1283 (i), 6290 (ii).
To make Survey, 1234 (i).
To pay Stephen Vanderburg, 6305 (iv).
To rebuild bridges, &c., Niagara and Queenston Streets. 1234 (i).
Williamsburg Steam Hoist and Pump, 1494 (i).
Miscellaneous :
Arbitrations and Awards, 1508 (i).
Costs of Litigation, 1521 (i).
Railway Commission, Board of, 1524, 1541 (i).
Railway Statistics, 1521 (i).
Salaries of Engineers, &c., 1521 (i), 9382 (v).
Salaries of Extra Clerks, 1521 (i). 6306 (iv).
School of Ry. Engineering, McGill, Contribution, 9381 (v).
Sunday Work on Canals, 9383 (v).
Surveys and Inspections, Canals, 1509 (i).
Surveys and Inspections, Railways, 1520 (i).
Railways :
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry., Surveys, &c., 2277, 2298 (ii), 6427, 7496 (iv), 9489 (v).
Construction, 9498 (v).
Terminals and Right of Way, 9498 (v).
Intercolonial Railway :
Additional Sidings, Facilities, &c., 1970. (i), 6428, 6431 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Railways—*Con.*
Intercolonial—*Con.*
Amherst, Increased Accommodation, 1983 (i).
Antigonish, Increased Accommodation, 1967 (i).
Belœil and St. Lambert, Double Tracking, 2183 (ii).
Campbellton, Improvements, 1963 (i).
Cape Road Crossing, Elimination, 6432 (iv).
Double Tracking, 1933 (i), 2027 (ii), 9290 (v).
Drummondville, Accommodation, 1960 (i).
General Vote, 2204 (ii), 7445 (iv).
Gratuity to Family, Late C. J. Carter, 2183 (ii).
Halifax, Dredging at Deep Water Terminus, 2026 (ii).
Improving Grades, 1987 (i).
Increased Accommodation, 2031 (ii), 9391, 6429 (iv), 9432 (v).
Indiantown and Blackville, Maintenance, 9482 (v).
Machinery for Shops, 6428 (iv).
Memramcook, Accommodation, 1977 (i).
Mitchell, Diversion of Line, 1940 (i).
Moncton Accommodation, 1946 (i), 9391 (v).
New Castle, Improvements, 1967 (i).
Original Construction, 1912 (i).
Pictou, Increased Accommodation, 9390 (v).
River du Loup, Engine House, 9389 (v).
Rolling Stock, 1986 (i), 2037 (ii), 9482, 9501 (v).
St. Cyrille, Diversion of Public Road, 1969 (i).
St. Fabien, Subway, 1980 (i).
St. Flavie, Increased Accommodation, 9390 (v).
St. John, Increased Accommodation, 9389 (v).
St. Moïse, Station, 1976 (i).
Semaphores at Stations, 1986 (i).
Steel Rails, 1988 (i), 2038 (ii).
Strengthening Bridges, 1912 (i), 9384 (v).
Sydney Accommodation, 1912 (i).
Sydney Mines Extension, 1987 (i)
Truro, Increased Accommodation, 9391 (v).
Water Supply, 2170 (ii).
Working Expenses, 6901 (iv), 9384 (v).
Prince Edward Island Ry.:
Air Brakes, &c., 2178 (ii).
Bloomfield, Agent's House, 6432 (iv).
Branch Line, Cardigan to Montague Bridge, 2171 (ii), 9482 (v).
Branch Line to Vernon River Bridge, 2177 (ii).
Charlottetown, Increased Accommodation, 2024 (ii).
Extension along Water Front, 6433 (v).
Freetown, Agent's House, 2180 (ii).
Georgetown, Increased Accommodation, 2179 (ii), 9486 (v).
Kensington, Increased Accommodation, 2178 (ii).
M. C. B. Couplers, 2178 (ii).
Morrell River Draw Bridge, 2177 (ii).
Murray Harbour Branch, &c., 2038, 2127, 2204 (ii), 8692 (v).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Railways and Canals--*Con.*
Railways—*Con.*
Prince Edward Island Ry.—*Con.*
Summerside, Improvements, 2176 (ii).
Water Service, 2170 (ii).
Working Expenses, 6901 (iv).
Scientific Institutions :
Hydrographic Surveys, 2679 (ii), 6623 (iv), 9172 (v).
Steamer for Atlantic Coast, 9172 (v).
Meteorological Service, 2679 (ii).
Observatory, Salaries, &c., 9248 (v).
Steamboat Inspection :
Inspection of Dom. Steamers, 2695 (ii).
To pay the Widow of Douglas Stevens, Esq., 6628 (iv).
Trade and Commerce :
Administration of Chinese Immigration-tion Act, 981 (i), 7204 (iv).
Bounties on Iron and Steel, &c., 7216 (iv).
Commercial Agencies, &c., 9037 (v).
General Vote, 7218 (iv).
Unprovided Items :
Generally, 6902 (iv).
Concurrence :
Archives, 6918 (iv).
Cattle Quarantine, 6911 (iv).
Civil Govt., Interior Dept., 6909 (iv).
Fenian Raid Pensions, 6961 (iv).
Geological Survey, 9685 (v).
Immigration, Salaries, Can., G.B., &c., 9769 (v).
Militia, Ordnance, Lands, &c., 9689 (v).
National Transcontinental Ry., Surveys, &c., 6910 (iv).
Post Office, Mail Service, 9772 (v).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act (salaries) Amt. B. No. 205 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) Res. prop., 9705 ; in Com. on Res., 9760 ; 1°* of B., 9760 ; 2°* ; in Com., and 3°*, 9796 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 47.)

Supreme Court Bench, N.S., Vacancy, Appnmt., &c., Delay : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6837 (iv).

Supreme Court Judgeship, N.S., Vacancy *re* : Information asked for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5209 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5036 (iii).

Supreme Court Rep., Delay in Printing, Cor , &c. : M. for Copy* (Mr. Monk) 1398 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1341 (i).

Supreme Court Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 125 (i).

Surveys and Inspection *re* Public Works : in Com. of Sup., 7611 (iv).

Surveys, Dom. Lands : in Com. of Sup., 9306 (v).

Sussex Rifle Range, Inspector : Remarks (Mr Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7011 (iv).

Sutherland, Hon. James, Decease of : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5316 (iii).

Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 937 (i).

Sydney Harbour Pilots, Charges *re* Widows and Orphans Fund : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9036 (v).

Sydney, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1912 (i).

Sydney, Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1044

——— Quarantine Station Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).

——— Station, I.C.R., Collections for Freight, &c. : M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Ret., 1767 (i).

Sydney Mines, Extension of I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1987 (i).

——— P. O. : in Com. of Sup., 1045 (i).

Tache, J. C., Special Remuneration *re* Tel. Service : in Com. of Sup., 6897 (iv).

Target Ranges : in Com. of Sup., 445 (i).

'Tampican,' SS., Grounding of : *See* 'Montreal Wharfs.'

Tariff Commission, Expenditure *re* : in Com. of Sup., 9614 (v).

Tariff *re* Freight Rates, Advancement : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1544 (i). *See* 'Rys,' &c.

Tatamagouche Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9579 (v).

Tay Canal, Ref. to in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Haggart) 1301 (i).

Telegraph Lines in Canada, Americanizing of, in Violation of Alien Labour Act (Mr. Monk) to adjn., 7642 (iv).

Telegraph Lines, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 7635 (iv).

——— Mar. Provs. : in Com. of Sup., 7606 (iv).

——— N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6893 (iv).

——— Que. : in Com. of Sup., 9604 (v).

Telegraph Service Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 7620 (iv).

Telephone Grievances, Rep. of Telephone Com. Legislation, &c. : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 9523 (v).

Telephone Systems, Investigation *re* Committee: (Sir William Mulock) 2681, 2841 (ii).

——— M. (Sir William Mulock) to add Names, 4186 (iii).

——— Rep. Govt. Policy *re* : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 9687 (v).

——— Translation of Evidence : in Com. of Sup., 9621 (v).

Telephone Lines, Pet. *re* Municipal Control : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 1244 (i).

Telephone Service, Ottawa Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1669 (i), 6914 (iv).

Telephones : *See* 'Municipal,' 'Northwest Telephone B. 28.'

Telephone and Telegraph Lines, Govt. Construction, &c.: Ques. withdrn. (Mr. Boyce) 6105 (iv).

——— Govt. Control : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 187 (i).

Temiscamingue, Establishment of Experimental Farm : in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Barr) 6167 (iv).
Temiscaming Lake, Baie des Peres Wharfs : in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).
Terrebonne Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7394 (iv).
Thames River Dredging : Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 6872 (iv).
Thames River, Ice Jam : Remarks (Mr. Clements) 1013 (i).
Thames River, Lake St. Clair, Survey, Completion and Cost : Ques. (Mr. Clements) 590 (i).
Thermograph Records *re* Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 2778 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. Henderson) for Copies, 1767 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 868 (i).
——— Ret. laid on Table (Mr. Fisher) 7016 (iv).
Thessalon Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
Thessalon Postmaster, Appnmt. and Sureties : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 6105 (iv).
——— Dismissal of W. J. B. Dobie : M. for Cor. (Mr. Boyce) 3202 (ii).
——— Irregularities, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Boyce) on M. for Sup., 6192 (iv).
——— Papers laid on Table (Sir William Mulock) 6232 (iv).
——— Further Papers laid on Table (Sir William Mulock) 6646 (iv).
——— Salary Warrants Issued : Inquiry for (Mr. Boyce) 6239 (iv).
——— M. to reduce Salary (Mr. Foster) 9772 (v).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Thompson, Capt. Thos., Preventive Officer at Port Bruce, Dismissal, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 1763 (i).
Thornbury Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
Thousand Islands Park, Construction of Wharves, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9335 (v).
Three Fathom Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Three Rivers, Additional Judge : in Com. of Sup., 9682 (v).
Three Rivers, Gas and Electric Light Inspection : Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1760 (i).
Three Rivers, St. Maurice, Maskinonge and Champlain incorp. B. No. 57 (Mr. Bureau) 1°*, 986 ; 2°*, 1101 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 167.)
Tidal Service, Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).
Ties, &c., I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 6429 (iv).
Tignish Breakwater, Tenders *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 7018 (iv).
Timagami Ry. Co.'s B. No. 91 (Mr. McCool) 1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 3135 ; 3° m., 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 161.)
Timber on Indian Lands, Procedure *re* Sale of : Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 9280 (v).
Timber Lands, Sale or Lease of, since 1896, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 9698 (v).
Timber Limits, Sale in N.W.T. and Man., Advertisements *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7097 (iv).
Time Table, I.C.R., Changes and Delays : on M. for Sup., 6827-9 (iv).
——— Printing in English and French : Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 6827 (iv).
Tison, B. Aimé, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 6475 (iv).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. No. 99 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 2108 ; 2°*, 2297 ; in Com., 3651 (ii) ; 4680 ; 3° m., 4964 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 162.)
Tobacco and Cigars imported from U. S., Duties paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5687 (iii).
Tobacco Industry, Inspection *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1681 (i).
Todd, James, Dismissal from Burritt's Rapids Locks : Ques. (Mr. Reid) 8384 (v).
Toney River, N.S., Boat Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).
Toronto Centre, Electoral District, Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 4370 (iii).
——— Issue of Writ, Registration, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2777, 3251 (ii).
——— Issue of Writ : Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3362 (ii).
——— notification (Mr. Speaker) 2841 (ii).
Toronto Customs House, Alterations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1581 (i).
Toronto Drill Hall, Additional Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 1582 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Macdonnell) in Com. of Sup., 1657 (i).
Toronto Examining Warehouse, Addition to : in Com. of Sup., 1583 (i).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s B. No. 48 (Mr. Calvert) 1°m., 817 ; 2°*, 909 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1541 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 163.)
——— B. No. 110 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 164.)
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. No. 79 (Mr. Zimmerman) 1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i) ; in Com., 4259 · 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 165.)
Toronto Harbour, Eastern Entrance : in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
——— Expenditure from 1880 to 1904 : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 403 (i).
——— Fog Horns, Nuisance *re* Testing : Remarks (Mr. Kemp) 9281 ; Cor., &c. (read) 9282 (v).
——— Fog Signals, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).

Toronto, Island Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7567 (iv).
——— Straightening of Don River : Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. of Sup., 6888 (iv).
——— Tender *re* Breakwater at Eastern Gap : Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1761 (i).
Toronto Meteorological Building, Erection of : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1149 (i).
Toronto Military Buildings, Barracks, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1589 (i).
Toronto Pneumatic Postal Service, Contract *re* : Remarks (Mr. Hyman) 5921 (iii).
——— Contract *re* Trench (Mr. Foster) 5922 (iii).
——— Plant, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).
——— Pneumatic Service : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5807 (iii).
Toronto Postal Station 'C' Quarters : in Com. of Sup., 1592 (i).
——— remarks (Sir William Mulock) 1584 (i).
Toronto Post Office, Additional Postal Station : in Com. of Sup., 1591 (i).
——— Erection of a new Building : Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for Sup., 6833 (iv).
Toronto Trades and Labour Council, Memo. *re* Immigration in G.B.: Read (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 9309 (v).
Tracadie Lazaretto, Quarantine : in Com. of Sup., 1845 (i).
Trachoma Hospital, Halifax, Disposal of to Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2303 (ii).
Trachoma Hospitals in Quebec : in Com. of Sup., 1138 (i).
TRADE AND COMMERCE :
Annapolis Basin SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 966 (i).
Annapolis and G. B. SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
Annapolis and London Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 9622 (v).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 892 (i).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Baddeck and East Bay SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 934 (i).
Campbellton and Gaspé Basin Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 9616 (v).
Canada and France SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7094 (iv).
Canada and G. B. Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 864 (i).
Canada and Mexico Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 891, 1560 (i), 9622, 9680 (v).
Canada and Mexico SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., conc., 6909 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 66 (i).
Canada and New Zealand SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 7094 (iv).
Canada and S. Africa SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 971 (i).
TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*
Commercial Agencies in Can., Location, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Martin) 403 (i).
Commercial Agencies : in Com. of Sup., 7208 (iv).
——— Letter *re* Mr. Jackson's ability (read) in Com. of Sup., 7210 (iv).
Davie, Geo. T., Co., Wrecking Plant *re* Ship Channel : Remarks (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. of Sup., 2479 (ii).
Furness, Withy & Co., Contract *re* S. African Trade : in Com. of Sup., 971 (i).
Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 934 (i).
Grain Survey Boards, Pets., Memorials, &c., *re* : M. (Mr. Ames) for Copies, 1763 (i).
Grand Manan and Mainland, SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 922 (i).
G. B. and Canada Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 864 (i).
Halifax and Canso SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 937 (i).
Halifax and Newfoundland SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 906 (i).
Halifax, St. John's Nfld. and Liverpool Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 902 (i).
Halifax and W. Indies SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 7087 (iv).
'King Edward' and 'St. Lawrence' Strs. SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
Magdalen Island SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 906 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c., Information *re* System, Utility, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 923 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 864, 919, 932 (i), 6901, 7176 (iv), 8691, 9616, 9680 (v).
——— conc., 6909, 7087 (iv).
Mexico Steamers, Subsidy *re* : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1560 (i).
Montreal and G.B., St. John and Manchester, SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 932 (i).
Murray Bay and Rivière Ouelle SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 938 (i).
Paspebiac and Gaspé Basin SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 944 (i).
Petit de Grat SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 966 (i).
Pictou and Cheticamp SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 935 (i).
Pictou and Montague Bridge SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 926 (i).
Port Essington, B.C., and Queen Charlotte Islands Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 9616 (v).
Port Mulgrave and Bras d'Or Lakes SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 934 (i).
Port Mulgrave and Canso SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 935 (i).

TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*
P.E.I. and G.B. SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 7088 (iv).
——— Claims of SS. Cos.: in Com. of Sup., 927 (i).
——— Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7088 (iv).
P.E.I. and Mainland SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 919 (i).
P.E.I. and Newfoundland SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 940 (i), 7092 (iv).
Quebec and Blanc Sablon SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 937 (i), 9617 (v).
Quebec and Gaspé Basin SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 926 (i).
Quebec and Natashquan SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 948 (i).
St. François and Quebec SS. Subsidy, Requests *re* : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1504 (i).
St. John and Digby SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 904, 966 (i).
——— Res. from Moncton Board of Trade : Read (Mr. Daniel) 904 (i).
St. John, N.B., Dublin, Belfast Winter Service : in Com. of Sup., 902 (i).
St. John, Halifax and London SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 903 (i), 7087 (iv).
——— Memorial from Board of Trade, St. John : Read (Mr. Daniel) 903 (i).
St. John, Halifax and W. Indies Mail Subsidies : in Com. of Sup., 7176 (iv).
——— Res. from Montreal Corn Exchange : Read (Mr. Ames) 7178 (iv).
St. John and Halifax via Yarmouth SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 923 (i), 6901 (iv).
St. John and Minas Basin SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 926, 971 (i)
St. John River, Mail Subsidy paid to Star Line : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 181 (i).
St. John and St. Martins, N.B., Mail Contract : Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2776 (ii).
St. John and W. Indies and S. America, Mail Subsidies : in Com. of Sup., 8691 (v).
St. John and Westport SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 966 (i).
St. Stephen and Black Bay SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 936 (i).
S. Africa and Canada SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 971 (i).
Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 937 (i).
Trade and Commerce, Salaries, Deptl. Contingencies, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 96 (i), 9034 (v).
Victoria and San Francisco SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 906 (i).

TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*
Victoria, Vancouver and Skagway SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 7091 (iv).
Victoria and Vancouver SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 938 (i).
Wrecking Plant, B.C., Subsidies to : in Com. of Sup., 9177 (v).
Wrecking Plant, 'Lord Strathcona' Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 957 (i).
Wrecking Plant, St. Lawrence : in Com. of Sup., 7094 (iv).
Trade and Navigation, Deptl. Rep. : Presented (Mr. Paterson) 50, 321 (i).
Trading Stamps, Abolition of, Legislation *re* : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7684 (iv).
——— Res. *re* Abolition of : Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 6903 (iv).
——— Legislation *re*, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7020 (iv).
——— Legislation *re* Suppression : Ques (Mr. Stockton) 5425 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) 5134 (iii).
See 'Criminal Code B. 196.'
Traffic Arrangements I.C.R. with Foreign and Can. Rys., Amounts received : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4703 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 1915 (i).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2228 (ii).
Train Service, I.C.R., Stalled by Snowstorms, Tel.: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 695 (i).
——— Explanation (Mr. Emmerson) 726 (i).
Trans-Canada Ry. Co., Claims for Surveys along G. T. Route : Remarks (Mr. O. E. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 9494 (v).
Transcontinental Commission, Appnmt. of Chairman : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7916 (iv).
Transcontinental Railway Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 6427 (iv) ; conc., 6910 (iv).
Transcontinental Ry. : *See* 'G. T. Pacific,' &c.
Transportation Commission : in Com. of Sup., 7627 (iv).
——— Appnmt. of Chairman : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 404 ; Announcement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 492 (i).
——— Complete Membership and Reps. *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 321 (i).
——— Constitution and Progress, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9679, 9687 (v).
——— Expenditure : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 8692 (v).
——— Interim Rep. *re* St. John Harbour : Inquiry for (Mr. Daniel) 2595 (ii).
——— Preliminary Rep : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 731 (i).
——— Rep. of Mr. Bertram : Read (Mr. Emmerson) 1288 (i).
——— Rep. *re* C. A. Ry.: Remarks (Mr. Haggart) in Com. on B. 45, 4225 (iii).

Transportation Commission: Progress *re* Works, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 6438 (iv).
See 'Waterways,' &c.
Transportation Facilities, Georgian Bay Survey : in Com. of Sup., 7637 iv).
——— I.C.R., *re* Fish Trade, Mar. Provs.: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) 1930 (i).
Transportation Problem *re* Waterways : in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1288 (i).
——— and Wharf Building : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Travelling Expenses, Inspectors of Weights and Measures : in Com. of Sup., 1695 (i).
Treadgold Concessions, Instruction to Commissioners : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7101 (iv).
——— Rep. of Judge Britton : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 821 (i).
Tree Culture and Forest Protection, Man., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9297 (v).
Trelawney, Agnes Hedevig Helga Salusbury, Relief B. No. 198 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 9278 ; 2°*, 9587 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9760 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 166.)
Trent Valley Canal, Claims for Damages, Mr. Jas. Clark, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Ward) for Copy, 1395 (i).
Trent Canal, Construction, 1420 (i).
——— Dismissal of J. Ritchiel, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Foster) 2777 (ii).
——— Incomplete Return : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4750 (iii).
See 'Canals,' &c.
——— Geo. Matthews Co., Claim *re* Damages by Flood : in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).
——— Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1499 (i).
——— Lowering Floor of Lock : in Com. of Sup., 6302 (iv).
——— McLaren's Creek Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 9379 (v).
——— Peterborough Dam : in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).
——— Ref. to in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Lennox) 1311 (i).
——— Staff on Dams, Taken by Dom. Govt.: in Com. of Sup., 9383 (v).
——— Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 1471, 1476 (i).
——— Letter from Sir Wilfrid Laurier to Mr. Aylesworth : Read (Mr. Ward) 1476 (i).
——— Surveys, Completion : in Com. of Sup., 6291 (iv), 9354 (v).
——— Surveys of Dams taken by Dom.: in Com. of Sup., 9376 (v).
——— Surveys, Rice Lake, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 153 (i).
Trenton, Dredging Trent River : in Com. of Sup., 9600 (v).
Truro, Dining Room, I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 2255 (ii).
Truro, Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 9391 (v).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of : prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1351 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Perley) for Special Com., 8636 (v).
——— Rep. of Joint Com.: Presented (Mr. Perley) 9392 (v).
——— M. (Mr. Perley) to conc., 9522 (v).
Tuberculosis Grant : in Com. of Sup., 7248 (iv).
Turner, Mrs. J., Gratuity to : in Com. of Sup., 6435 (iv).
Turriff, J. G., Employment by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8266 (v).
Underwood Typewriter Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 146 (Mr. Grant) 1°*, 4644 ; 2°*, 4977 (iii); in Com., and 3° m., 6383 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 169.)
——— Patent No. 69772 Relief B. No. 146 (Mr. Grant) 1°*, 4644; 2°*, 4977; in Com., and 3°*, 6383 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 168.)
Uniforms for Customs Officers : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 413 (i).
——— for Letter Carriers, Contracts *re* : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 206 (i).
——— Militia, Regulations *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 438 (i).
Union Labour Labels B. No. 10 (Mr. Smith, B. C.) in Com. on Res., 272 ; 1°*, 279 ; 2°*, 601; in Com., 918, 1770 ; 3°, 1780 (i).
U.S. Tariff Drawbacks on Raw Materials, &c.: M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 746 (i).
Unprovided Items : in Com. of Sup., 6902 (iv).
Upper Ottawa Improvement Company : in Com. of Sup., 7629 (iv).
Valleyfield Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1144 (i).
Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 131 (Mr. Macpherson) 1°*, 4081 ; 2°*, 4414 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 171.)
Vancouver Dry Dock : Personal Explanation (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 1317 (i).
Vancouver Island and Salt Spring, Telephone Line : in Com. of Sup., 7610 (v).
Vancouver Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1642 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. No. 139 (Mr. D. Ross) M. to receive Pet., 3743 ; 1°*, 4550 ; 2° m., 4700 ; 2°*, 4977 (iii) ; in Com., 8315, 8637 ; 3° m., 8818, 9040 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 172.)
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. No. 42 (Mr. Macpherson) 1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1541 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 173.)
Vanderburg, Stephen, Claims *re* Injuries on Welland Canal : in Com. of Sup., 6305 (iv).

Vats for dipping Quarantined Cattle, N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) in Com. of Sup., 2312 (ii).
Vegetables, Canned, Preserved, &c., Value of Imports : M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Monk) 279 (i).
Venning, R. N., Honorarium to : in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).
Ventilation in the House of Commons : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7812 (iv), 8695 (v).
Verdun, Damage by Floods, Cor. from Board of Trade, Montreal : M. for Copies (Mr. Monk) 457 (i).
Vernon River Bridge Branch Line, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 2177 (ii).
See 'I.C.R.—P.E.I. Ry.', &c.
Vessels, List of : Rep. Presented (Mr. Préfontaine) 6907 (iv).
Veterans of 1886 and 1870, Grants of Lands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6047 (iv).
Veterinary Inspectors employed by Govt., *re* Hog., &c., Diseases : Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1933 (i).
Vibert, Philip, Relief B. No. 172 (Mr. Zimmerman) 1°*, 7095 ; on Order for 2°, 7218 ; 2° m., 7261 ; in Com., and 3°*, 7624 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 174.)
Victoria Beach Wharf ; in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Victoria Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
Victoria Harbour Mail Contracts : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2191 (ii).
Victoria and San Francisco SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 906 (i).
Victoria and Vancouver SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 938 (i).
Victoria, Vancouver and Skagway SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 7091 (iv).
Virden Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1634 (i).
'Virginian,' SS. and Landing of Mails at Sydney : *See* 'Post Office,' &c.
Voters' Lists, Algoma, East and West, Revision, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 594 (i).
Voters' Lists *re* Edmonton Election, Preparation of : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).
Voters' Lists Electoral Atlas : in Com. of Sup., 6722 (iv).
Voters' Lists for Macdonald, &c. : M. for Copy* (Mr. Staples) 697 (i).
Voters' Lists for Man., Printing, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 60 (i).
Voters' Lists for Unorganized Ters., Cor. *re* Instructions, &c. : M. (Mr. Boyce) for Copies*, 1397 (i).
Voters' Lists in N. W. Ters., used in Dom. Elections, 1905 : M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 601 (i).
Voters' Lists, Printing, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6897, 6954 (iv).
Voting in Ottawa Provincial Elections : Personal Explanaion (Mr. Logan) 562 (i).
Walkerton and Lucknow Ry. Co.'s B. No. 25 (Mr. McKenzie, Bruce) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1101 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 175.)
Wallace Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Walsh, Maj. John, Superannuation, and Appnmt. of Mr. Binks : Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 8146 (v).
Walton, Mr. R. M., Arrest by U. S. Authorities in the South : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4199 (iii).
Water Meters, Inspection B. No. 188 (Mr. Brodeur) Res. prop., 8385 ; in Com. on Res., 8674 ; 1°* of B., 8676 ; 2°*, 9409 ; in Com., 9409 ; 3°*, 9524 ; Sen. Amts., 9816 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 48.)
Water Rights Reservations, N.W.T., Rep. of Mr. Burley, &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1398 (i).
Waterways and Transportation Problem : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1288 (i).
See 'Transportation,' &c.
Watson, Mr., Customs Collector, Collingwood, Superannuation, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 408 (i).
Waverley Postmaster,, Duties and Residence &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5427 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5807 (iii).
Ways and Means : M. for Com. (Mr. Paterson) 50 (i).
——— M. for Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6966 (iv).
Ways and Means—The Budget, Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 8888 (v).
——— Resolutions moved, 8914 (v).
Weights and Measures Inspectors . in Com. of Sup., 1692 (i).
Weights and Measures Standards : in Com. of Sup., 1695 (i).
Welland Canal, Deepening, Expenditure, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 588 (i).
——— Deepening Long Level : in Com. of Sup., 6290 (iv).
——— Deepening Summit Level at Port Colborne, 1263 (i).
——— Electric Power Plant : in Com. of Sup., 1231 (i), 9377 (v).
——— Employees during Oct., Nov. : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 453 (i).
——— Emplymt. of Labour, Political Influence : Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 6855 (iv).
——— Lowering Head of Lock No. 1 : in Com. of Sup., 6309 (iv).
——— Port Colborne : in Com. of Sup., 1263 (i).
——— Port Colborne Elevator : in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1288 (i).

Welland Canal, Removal of Obstructions : in Com. of Sup., 1231 (i).
——— Removal of Piers and Bridge Building : in Com. of Sup., 1234 (i).
——— Stone Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 1496 (i).
——— Survey : in Com. of Sup., 1234 (i).
——— Surveys : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1520 (i).
——— Water Power Leases, Names, Quantity, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. German) 2097 (ii).
Wellington Street Pavement : in Com. of Sup., 1571 (i).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. No. 135 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 4553 ; 2°*, 4700 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 176.)
Western Deptl. Block, Addition to : in Com. of Sup., 766 (i).
Western Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. No. 108 (Mr. Adamson) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., 4684 ; 3°*, 4700 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 74.)
Westinghouse Brakes, P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 2178 (ii).
Wharf Building, Policy of Govt. : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1727 (i).
Wharfs in N.S., Expenditure *re* : Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 2611 (ii).
Wharfs, Piers, Docks, constructed by Govt. since 1896 : M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2777 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 8178 (v).
Wharfs in Tidal Waters : in Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).
Wheatley River Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. James Power, Cor., &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 9698 (v).
See 'Post Office.'
Whitby Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6880 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Christie) 2190 (ii).
White Head Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
White Lead : in Com. on Ways and Means, 8983 (v).
——— Amt. *re* Customs Act : in Com. on Bill, 9761 (v).
White, Mr. O., Dismissal, &c. : M. for Cor. *re* (Mr. Crocket) 193 (i).
——— Dismissal as Station Agent, I.C.R. : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 107 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 2205 ; Cor. (read) 2206 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 2235 (ii).
White Mud River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Wiarton Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7569 (iv).
Williamsburg and Cornwall Canals, Water Power Leases, Dates, Rentals, Claims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 4809 (iii).
Williamsburg Canal, Steam Hoist : in Com. of Sup., 1494 (i).
William's Head Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 1841 (i), 7576 (iv).
Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s incorp. B. No. 101 (Mr. Costigan) 1°*, 2108 ; 2°*, 2297 (ii).
Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s B., Cor., &c., *re* : M. for Copies* (Mr. Costigan) 9697 (v).
Wines, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 8983 (v).
Wines, Preferential Tariff : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Customs Bill, 9762 (v).
Winnipeg, Customs Examining Warehouse : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).
——— Hospitals : in Com. of Sup., 1846 (i).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospitals : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 2318 (ii).
Winnipeg, Immigration Building : in Com. of Sup., 1635 (i), 9550 (v).
——— Military Buildings, N.C.O. Quarters : in Com. of Sup., 1635 (i).
——— Postal Station : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).
——— Post Office, Land and Building : in Com. of Sup., 1636 (i).
Winnipegosis Channel Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Winter Communication, P.E.I. and Mainland : Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 6643 (iv).
Winter Mail Service, P.E.I., Ice Boat : in Com. of Sup., 2648 (ii).
——— Cor. Read (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2649 ; Res. from P.E.I. Delegates : Read (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2651 (ii).
——— Statement of Trips of Ice Boats : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2675 (ii).
Winter Mail Service : in Com. of Sup., 6467 (iv).
See 'P.E.I.', &c.
Wire Fencing, Inspection by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 585, 685 (i).
Wire Fencing *re* N.W.T., Boundary Line, Contract *re* Erection : M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., Cor., read, &c., 5578 (iii).
See 'N. W. T. Boundary,' &c.
Wireless Telegraphy Regulation B. No. 186 (Mr. Préfontaine) 1° m., 8177 ; 2°*, 9031 ; in Com., 9031 ; 3°*, 9032 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 49.)
Wolfville Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Woodill, Seymour, Emplymt. on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 2191 (ii).
Wood Island, Protection to Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1743 (i).
Wood, Major Z. T., Additional Living Allowance *re* Yukon : in Com. of Sup., 9250 (v).

Woodstock Armoury, N.B., Ownership of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 4920 (iii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1057 (i).
Woodstock and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 80 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 1°*, 1671; 2°*, 1758 (i).
Woodstock Rifle Range, Purchase of Land: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 5132 (iii).
Working Expenses, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 6907 (iv), 9384 (v).
Worthington, Mr., M.P., Disqualification for H. of C., as Medical Officer of Militia: Remarks and Cor. read (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9149 (v).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Wrecks, Investigation *re*, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6466 (iv).
Wrecking Plant, B.C., Subsidies to: in Com. of Sup., 9177 (v).
Wrecking Plant *re* Life-Saving Stations: in Com. of Sup., 2624 (ii).
Wrecking Plant, 'Lord Strathcona,' Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 957 (i).
Wrecking Plant *re* St. Lawrence Channel: in Com. of Sup., 2476 (ii), 7094 (iv).
Wright Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1846 (i).
——— Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 98 (i).
'W. S. Fielding,' Completion, &c., of New Dredge: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 6891 (iv).
Yamaska Lock: in Com. of Sup., 6868 (iv).
Yamaska River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7394 (iv).
Yarmouth Bank of N.S., Investigation, Punishment of Offenders: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9690 (v).
Yarmouth Harbour Retaining Walls: in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Year-Book: in Com. of Sup., 1474 (i).
——— Statistics, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. on B. 5, 997 (i).
'Yellow Dog,' Attack on Orangemen by Quebec Newspapers: Ref. to in Com. on B. 69, 8350 (v).
See 'Autonomy,' &c.
Yoho Park Reserve, N.W.T.,: in Com. of Sup., 7719 (iv).
Yonge Street Bridge, Toronto, Order *re* Construction, Tel. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 586 (i).
Young, Thos., and G. C. McNab, Dom. Officials and Political Organizers: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9154 (v).
Yukon Ter., Annexation to Provs., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Thompson) 6509 (iv).
Yukon-Ashcroft-Dawson Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 7635 (iv), 9605 (v).
Yukon, Buildings, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i).
——— Commissionership, Vacancy *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5036 (iii).
——— Court Fees: In Com. of Sup., 137 (i).
——— Customs, Living Allowance: in Com. of Sup., 411 (i).
——— Elections for Dom., Delay in opening Ballot Boxes: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 987 (i).
——— Election, Cor. *re* Returning Officer: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1254 (i).
——— information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1152 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 453 (i).
——— return of Member Elect: Telegrams read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1066 (i).
Yukon Govt. Administration, Living Allowance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 126 (i), 7716 (iv).
——— Grant to Local Council: in Com. of Sup., 7718 (iv), 9250 (v).
——— Judge's Allowances: in Com. of Sup., 126 (i).
——— Law Books: in Com. of Sup., 136 (i).
——— Legal Adviser, Appnmt. of Mr. Congdon, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 7020 (iv).
Yukon Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 203 (i).
Yukon, Orders-in-Council, Regulations, &c., Approval of, &c.: prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 9725 9784 (v).
——— Ordinances: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 54 (i).
——— Post Office Officials, Salaries, Living Allowances, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).
——— Prisoners, Maintenance of: in Com. of Sup., 135 (i).
——— Reforms *re* Government, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Thompson) on M. for Sup., 7021 (iv).
——— Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 6896 (iv).
——— Territorial District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2322 (ii).
——— Witnesses Fees, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 135 (i).